ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
September 8, 2017
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much (unintelligible). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG ExCom Call on Friday the 8th of September 2017. On the call today was have Farzaneh Badii, Monika Zalnieriute, Raoul Plommer, Robin Gross, Tapani Tarvainen. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Hi Maryam. So this is Tapani speaking. And thank you everybody for joining us. First let's start by looking at the agenda. And if anybody has any other business you'd like to add to the agenda, please let me know at this point so if you have any other comments on the agenda.

It's a little different from the one I posted and the order of ICANN's been changed because I wanted the Vice Chair election procedure approved first. Sort of urgent. So any other business you want to add? No? Okay.

Maryam, can you please display that - what's you election procedure text? Let's start a little different. Some introductions of this for those who don't know, we had a common meeting with the CSG in Hyderabad that we approved and read on the best text for this and the one we are approving now is basically just the clean up version of that.

And the timing is rather urgent thing to speak because we are going to start negotiating that right about pretty much right now. CSG has already approved this. And there are some other CSG constituencies actually having their elections completed I understand today. So it would be perfect time if we can agree on this now.

And I circulated a text in Policy Committee and discussed this with Rafik and (unintelligible) commented to approval even though it's sort of NCPH policy. And we have just a little more background that Council has two Vice Chairs and one of them belongs to NCPH and we are half of NCPH so we have to (negotiate) talk with (unintelligible) CSG.

So Maryam, can you display the difference document? That's more useful at this point because it's basically just reviewing what (unintelligible) there are some unintended substantive changes in the document. And even though I expect this would have been spotted. Not that one. That's the original. Hyderabad. Do you have the difference doc?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Tapani. I'm just uploading the three attachments I saw in the email. I don't know.

Tapani Tarvainen: The one that - the first one there, that's the difference doc.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay. Hold on a second please.

Tapani Tarvainen: Anyway, going on for this, the problem here is that at (unintelligible) we should sort of be alternating the Vice Chair position with CSG. And this is making - well that - for that as in the (unintelligible) has been sort of ad hoc and not always easy. So we wanted to have a proper (project) to this and this was the outcome of that discussion last year.

And I might add that the situation now may be that chances are that the NCPH will get the Chair position at this time in which case the Vice Chair will still be - let's see. Can you put the last attachment there? Okay. This one is a bit small. I guess we can enlarge it if need be.

So they have been tackling with the changes mainly. It was - would changed to will, others like that. Do you want to review this in detail? At any points you have noted that need more explanation?

Okay. Let's review it quickly that there is there. Vice Chair is always one year term and they (will take it) it normally would be doing two years because it's kind of one year is short. But after the first term, the other group who elected can review it and be cause for change if need be if there are (unintelligible) in their reasons.

There was a discussion in the Policy Committee that what this exactly means. But not easy to (cope) in these details. Basically it has to be some reason that the other stakeholder group is willing to (explain) out loud.

And of course if that happens, then well, the implication should not normally happen but something really unusual takes place. But imperfect it will give them the option for rejecting the second term if need be.

And if there is no second term, then the stakeholder group in question will nominate someone again and (they go) for the remainder of the term. And this basically this means that we'll be taking a compromise and there will be sort of a temporary veto for the other stakeholder group. We don't want that guy offer someone else. Call it up please Maryam.

Like - and they actually have a - we offer two alternatives. Then the NCA will be asked to mediate. And also it is not even (unintelligible) that we can agree to have the NCA as the Vice Chair, which would be us postponing the term - the right to have the NCA Vice Chair as it were.

And Number 10 is something that actually may now happen that if we get NCPH gets the Chair and the other stakeholder group will get to pick the Vice Chair by the same process above so they have the postpone (veto there). And as (formal as) the selection goes, the Councilors of the NCPH will vote at this - in NCSG and NSCG Councilors and the NCA have a vote there.

But it requires a super majority, I think two thirds. Yes. So that effective means that the stakeholder groups have to agree unless they split up, which is possible but unlikely.

