

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
January 8, 2016
9:00 am CT

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So the recording has started. As I was saying, we have a bit longer agenda than usual, but I hope most of these issues will not take too long, and then we have a fairly short list of impending member applications. So we should be able to do this in the time we have.

So the first two items actually have the same purpose here. I'm trying to get somebody else to help me share the workload of the chair. For that purpose, I'm proposing inviting one more observer to the EC, Kathy Kleiman, the first item. Does anybody object that? Can we have a consensus here?

Robin Gross: Hi, this is Robin. Can I speak?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Go ahead, Robin.

Robin Gross: Yes. I just had some questions. So you want to invite someone to be an observer to EC to be - so we're on number 1. Why would Kathy be an observer? I'm just trying to understand what that - how that works.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, basically I want someone here who could help pick up some (tasks) I would have to do otherwise and where I tend to run out of time. And Kathy is very experienced and knows just about everything in the history. No, I think. So I think she would go good in picking up some - helping us in some subjects where I am too inexperienced. (Unintelligible) have too little time to work here.

We have a number of observers from the past chairs and so forth already, so it's not a big thing as such.

Robin Gross: Okay, when you say "observer," that's different from what you're proposing for number 2 to have someone help with work. So you're just saying somebody to be on the list, to watch the list, is what you're proposing for number 1?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Robin Gross: Oh, okay. Then I was confused. I guess I was sort of imagining the number 1 was going to be an administrative role as well. But you want to put her on the mailing list...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Robin Gross: ...as an observer. Oh, well, that's fine. I mean anyone - our mailing lists are open anyways. Have you discussed this with her? Is this something that she wants to be an observer on our list?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I did. She agrees.

Robin Gross: But what if she - she's not going to be doing administrative stuff. She's just going to be looking, keeping track of our list. What happens...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, butting in whenever she thinks she has something useful to say. But I don't think she would have any time for administrative work anyway.

Robin Gross: Okay. Well, I guess that's fine. I mean we're just talking about putting her onto a list that is already publicly available to be looked at anyway. So I guess that sounds okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: No objections. We will have to wait for Klaus to have come in because we need consensus here. Rudi, any problems with this? Yes, Rudi go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: I'm also slightly confused. I'm just wondering, first of all, the difference between EC and the policy committee at the end because EC up until now didn't take that many stuff on the table, the workload. Most of the work is done in the policy committee. The EC has a limited task list and so far I didn't see any reason to have more people on the EC was most of the work is done in the policy committee.

At the other side, there is an observer, but the observer is there because of the constituency still not being created. And as such, the person who is as an observer is there due to the status of the constituency. That's the only reason why as (unintelligible) an observer.

I would try to understand where it would be different workloads through what we did in the past, which essentially is validating the members, the applications that were entered into the system and to become a member of NCSG. We did in, let's say the last few years is what I think.

And I would try to keep the real practical work that needs to happen in the policy committee because that's where we have much more people available to do the work and keep it there. Otherwise, I think we need to change a little bit the charter and the bylaws of the whole contract.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, the policy committee does publish work but we have a lot of practical work in what needs to be organized type of things. And I would like to have - like we have old chairs in the list, for example. Well, I'm not sure if you want to call them observers, but basically I would just want to have it on the list so that she can comment if need be on things we are planning to do, not about membership applications; mostly routine stuff anyway.

Rudi Vansnick: I was not aware of the fact that we have on the mailing list the previous chairs. I was not aware of that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, I think this was a good item to bring up so that you know now. Should we clear them out?

Rudi Vansnick: Well, it's something that we need to discuss in our constituencies. And that's the reason why I say, Okay, this agenda was a little bit late to have the chance to discuss this by our group and have a decision on this. It's something that I have to go back to my colleagues anyway. I cannot - I have to abstain for the moment to decide on this.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: I think that we need to have a discussion inside the constituency to try to understand and have an approval. I'm not approving without consulting my group.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I thought that just because we have a number of former chairs and what not in the list already, this would not be big issue. But, of course, if we want to take the case of who we want to have on the list in general, on the table, we can postpone this until you have discussed it within your constituency.

Rudi Vansnick: It's completely new. I was not aware. On the mailing list we have other people than those having been assigned to the executive committee. I'm (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Actually that's the way it's been as long as I know that I'm aware of is that they - the former chairs were kept on the list just for continuity sake, but we don't really hear much of anything from them. But if we were to do something totally crazy, they would at least know about it in a position and say, hey, what are you guys doing?

Rudi Vansnick: Please don't misunderstand me. I'm not against it. But it's the first time that we are informed about that.

Robin Gross: Well, I think maybe - I remember it was discussed very early on and everybody agreed on it early on. Everyone thought it was a good idea early on. I guess when you joined the EC, you didn't realize or didn't look at the list of who's subscribed to the mailing list.

And so I guess, you know, you weren't specifically told that that was the practice that had been in place for some time as people were not kicked off the mailing list. They just didn't participate really in the discussion. But they were there as an observer. I mean I was there. Rafik is still here. Avri is there.