Anyway, this is mostly agreed in text. I just want to have the formal agreement or the CSG wants to have information but I think we agreed and it was (passed). Any comments? Any objections to approving this now?

See Monika is typing. See no hands up. Okay. Unless somebody objects, I'll call it accept approved although nothing that since (we require) full consensus, we'll have to get Gangadhar's approval later.

And at this point I'll note that the procedure has been that whenever someone is missing from meeting, we ask them to indicate their agreement by email afterwards and given seven days (limit the issue). If we don't hear anything from seven days, we take it as an approval of - in case it's something everybody else has agreed on. So approved pending Gangadhar's objection or (create) approval.

Next we have a bunch of member applications to process. And I believe Monika has got - given the new members, (Raoul) and Gangadhar access to this database. I'm not sure if you have test - had time to look at them but let's go through them quickly.

Has everybody opened the member application list? Let's start with the individuals. Actually I don't think we even have an organization of applicants at this time.

Raoul, I see your comment. Do you object to the approval at this point? It is kind of late for us to do any changes to the text at this point. Going back to the previous item. It's Raoul's comment about vagueness. Raoul, please confirm are you objecting to approval of the process at this point? Okay.

So I take it Raoul is agreeing to the approval of this process - procedure, (PPC) procedure. And I note that this is the first time this will be used. So changes are at least I will find something more (to that). We'll have to change it. But it is necessarily a bit vague.

It's just an attempt to formalize the process of a discussion basically to make it at least sort of sensible. Make it a bit more formalized. But in the end if we can't agree, then we can't agree. And the key point there is that if we can't agree, then NCPH will not have a Vice Chair at all. Just sort of a (straight) (reason) for consensus.

But let's get back to the member applications. Raoul, it was supposed to be linked to at least the list. At the time they were you could have been able to read it.

But anyway, as I noted it is too late for us to make changes for it for this round. If it does turn out to be too bad, we can insist for (any) changes later. But now we pretty much have to approve it as it is. We can't make it any better yet now because people actually start applying (nothing) right now. But that was just a comment in the (past).

Let's go back to the membership applications. We have a duplicate there. I'm not sure why but we can make note of second one. So starting with the new membership applications, individuals. We have (Holcut Kiliuk) Ukraine.

An individual Internet user with primary concern with the public interest aspects of the domain name policy, et cetera. Not a member of any ICANN groups. Interest statement. Individual user and currently NCSG as the proper forum to start my engagement with ICANN.

I have a PhD in International Law focusing on transformative (unintelligible) with a (process) of development of international law. Just very for Internet governance, also the security to privacy and human rights. Online co-founder of (NCO) digital different as partners, I look at in a free and open and a lot of (unintelligible).

And reference Tatiana Tropina. There's a LinkedIn page as well. Opinions? I think Farzi may not have an account. Maryam, did you create an account for Farzi in there?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes. Farzi has an account.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Good. Okay. Robin has - yes, it seems as I can't see it though in the forum. Interesting. Oh yes it is. Sorry. The window is too small. That's one on my list of improvements. Any others? Monika. Monika, what do you think of (Holcut Kiliuk)? Raoul. You can either speak up or type in the chat, whichever works best for you.

I don't see your marks on this. Problem with this forum is that it will not - you have to click save afterwards and if multiple people are doing it at the same time, it will not work.

So at this point if you haven't entered your comment earlier, just type in the chat that you approve. Okay. So Raoul is approving (Holcut). Good. Monika. Okay. Agreed. So we approve (Holcut Kiliuk) pending Gangadhar's approval later.

And we have (Omar Osman Omeider). And Robin indicated approval already. Others. Raoul. Monika. Monika approving. (Omar) is not yet a member of any group. Oh he says he's a member of (this) group. That's a good point. Doesn't say which - he's got a domain (on his own). Should tell what it is.

Okay. It seems that he states he's a member of a group within ICANN but doesn't state which. And he says he's got a Web site domain but doesn't tell

which. This forum definitely allows indicating which group you are a member of. At least has in the past. And I see some people have managed to state that.

So I would be inclined to ask (Omar) to fill in these details. I guess the question is are you a member of any groups within ICANN. And if so, please state. What's wrong with that? Okay. (Unintelligible) talks two or three but please (unintelligible) what it means. Yes.

Well, I should think that's obvious enough but in any case, I think we should ask explicitly in this case (unintelligible). Maybe they are split (with the form) as well. Maryam, make a note that we'll have the form fixed.

So I suggest we leave this one pending until we get and ask just to fill in these details, which ICANN group they are a member of and what domain they are registered especially in the case of (Omar) because he has - if he has registered a domain name. Everybody fine with that?

Yes. That's exactly what we do. In general whenever we have some questions about someone, we send them an email unless they show up - sometimes we reject someone, I'll try but when it's in numerous cases we'll send or Maryam sends them email asking for what we want to ask to clarify.

In this case it seems to be fine other than that we want to know which ICANN group they are a member of. That's something actually we'd need to know because if they are a member of CSG for example, then we'll have to reject them. And knowing the domain they had registered and they have something we want to have on file as well. So let's do that with (Omar).

And (Bucher Ranat Oscelot) has the same problem. Says that he's a member of an ICANN group but doesn't say which one. That's also a duplicate. So let's ask him as well. Okay.

And next one unless somebody objects - Robin, you're typing something. I'm not sure. Well maybe. We'll have to work on that. That's something I have on my list of things to ask in the next - with (Martin).

But it should not - actually should not even because these do look like absolute duplicates here. So I suspect it could be a software issue or possibly something like (unintelligible) clicking too fast or whatever. But it actually should not even allow entering two duplicates at the same time. So that's something we'll have to look into.

But the next appliance we have is (Clu Delwahi), Indonesia. Individual who's primarily concerned with public interest aspects and so on. And he says he's not a member of any other group. Long description, which I am sure you can read yourselves. I'll give you a moment to read that.

Note that reference is Kathy Kleiman. There's a LinkedIn page. So Raoul, I take your vote yes. And Robin already has put a yes for (most all), so. Monika. So I read (Clu Delwahi) approved pending Gangadhar's approval later.

Next is (Moritzia Abdul) from South Africa who's got a domain of her own and it's actually been given. (Unintelligible). Next a member referring (Anria Desterhusen) even though misspelling her name but I'm sure you know who she is (unintelligible) what is meant.

So opinions on (Moritzia Abdul)? Raoul. Monika. I note Robin already marked in first. Accepted as well. Monika's accepting. Raoul as well. I'm likewise. So (Moritzia) accepted pending Gangadhar's approval later.

And I got next (Hadli Havis Anotyi Yaya). I hope I'm pronouncing it to even close to understanding. In chat we get an individual considered public interest aspects. Not a member of any other ICANN groups. It's just that Internet governance refers to the processes that impact how the Internet is managed.

There's policy (unintelligible) and technical experts work to connect the remaining two thirds of the world's nations to (weigh) - each Internet (discovery) will likely have an impact on how we use and how it evolves.

Any opinions on him? Okay. Robin is saying that it's not clear this is a real person. LinkedIn page at least seems to be broken. There's a reference who's one we just approved - do we know this reference here? (Abaca Uma Marcel)?

In any case, the very least we'll have to do is to ask the correction for the LinkedIn page because that is broken. Okay. You did. So how does it look like? Okay. What do you think of that (compared to then)?

Mobile Business Enterprise. Okay. So Robin's approving. Others? Monika approving. Raoul. Okay. Let's approve (as well) pending Gangadhar later. And there's another duplicate here. Okay. Next.

(Chun Ho Wun) from Singapore. She's on I think a 2017 (fellow). There's very little information but no Web site or I think - who's mic is that? Could you - whoever that is, please mute your - actually everybody please mute your

mics when not speaking. I get I think some background noise from somewhere.