Tapani Tarvainen: It seems this was a surprise, which I did not expect. Some of us will need to have more discussion about this and leave until later. If you want, Rudi, to

postpone this to the next meeting until we can discuss this in detail and whether we should remove the other?

Rudi Vansnick: I would prefer that there is a chance for us to have (unintelligible) discussion on this because it's a new item that came on the table this morning. And I want to first consult my group to see what they think about and give them the information that I'm receiving today so that we can make an appropriate decision and keep track of this knowledge for the future of NPOC executive committees that they know how the NCSG executive committee is composed with regard to (unintelligible).

I have no objections, it's just that I feel embarrassed that I have to take a decision on something that - I first want to talk to my colleagues about.

Robin Gross: You know, I think that's totally fair. I do. I just - I wonder, maybe we should clarify what we're saying here. When I said "these people were on the mailing list," I didn't actually mean they were still members of the executive committee, per se. There is nothing to make these people still be members of the executive in any capacity. They are simply still subscribed to the mailing list is all.

I presume that's what Tapani meant when he said add Kathy as an observer also. That's kind of why I was a little bit confused at first in terms of trying to understand exactly what was being proposed.

But I think it's fair that we would want to go back and talk with those who appointed us to see how they would feel about this.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm just looking at subscriber list now just for reference. There is Avri.

Dorothy, I think. Maryam is on the list. Milton Miller is on the list. Rafik is on the list in addition to the EC members. So just for reference.

But let's move this so that - we apparently weren't prepared for this, so let's postpone this item 1 until later.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, sorry that I have to push it back for the moment so that we have discussions by the group. I'm rather positive for the proposal but need some clarification.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So we're postponing item 1.

Let's move on to number 2. I guess we need to be discuss about this this as well. So I'm proposing to have a vice chair as our charter provides for here, and that would be specifically for helping in the administrative tasks, organizing meetings and all that kind of stuff as far as (unintelligible) everything that kind of thing.

And I have put two key points here that - while I'm proposing JoanKerr as the vice-chair here, it is not intended to be any kind of constituency and (unintelligible) any more than I feel myself to be an NCUC representative. But I presume Joan would have no problem with that. Sorry she's not present now.

And formally the task division with (unintelligible) chair and vice-chair, it's up to the chair in practice but would, of course, discuss (unintelligible) until the time that we're trying to share the load, especially when I can make support approach and all kinds of schedules need to be organized and arranged and so forth.

Any opinions on this one?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Sorry. Again, it's something that I would like to have the full consensus from the executive committee that everybody agrees on this without having any discussion. It's a bit difficult.

I've put it on agenda for ExCom call so that this could be validated and there is nothing that has been decided that nobody in the (unintelligible). It's something that has been decided by a few people. That's not the way it works, so I would like to propose this first and have a consensus in the ExCom before we can fully approve that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. We would be happy to do it so that we leave it pending your decision. It will be effective as soon as you confirm your point, or do you want to postpone it until our next meeting?

Rudi Vansnick: Well, no. Until we have our ExCom call, I could say let's put it in pending. It is also depending on the decision of other members of the executive committee of NCSG, also.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I understand that. But still we cannot do it. We decided that - your opinion on that issue is left pending and then we'll wait until we hear from your executive committee and then record it and consider it done by that, or we can just postpone the whole thing until we have our next call.

Rudi Vansnick: There is no need for postponing it. I said we can put it in pending and when we have our call give you the results. And we just lay back and then it's just like this.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. It seems that (unintelligible) as well. Klaus is still not in. Robin?

Robin Gross: Can you hear me okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Robin Gross: I can be persuaded to this, but its pretty much - if it's an administrative role, that's sort of the key for me is that if you're really busy and you need help with tasks and administrative things, I think that's great to find someone who is willing to help with that.

So the only part where I would have some trouble is then if this position were to be a position of some kind of authority and it wasn't appointed by the membership, per se, the way that other representatives of this committee are. We're here because we represent our constituencies' interests. And so that's an important interest for us to represent.

I would have - I would not be comfortable with this if this were some kind of a decisional role or some kind of authoritative role that was being proposed. But if it's purely administrative, I think I can be okay with it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Our charter provides for the vice-chair's election that it would have to be chosen by the AC. So it's kind of indirectly chosen by the membership. But (unintelligible) need to be an administrative task to have no independent in making power as such. The question is if you trust that I will not delegate through anything that I should not.

Robin Gross: What if it doesn't work out? Is there a path being removed and replaced? I mean are there parameters? I think we need to have parameters and specific job duties and specific responsibilities, just so everybody is clear about what

their role is and what their responsibility is and isn't, and how that could be changed.

It's a good idea, but let's just define it so everybody is clear what it is and it's administrative.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm not sure. I don't think we can list in detail what she would be doing. I know that our charter provides for getting rid of the EC vice-chair if need be. And, of course, if it doesn't work out, then it will become effectively nominally. It will be up to me then to decide if she doesn't do anything useful then...