So looking at (Chun Ho Wun). Robin's approving. Description - okay. Monika I take it you are approving (Chun Ho Wun). Raoul. Okay. And the description looks good to me too. So let's approve him I think pending Gangadhar later.

And the next (Louis Martinez) from Mexico. Again hearing some background noises. Please do mute your mics if you don't want to speak. Refers (Latrolo Naeter) IETF. Well IETF is not an ICANN organization. But (Latrolo) is fine. We have not problem with elect members (in kind). Referencing (Reneta Akino). There's a LinkedIn page. And Robin already approved again.

So Monika and Raoul, opinions on (Louis Martinez)? Point is we have very little Mexican members. So if you are just one. Okay. Raoul approving (Louis). Monika. Hello Monika. Okay. So let's approve (Louis Martinez) as well again pending Gangadhar later.

Next is (Wella Katid) from Jordan. Again individual with concern would appear public interest aspects. Not a member of any other in group. But (acting IG), Internet governance (unintelligible) North Africa. And there's a LinkedIn page with (her handle).

And Robin approved already. Others? Monika. Raoul. Monika approves for (Wella). Raoul. Raoul as well. Agreed. So again, approved pending Gangadhar later.

We have a (Nadia Kardun) from Pakistan. Referring (Zay Zegeciette). (Unintelligible) Pakistan member. And I see Robin approved. Others? (Nadia). Raoul approved Maria, Monica. Monica approves as well. Agreed. So (unintelligible) also approved pending Gangadhar later. Next, (Abdul Sabul Malik) from Pakistan, from ICANN Academy. Again, referencing (Zakir) and (unintelligible). I don't see Robin's mark here either in the forum. So Robin, please confirm. Okay, Robin approvals (Abdul). Raoul, Monica. Monica approves (Abdul). Raoul? (Unintelligible) and I do, so again, approved pending Gangadhar. He is popping in later.

And we have (Ishan Metha) from the United States. I see that we have Farzaneh Badii as one of the references. Farzaneh, would you mind commenting if you actually know this person so she's not just putting your name as reference for (unintelligible) comment.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, Tapani actually he's our research assistant. So he's totally -- he's in existence. I have a meeting with him. So I'm sure (unintelligible) discuss it later.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Farzaneh. So at least we know he exists. Any opinions? Anybody, everybody, okay, Robin indicated approval of (Ishan). Raoul as well, Monica. Yes, so (Ishan) approved although we'll have to wait on Gangadhar. Then we have (Ebenezer Crimson), hoping the pronunciation is close, from Ghana. Not much to go on and again, I don't see Robin's approval either there but the description so I will use my contribution and advocacy and advice to make the best out of the internet as an end user in a limited resource except in searching for proper efficient and secure communication among nations, communities, societies, and individuals.

Opinions on (Ebenezer)? Raoul approves (Ebenezer) here. We don't have too many members from Ghana, I think. Robin? Monica? Robin approves. And Monica as well. Okay, agree the description looks good enough. So I'll approve (Ebenezer) pending Gangadhar later. Then we have (Nicholas Charay) from the United Kingdom referencing Matthew Shears (unintelligible) page. There's not much there. Anyway. Opinions? (Nicholas Charay), Robin has indicated approval. Raoul is okay with (Nicholas Charay). Monica, did you mark him? Yes, okay. So we are approving (Nicholas Charay) as well pending Gangadhar later.

Then we have (Sayid Zat) from the United States with very little information to go by. There's no other membership, no (unintelligible) page but he believes that the internet is an important resource. And this time, I don't see Robin's comment either on the clock so opinions on (Sayid Zat)? And reminding you what the options are, approval, reject, or ask for more information if we so choose. Raoul thinks we should ask for more information. Others? Okay, and of course, I noted since we have (unintelligible) require full consensus, even a single member of DC wanting more information or rejection (unintelligible) enough.