Robin Gross: So it would be kind of a unilateral decision for you to remove the person or not remove the person or...

Tapani Tarvainen: I could not remove her nominally from the position, but I could remove all the power from her. If you want to remove her nominally, then we'd have (unintelligible) decision there. But for practical purposes, she would have no power basically to override whatever I want to do or do anything unless I say so.

Robin Gross: So this is sort of like your assistant?

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, if you want to (unintelligible). I hope you don't because she will then say no.

Robin Gross: We can give it all sort of fancy titles. I just want to make sure I understand what the role actually is. And maybe we should go back and talk to our constituencies about how they would feel about that.

Klaus Stoll: Hi. Can you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Hello, Klaus. Welcome. Yes, we can hear you.

Klaus: Oh, wonderful. Thank you. Sorry about that. Roads were very (bad) and I've got the (unintelligible). My fault.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: If I just may connect to what also Robin was saying. I fully agree with her that we need some reflection from inside the constituency. And I think it's clear that we need clarification on the charter of NCSG in order to avoid that we don't have a good procedure for doing this that we try to do. There is a lack of rules and procedures that we need to follow. It could harm the structure if we are not following the right procedure.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, the procedure for choosing a vice-chair is clear enough, but it's true that the charter provides basically no guidance on the tasks of the vice-chair. But I would - but the vice-chair normally would do it - basically take over those tasks that the chair can't handle or won't. So I don't see that there is a big problem there. I guess I'll have to call this again.

Are we happy to leave the decision so that once you confer with your constituencies, you will indicate your position here and then we are going to call? Or do you want to postpone it to the next call?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick, for the transcript. As I said, I can keep it on pending until we have agreed upon. But I think it is important that whoever will be a vice-chair anyway has a clear description of the tasks, duties and responsibilities which

are actually quite unclear. I think it's good if we can clarify that and see if the person feels good with what is proposed as duties, responsibilities and tasks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. There is difficulty in defining in too much detail. The usual way I'm seeing more similar - or other organizations that have a vice-chair what it's like, especially that it's up to the chair to define the division of tasks. But if you want to try to define it in more detail, I'm open to suggestions but I can't see any easy way to do practical and practice any detailed definition here.

Rudi Vansnick: Tapani, sorry to interrupt. Rudi, for the transcript. I want to mention -- and Klaus has his hands up also -- I just want to have the following situation in case for some reason -- health issues or whatsoever -- that you as a chair are not able to execute as a chair, does the vice-chair take over all your responsibilities? That's at least something that should be clarified. I'm not discussing about all the administrative (unintelligible). I don't want to talk about that.

In reflection to who can engage NCSG and who is effectively enabled to replace the chair when there are discussions and there are meetings going on, I think that's important. That should be clarified. So far, I have no idea if this is clarified.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I think that calls for rather (unintelligible) the vice-chair's role in case of a temporary incapacitation or absence of the chair. I'm sure he would take over until - if it becomes permanent, inability of the chair to carry on, the charter is clear that a new temporary chair should be elected.

But in the temporary absence of the chair, yes, the vice-chair would take over noting that without a vice-chair, there would be nobody to take over in that situation, and the whole EC would effectively be unable to function until a

new chair is elected. So that would not really make a big difference in those terms other than just giving up the temporary scenario in case a new chair needs to be selected.

Rudi Vansnick: There is the question of (unintelligible) power, too. But I don't know, Tapani if you see the Adobe Connect. Klaus has his hands up. I would like...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I was going to hand it to him but you've been talking a lot. Okay, let's have Klaus to say his words. Klaus, please.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the transcript. I agree with Robin and I agree with Rudi Vansnick. We need a description very roughly beforehand. And I think the easiest way is - can we, and I apologize in advance - Maryam, would it be possible to look if there is not something, a paragraph or two, that we could actually look at and at our next meeting talk about it, agree on it and then see if the person we have in mind is actually wanting to do the job.

If somebody would come to me and say - becomes a vice-chair, but it's not clear actually what my responsibilities are. I actually would say, "I don't want to do it." So is that a reasonable solution? Let Maryam look for some definitions we might be able to use, discuss them after next meeting and then go forward from there.

Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Klaus. It seems we do need to discuss this a bit more. Let's try to have some kind of - okay. Maryam is volunteering to draft up some roles and responsibilities table.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Maryam.

Tapani Tarvainen: So let's postpone this until we get it and discuss it within our constituencies and see if we can come up with something clear enough for us to move forward.

Yes, I realize I was bringing this up with a short notice, but I also felt the need to rush this a bit and nothing happens otherwise. So next call will include this stuff. I'll try to make a decision then.

Okay. Let's move on to the finance committee. Another one on short notice, but in this case I'm not proposing anything else and let's decide to reactivate the finance committee. And then I would ask the constituencies to go back to your executive committees and your representatives. Would you be happy with this?

We don't have any financing to speak of as yet, so this would not be a very hot topic, but there are some things I would expect the finance committee to do. First, to track ICANN budget so with people there who are interested in budgeting stuff and also possibly prepare any - we might have special budget requests or (unintelligible), but we don't have that time to have finance committee for that, but in the future it would be useful as well as if we do get money for whatever reason or channeling the finance committee would be asked to take care of that.

For example, we might want to pay for the membership database, might have to (unintelligible) a bank account somewhere or something like that. So the proposal is that we decide to (unintelligible) the finance committee and ask constituencies to name their representatives, one each, to it.

Okay, Robin. You have a hand up.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Robin Gross: Yes, I think this is a great idea. I think it also is worth pointing out that probably the reason we've never had much of an active finance committee is because we've never had any bank account or any money or any funding. NCSG has never had any funding of any sort. So I think maybe that's one of the reasons why this committee never really got off the ground and going.

But I really like your idea of trying to use the committee to focus on following the ICANN budget process and then making budget requests for NCSG for various things in the ICANN budget process. That would be extremely useful and really worthwhile. I think that's a great idea.

But I would just want to make sure that we'll be sure to let the constituencies know that that's the kind of work we're talking about doing on this committee. It isn't a committee where we've got a bunch of money where we could just spend. We've never had a cent to spend. But in terms of tracking ICANN and that budget process and making some budgetary requests for NCSG, that's a great idea.

And maybe we could also, you know, do some requests, do some grants, applications or something if we get this committee in place. So maybe - we don't have to have a 0 balance forever.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Robin. I trust you will communicate to your constituency the points and idea behind this. And I see that Rudi Vansnick has his hand up. Rudi, please?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Tapani. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Well the executive committee in fact exists. When you're looking through the NCA's new Wiki page, you will see that there is an update done on the composition of the financial committee, actual list (unintelligible) NCSG care topic and positive. (Unintelligible) for NCUC it's (Milton). And there is an observing member that is Dorothy Gordon.

So it's something that wasn't (unintelligible). The question is: Does NCSG itself (unintelligible) finances? Is it not going to be conflicting with the constituencies that are, in fact, doing most of the work and are the NCSG expenses most of the time covered by the GNSO level if I'm not wrong where all the counselors are, in fact, covered by GNSO (unintelligible)?

But I can be wrong. I can have a wrong perception of it. It's just that it's going to make things complicated, I think, if you need to have within a stakeholder group a budget discussion and have similar discussions at the level just below that could be conflicting with each other.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Thank you, Rudi Vansnick. That's a good point, but the intent is not to - the request, that would be more appropriate at the constituency level but only things that we really need to do at stakeholder group level. In terms of actual money, the only thing like that I foresee happening now is the member database payment, if we end up doing it that way. So then we might need a bank account for that.

But my primary purpose here, it will definitely be needed. It would be someone to track down the ICANN budget.

Okay. Robin, I see you have your hand up again. Robin?

Robin Gross: Sorry, that's an old hand.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Robin Gross: Okay. I've taken it down.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. We had (unintelligible) starting the finance committee like this without having any money to start with, so would communicate to whoever you - that you won't have any money to decide about. The first task will be (striking) down ICANN budget but potentially handling the bank account if we get and need one. We do not have to plan to have any big amounts of money at any point.

Klaus, you have your hand up?

Klaus Stoll: Yes. (Unintelligible) but the thing what Rudi Vansnick said makes me think. Maybe we should actually get - let's have the finance committee but also write down and agree and (unintelligible) that we don't overlap a new understanding and who do we want and (unintelligible).

I think that it would make me feel much, much better if we have a finance committee who actually knows what (unintelligible).

Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Well, looking at charter for the NCSC FC, it does not - given that we don't have a budget yet but we would have a treasurer if we get it that has basically no function unless we get a (unintelligible) count. And we would have to decide that with the EC to begin with, so that will not happen without

a separate assignment if a decision here. It also should be just a determining rate for voluntary contributions from members. I don't expect we'd actually do that or a fundraising plan. Again, I don't expect NCSG to actually raise any funds as such.

Accounting for any funds received by the NCSG; again, I don't see us receiving any except possibly funding member database. So the actual thing that remains is to - other prescribed financial requirements by organizations and document matters and (unintelligible) and so forth are subject to review by the NCSG.

But if you like, we can at this point decide is the task initially would be only to track down ICANN budget unless and until otherwise directed by the EC.

Klaus Stoll: I think that's acceptable.

Rudi Vansnick: Tapani, (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes?

Rudi Vansnick: What I'm a bit afraid of, and if we start having our own financial budget, that ICANN would say, well, you know, now NCSG, you have your own funding; we don't cover any costs anymore of NCSG itself. And that would harm us a lot because it means that we will need to find a lot of money.