But I'm glad we agree on this one. So let's ask some to explain using our standard phrasing I think that what's his interest in the GTLD policy, DNS. And the last one we have (Bashas Sewell). No idea how to pronounce that, referencing Renata and Nadira. There's a LinkedIn page, a doctoral student, and information (unintelligible) communication technology. Robin approving Raoul approving as well. Monica, likewise, so (Bashas) approved pending Gangadhar coming in later. Do we have any pending applications? Let's look. Yes, we do. Now, we actually are on duplicates I think. So there are no pending applications. Is that correct, Maryam? We don't have any left over from the last time.

Okay. And there are no organizational applicants.

Maryam Bakoshi: No, none.

Tapani Tarvainen: Not even pending ones, no. Okay. So we're done with the membership applications. Good. The last item I had on the agenda is Abu Dhabi planning. Maryam, can you show us the GNSO part of the schedule as it is still a work in progress. It's not final, which is actually a good thing so we can do something about it if need be or maybe not so much.

There are not too many problem issues there. The ones that we're having trouble with, we're trying to meet registries and registrars. What's the situation with those at the moment, Maryam? Can you give us a little -- well, maybe we'll just have as quick overview of this if you haven't seen this. Anybody has, they can look at this block schedule, but this is mostly similar to previous one. You see that we have an extra meeting on Saturday, which will be the last meeting I'll be chairing.

NCSG ex-com meeting and then you roll down to the -- sorry, I misread it. It's NCUC meeting. It's Saturday. Yes, that's correct since it still is that way. Let me see what date is that. Yes, as Maryam pointed, these are still moving so the reason I brought this here that we can highlight this and ask for changes if possible. So the NCSC ex-com meeting is overlapping with the CWT accountability work stream two session, which is a problem since at least Robin will be there. And Maryam, make note of that and see if there's any hope of moving it someplace else.

Maryam Bakoshi: Tapani, is that the NCSG EC meeting?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, because it overlaps the CCWG accountability at the same time and Robin is a member of the CCWG accountability group so she'll have to be there.

Maryam Bakoshi: That's fine. Do you want me to move it to Friday because there is absolutely nothing happening on Friday. So I'm happy to move it to Friday, if everyone agrees with Friday morning.

Tapani Tarvainen: How early are you leaving on Friday, Robin? Okay, we can't have it on Friday before 2:00, I'm afraid. So any other possible slots we could move it to, Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: Tapani, it's very challenging at this point so I honestly don't know but I'll try and see what I can do.

Tapani Tarvainen: Note that we are a small group so we can put it in a small room somewhere.

Sure, I can see if we can have it in a pop up room instead so it will probably not be on the schedule if that's the case.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, that's not really a big problem. We can announce it to those who need to know, and of course, in (unintelligible) discuss for all members who might be interested in it. So if it's not in the public agenda that's a smaller problem then if it's overlaps so that we can't all be there. So try to find out. Is there anything else that will be critical overlap to us? Of course, we will be part of the NCSG sessions. We already we'll have (unintelligible) we can't have them overlapping, but otherwise, are any of us members of any other critical working groups or such that would have to be (unintelligible) like that?

Maryam Bakoshi: Tapani, what about on Wednesday, just to when the GNSO Council meeting starts, will that work?

Tapani Tarvainen: Overlapping the council meeting. Well, none of us are councilors so we could make that even though it's not convenient. I'd rather attend the council session. Robin, I see you're typing. Are there any early morning sessions? Like Wednesday morning at 8:30.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, if everyone agrees, I can move it to 8:30 in the morning on Wednesday.

Tapani Tarvainen: Would that work for everybody? Better than overlapping the council. It will overlap with the new GTLD PDP working group but none of us belong to that I think.

Robin Gross: Tapani, I'm actually one of the (unintelligible) of that working group so I won't be able to miss that session either.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, that was (unintelligible). Any suggestions, any other time? Any other early morning times?