I'm a bit hesitating on having a finance account. I'm not hesitating on having the finance committee that could have opinions on budget allocation by ICANN. But looking for own budget, own money, I'm a bit afraid of in the sense that ICANN would say, Well, okay, you know, you have your own money, go, we don't cover your costs anymore.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. But if we are going to have our own money, that would be a separate decision anyway. As noted, the only such I foresee would be the member database fees which would be paid by ICANN anyway. So it would be kind of (unintelligible) for not paying anything else. In any event, that would be a separate decision.

At this point, we would only authorize the finance committee to track ICANN's budget and make suggestions about what we can do about it and so on. But not having our own bank account could be a separate decision to be made later if we find it is necessary.

Any other points here can be agree on? Let's start the finance committee and tasks and to track down ICANN budget. No other talks until otherwise explicitly decided.

Robin Gross: Works for me. This is Robin.

Klaus Stoll: Will work for me, too. To inform you, Tapani Tarvainen, I'm in the finance working group of ICANN where we have our discussions at ICANN's physical meetings to prepare budgets. So I'm happy to work and join.

Tapani Tarvainen: That will be nice. Okay. With that, I'll talk to you guys to contact your executive committees and appoint your representatives to the finance committee.

Okay. Let's move on. We have a relating point, a special request deadline coming, but I don't know if there is anything that we should apply for NCSG here. As noted, we have never actually spent any money as NCSG. So I just put this here on the agenda so that you can comment on if you have any ideas

about this. I'm not suggesting that we actually make any requests because I can't think of any.

Robin Gross: This is Robin. I've got an idea.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Robin.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me? Do we have brochures? Do we have NCSG brochures or any kind of written materials? I know the constituencies have some, and I just wonder if that might be something that would be helpful for us to have as well. And that could be something that I think would be a very reasonable budget request.

Tapani Tarvainen: I think we have actually separate - Maryam. Yes. Maryam brought in, there is a separate budget for publications. And we have actually, I think, brochure but she was reviewing it, updating.

Robin Gross: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Klaus, you have your hand up?

Klaus Stoll: Yes, Tapani. (Unintelligible) because I think it's one of the worst things that happened in ICANN because - a specific example of what happened last year. I spent a week filling out forms and doing budget requests for (unintelligible). We got (unintelligible) total five requests. And we were very happy to hear that these requests were granted to NPOC. But what happened then and where the whole (sham) started that instead of NPOC being able, for example, to do their own brochures or to do videos or to do outreach events or to do something, it was explained that the big money for the request allocation would go to specific staff inside ICANN to work for.

And what happened, for example, not in our case, but in the case, for example, of the (unintelligible), that the quote came in for two-page e-book online for \$5,000 U.S.

Basically, the whole thing was nothing else but another purchase line for increasing ICANN staff and ICANN activities. Maybe it's wrong to (unintelligible) of the NCSG, but I think we really should let ICANN know that this community purpose request and how it played out last year really was absolutely not acceptable in my opinion.

By the way, this opinion I made absolutely clear to the relevant ICANN staff. They didn't like to hear it, but I made this point extremely clear.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. That's a good point. And it occurs to me that this is part of criticizing the way ICANN handles its budget. So finance committee, we are - make concrete proposal here to ICANN on how this should be handled. Because I'm asking them to follow ICANN budget.

Anyway, does anyone have any other suggestions we should do about this now? I noted that we don't really have anything obvious that I can think of that should be at the stakeholder group level.

Rudi Vansnick: Tapani, this is Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Quickly, last time we had that agreement that there was a request came in by the MCGH for some activities. I haven't seen any message so far for that one.

Secondly, the activities - for instance, I'm thinking about the internet governance forum. There have been requests sent in previously for the previous years. What if we don't answer this request now? If we don't answer them, do we fail to have support for future IGF?

Tapani Tarvainen: Did we have for IGF last time at NCSG level?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, we had (unintelligible) travel covered by ICANN. But I think that came out of request.

Robin Gross: Yes, the last several meetings - there were NCSG delegation at the last several IGFs.

Tapani Tarvainen: That's not covered by special community budget requests?

Robin Gross: I think it may have been. I think they did have to do a budget request and have a workshop proposed. And then if it got accepted - if the workshop got accepted then the ICANN was willing to fund. I think it's three: The chair and then one person from each constituency is, I think, how it works out.

Rudi Vansnick, does that sound right to you?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Robin. That's fully correct. I'm just also wondering - it's a pity that the time is so short to get things done. But if I look at the proposal on the outreach plans that Jean-Jacques, and Adam are presenting, are they going to have the budget covered by that plan? Or do we have as NCSG - do we want to fit into the outreach activity? Do we need to have a special budget request done? That's still quite (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Yes, that's a good question.

Tapani Tarvainen: Maryam, do you remember last year if NCSG made a special committee budget request for IGF for how it was handled?

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam here for the record. No, I don't know. (Rafik) would have handled that. I could ask him and get back on the list.

Robin Gross: I think he did. I think (Rafik) did. I seem to remember (Rafik) making a bunch of requests. I don't remember exactly which budget proposal process it was, but I think - I'm pretty sure he did have to make a request. And so we should clarify. The deadline is January 15th if that's our deadline for the request for the IGF or others. I'm happy to talk with (Rafik) about it, too.

Klaus Stoll: I can say that - Tapani and others, I can say that I have seen it in the list of budget requests due to the fact that I'm in the finance committee working group of ICANN (unintelligible). This was also discussed. Each year when you get the approval of the budget request that's made public, you have the list of all the requests. And I remember quite well that there was this request in the list.

So it's something that we can easily pick up from the previous ones and just enter it again to be sure that we have that of budget.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So I take it that the decision here will be to check if the IGF event was covered by such budget request last year, and if so, do it again. Okay. I'll follow up. I'll (Rafik) and dig up the old request if there was such and then submit it as such, basically changing date-to-date, except we don't know the dates yet which should be a problem. The IGF dates haven't been decided yet.

Klaus Stoll: You don't have to mention the dates. We need to ask for a budget allocation for the present at the IGF. Whatever date it is, it doesn't make...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Yes. We'll do that.

Klaus Stoll: We need a budget for being present at the IGF and perhaps look immediately for a few other quite important events that are happening like the recent Plus 10 and others to automatically have budget allocated for this quite important meetings that we have representation of NCSG over there.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Can you all list which meetings we should prepare for? So we have IGF (unintelligible) Boston. When is that?

Klaus Stoll: Well, there will be (unintelligible) every year, I suppose, at least plus some of the special ones. But I think that each year the (unintelligible) will also have its important meetings eventually inside the (IPU) itself. Otherwise we need to use other ways to get to that meeting.

And it makes it easier if we just put in a request for every year for these types of meetings that we have. The ability to be present and to have (unintelligible) presentation of our community.

Tapani Tarvainen: And okay given that we have just one week until the deadline may I suggest that you or everybody actually put in writing - write down all these such meetings that you remember we should budget for and put it (unintelligible) list like as soon as possible.

We have IGF and the (unintelligible) meeting for now. Any others? But really just mail them to (unintelligible) and we can try to - I guess I can do request without another (unintelligible) meeting if we have. Just know exactly what to apply for.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes

Maryam Bakoshi: While I am here. So I just put in the chart a link to first of all the request (unintelligible) last year. So yes there was one. The deadline for is FY '17 is (unintelligible). So I really would want everything in by the 13th to get it ready for 15th. Is that okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: The 13th well yes. Well try to do it by then. So let's put it so (unintelligible) wants to know exactly what we (unintelligible) by Monday, 11th and I will work with to try to prepare request Maryam by Wednesday and she can move them on by Friday. Okay.

And I will (unintelligible) last year for IGF at least. Is that okay with everybody? I will do it that then.

Okay anything else about budget request or can we go and look at pending applications? Okay one minor point about the finance committee I forgot to mention that presumably we would name them to be in effect until the next executive committee is selected. So the term will be the same as (unintelligible).

But moving on to pending applications. Does everybody have the spreadsheet?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes (unintelligible) it seems most others haven't. Have you been able to take a look at these I am sorry to have reminded you so late. We have five individual members. Do you want to go through this in detail?

Only one is controversial as far as I can see but you haven't had time to look at these at all? Robin, Monika, Klaus could you please take a quick look? (Unintelligible) uncontroversial as far as I can see. The last one needs some discussion.

But please take a few minutes to review them if you haven't had time to do so.

Man: Tapani, just for clarification for the last one on the (unintelligible). He was a member of the (unintelligible). That organization (unintelligible) 2015 its activities.

And Andrei has consultancy business which he is in fact using here as a membership application. And I think it is clear his son is coming from business so I am very sorry I cannot agree on this one even if he wants to be a member of (unintelligible). And I am sorry (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes you can't be a member of (unintelligible) anyway since he is applying as an individual member.

In principle it is of course not necessarily where his funding is coming from but it is interesting (unintelligible). I am not really familiar enough (unintelligible) preference. So I can actually reference to his identify but not really to his purposes or background here.

So I can (unintelligible) but the point you raise is something I can't really judge on. But do others agree that we just (unintelligible) or would you like to argue that we should maybe ask him or something else for clarification?

As an (IICD) was pretty much not (unintelligible) but what kind of interest is here after now (unintelligible). Of course we need a consensus here so if (unintelligible) then that's it.

Any way I see that Klaus and Monika have not yet completed (unintelligible). Have you seen that spreadsheet?

Okay Monika. Can you fill in your points? Okay I (unintelligible) a bit strange. Okay Monika can you fill in your...

And while Monika is dealing with her communication problems. Klaus are you okay with these individuals? Have we lost Klaus?

Man: No he is still there but (unintelligible) looking to the form we don't see that connection.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay unless nobody wants to defend (unintelligible) that we have (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible).

Man: Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Yes (unintelligible) first four pages (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Okay I think we have (unintelligible) approve all (unintelligible). And looking at organizations we have only one. And I see that through this again rejecting and (unintelligible). And given that we need consensus it is (unintelligible) unless somebody plans to counter argue on this point.

Man: Really for the transcript I based my opinion on what I found the Web site itself and inside the application itself they are saying that they are getting their - they are funding from business activities. They can't prove (unintelligible) I am not objecting but the way it is presented it is difficult to say yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Getting funds from U.S. based trade association. (Unintelligible) commercial for all purposes. Robin what do you think?

Robin Gross: Yes I think it does and I agree with Rudi's assessment. I am looking at the Web site also and it look like this is maybe like a business government partnership.

And you know its golden objectives might be wonderful but I don't think it belongs in the non-commercial stakeholder group. It is a business government partnership so I think it would need to go in one of those other stakeholder groups.

Tapani Tarvainen: Now okay it is clear enough so we reject them as well. Maryam you will notify them that - yes Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes just a quick comment on this one. Maybe this is a proposal. Maybe we need to contact them and ask if (APWG) could be an applicant. Because that is something that I am not against at all.

It is something that could be interesting to have amongst our members and have discussions on the views of the (unintelligible). Could be a good partner in the discussions.

But the question can we ask an applicant to rather come with another organization to which they belong?

Tapani Tarvainen: I don't know if - I don't see any reason for stopping you from doing so if you want to contacting them suggesting that (APWG) joins or applies (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) he is a member definitely from that (APWG) and I think that that is a not for profit anyway.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay if that is not for profit then - Robin did you have something to comment on this?

Robin Gross: Well I am looking at the anti-phishing org Web site now and so I mean you know without them having actually applied and just looking at their Web site right now I just, you know, I can't really have an opinion as to whether or not it is commercial or if it is non-commercial or if it is a quasi-business, quasi-government campaign. I am not really sure.

And they haven't applied. It looks pretty clear to me that that other org was not the one that did apply (unintelligible). But you know just kind of speculating on this other one when they haven't applied and, you know, just kind of...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I don't think we can ask them - yes us (unintelligible) comment here cannot really solicit someone to join. So we just notify (unintelligible) that we reject them and leave it up to any of you individually want to do something about the (APWG) asking them to join for (unintelligible) that's up to you. As executive committee we can't really do that. So it is not that we reject (unintelligible). Yes (Rudi Vansnick)?

Rudi Vansnick: I dropped in the chat box the - about the (APWG) structure and it is a 501 USA. If we push back on (unintelligible) connect maybe they would say, go away we don't want to hear about (unintelligible) anymore.

While at the other side it would be a pity to lose people with some experience in this (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes looking at what you cut and pasted there it is U.S. based non-profit 501c3. I am not sure if that is good enough for us.

Well we are not going to solicit them but the question is that since even the (unintelligible) is legal and non-cooperation. Is that (unintelligible) Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes this is Robin. It seems to me though that we should really just be dealing with the application that is in front of us. And the application in front of us is the stop think connect application.

We have a consensus that that one isn't a viable candidate. So I think that is really where the end of our work as the (unintelligible) executive committee on this issue.

Now if any individuals among us think that there is somebody connected with that organization or this other organization that might be a good fit. You know there is nothing to stop that person from saying, hey maybe you should apply in this capacity or that capacity.

But I think our work as the executive committee is really only what the application that is in front of us. And really not to go any further than that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay yes I agree with that. That was my position. So let's leave it at that.

Okay so seems we have no application then to review then do we? So we are done with member applications. That was fast.

Man: Congratulations Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Okay the last item here would be about (unintelligible) Los Angeles (unintelligible) schedule. I know that we mostly has been discussed elsewhere so we don't want to hash on that here.

But some NCSG specific things and one I would like to have comment on is this possible NCSG level outreach event that has been proposed by some people.

Now having NCSG as such (unintelligible) vertically would meet that constituencies who want to do it that way. So I am asking your opinion should we try to do that? Do you want to talk with you constituencies (unintelligible) outreach to constituencies as such?

And again if you don't have already opinion here I am fine to leave it (unintelligible). It is not really necessarily something that has to be decided here. But if you have a position here, opinion, comment would be welcome.

Robin Gross: Oh I am sorry go ahead.

Man: No, no go ahead.

Tapani Tarvainen: Robin go ahead first.

Robin Gross: Okay sure. Well I mean I am just maybe I am a little bit behind in organizing. Did you say that the constituencies themselves are also organizing something? Would this be instead of that?

Tapani Tarvainen: I was asking - I was specifically asking because I was proposed that (unintelligible) that they would be happy to help us organize (unintelligible) if we want to. So I am asking you would you want this or would you prefer to have a stakeholder (unintelligible) instead or whatever?

Robin Gross: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: So soliciting opinions here. Would you like us to organize stakeholder group level outreach event?

Robin Gross: Well I think we definitely should do something since we are all going to be there and it is a new - it is an opportunity to bring in new members. So it sounds like really the question is do we do at the stakeholder group level or at the constituency level?

And I guess I don't really have a strong opinion one way or the other on that but I think it is a good opportunity for us to do some kind of outreach since we are going to be in the area and we are going to all be together.

I was just kind of wondering if the constituencies were already planning something and it sounds like they are not.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay Klaus you have your hand up.

Klaus: Yes (unintelligible) actually planning something. And we have a (unintelligible) I can (unintelligible) involved. Basically we wanted to ask the

speakers on topics like (unintelligible) day to day concerns (unintelligible) privacy and how I can try to (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) how to participate in ICANN as a NGO. What I would say to this one is it is completely open that we invite for example speakers from the (unintelligible) some of the topics as we take speakers from (unintelligible) on some of these topics (unintelligible) event. I am completely open to that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Klaus Stoll: And in addition to that Tapani I heard from rumors that there might be an internal event about future (unintelligible) challenges to the (unintelligible) that we can actually prepare ourselves for things to come. I will definitely plan to do something like that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes but not really definitely (unintelligible) would be going on there. And I am afraid I have been rather falling behind my schedule (unintelligible).

But now the question is just something is (unintelligible) if we should have a motion of what shall I say to (unintelligible) asking me if we want to organize something on Wednesday evening?

This is in addition to the reception event on Thursday evening which is for (unintelligible) where we can invite people but we could arrange something on Wednesday evening if we want.

Klaus Stoll: Sorry if we can (unintelligible) I think it is not only the event itself (unintelligible) we don't have local outreach going. So we need to decide do we have the capacity to (unintelligible) so that we actually get bumped into the hotel and then we can decide on what event we are doing.

And my proposal is that we use the structure and the idea of the (unintelligible) open it up to (unintelligible) speakers and basically making it NCSG event. But as I said it only makes sense if you also have the capacity for the outreach.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay when are you planning this (unintelligible) event?

Klaus Stoll: This one it is actually at the moment under discussion with (Robert Holgar) but I was expecting something on Wednesday.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So is this just for information we can't really make a decision here but (unintelligible) seems that it would be useful to arrange (unintelligible) level event on Wednesday (unintelligible).

So I propose (unintelligible) talk with your constituencies and if you think it would be a good idea then come back to me and we will see about organizing it.

Otherwise it seems we have exerted our agenda with only 1 hour and 22 minutes. Does anyone have any subjects we want to talk this point or shall we call this done?

Man: Tapani I am just looking at the - I am just looking at my timetable here. If we don't make a decision on this now we basically have two and a half weeks to do that. So if we don't do a new decision on this kind of event we are actually saying not doing any.

Tapani Tarvainen: But basically we have to make a decision within like today or tomorrow or something like that. We can't (unintelligible) request and I can start to look

for see for the possibility of (unintelligible) but we would have to make a decision pretty quickly that is true.

Man: (Unintelligible) opinion from the others on this one?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes and I (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) still on the allocation of logistics and eventual budget that in fact all depends on (Robert's) decision rather than ours. We can - if we are in Los Angeles on the Wednesday and we have an agreement by (Robert) on Monday we can still try to invite some (unintelligible) that are in LA or around LA to join us in the meeting.

But again it depends on what if I can offering logistics and capacity in order to do something like this.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay so does anybody propose doing something concrete here or shall we just leave it and we talk with with (Robert) and with our constituencies before doing anything.

(Unintelligible) consider if we can actually decide this without having (unintelligible). Anybody any other comments?

Man: I think we should ask (Robert) if we can have some (unintelligible) and resource for Wednesday and then quickly decide on what we are going to do if we have the (unintelligible) or space.

Tapani Tarvainen: I understand. I have been speaking with (unintelligible) about this. He will be willing to organize this (unintelligible) space if we want to do that.

Man: (Unintelligible) I would say we should use this opportunity even if we only have 10, 15 people coming. We should use that the possibility maybe as a pilot case to ourselves to see how to structure events for the future.

Man: I mean I am going to (unintelligible) volunteer myself to organize the event along the lines. I just get out and I will try to have parity and (unintelligible).

Man: So (unintelligible) is willing but I need to get (unintelligible) so they want to do it as well and I don't think we can.

(Unintelligible) Robin and Monika to think you can say that but otherwise I would rather wait for (unintelligible) opinions here. Robin? Monika? Do you think should we wait for (unintelligible)?

Robin Gross: Yes this is Robin. It would probably be best for me to ask (unintelligible) what he wants to do and the executive (unintelligible) executive committee. You know I just probably ask them what they want to do in LA.

But I will do that today because I do have quite a long list of things I need to discuss with them based on our meeting today. And so I will have that conversation within a few hours.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thanks good we will proceed with that. As soon as we get to hear from (unintelligible) and then we will try to make a decision if you (unintelligible) confirm (unintelligible).

Okay. I see that (Rudi Vansnick) is typing something. Anybody else want to say anything on this...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay let's call the meeting closed. Okay I raise a toast. I think we have some juice here. I am raising my glass. Happy New Year for NCSG. Okay let's call the meeting closed. You can stop the recording.

END