Robin Gross: What about Sunday at 8:30 or 9:00? I see there are GNSO working sessions but that's not really as important as the council meeting so I don't really mind missing their working session.

Tapani Tarvainen: Not ideal, but we could do that.

Robin Gross: Or even 13:30 on Sunday, again, is a GNSO working session but I don't mind missing that. Basically, anytime from noon to 15:15 when the human rights meeting starts.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Looking at other days, they don't look any better. Monday morning will not do. Tuesday will not do. Yes, I'm afraid that you are right, that's

probably the best chance we have, overlapping with the council working session. It's not ideal but it's better than any other option I can see. Saturday, okay, (unintelligible) is willing to change the NCUC ex-com meeting then that time would work. If you can find a better time for the NCUC meeting.

Robin Gross: It looks like the NCUC ex-comm meeting is also opposite a new GTLD working group.

Tapani Tarvainen: Right you are.

Robin Gross: So that one is (unintelligible) hopping in Abu Dhabi, that particular working group.

Tapani Tarvainen: So that won't go either. Okay, so I guess we're stuck with the Sunday morning.

Robin Gross: Sorry for being so overbooked this time. I'm not happy about it either.

Tapani Tarvainen: Sometimes it happens. Unless anybody else can find something I'm missing, (unintelligible) Monday but it doesn't look so good either.

Maryam Bakoshi: Tapani, Farzi is suggesting if you want to swap with the NCEC meeting on Saturday.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, we've discussed that already. That also overlaps with the (unintelligible) several working group. So that we can't do that. So I don't see anything on Saturday. I presume the NPOC outreach event was something NPOC members would rather not miss. Raoul? Okay. Sunday morning, well, yes, the GNSO working session is the only problem on Sunday morning and I guess that's the least bad option.

Actually, yes, Maryam, is it possible to start early, like 7:30?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, it's impossible to start early. The earliest is (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I thought so. Okay, still looking (unintelligible) council see any better alternatives than Sunday morning than. What times on Sunday, Robin?

Robin Gross: So we were looking at Sunday around 9:00, 8:30, 9:00, and then Sunday again any time from 13:00 until 15:15.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, basically all those times that are overlapping the GNSO working session, we can take any of those since we can't find anything better.

Robin Gross: Well, I do note that the NPOC ex-com meeting is between 10:30 and 12:30. So we would want to avoid that time. But other than that, it looks like that would work for us.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, I don't want to miss -- yes?

Maryam Bakoshi: 1:30 to 3. I can move the meeting from -- to start at 1:30 to 3:00.

Tapani Tarvainen: There's a council meeting with the ICANN Board at 1:00 to 2:30. I'd rather not miss that one. So maybe the morning, 8:30 to (unintelligible) would be nice, the least problematic I think. So 8:30 on Sunday?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, we can do either 8:30 to 10:15 or 9:00 to 10:15.

Tapani Tarvainen: Do we need 90 minutes? I think the GNSO working session does overlap. It goes all the way even though it's not marked that way there. Maryam, are you saying that 9:00 to 10:15 is not GNSO working session time?

Maryam Bakoshi: From what I can see, this is what we're working with, it's not marked. Unless that's an error, it doesn't show that something is happening at that time.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm pretty sure that's a mistake that there's no sense to have GNSO working session half an hour, and then an hour break, and then continuing. It's always been continuously all day. But if we are -- we can do 9:00 to 10:15. I think that would be enough for us. Anyway. But I'm quite sure the GNSO working session will be going on at the time, but we can miss that. None of us are councilors and while it's inconvenient to miss that, we can do that. And I'm sure you can find a room for us, Maryam, because we are a small group.

Okay. Let's do that then. Looking at Monday but everything here overlaps something. Well, just a quick question, how does the Monday 12:00 look to you? It's a cross community topic session reporting DNS abuse. Would that be more important than a GNSO working session for you guys?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, which one Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Monday, 12:00 or 13:30 to 15:00 actually is the (unintelligible) that's the cross community topic session reporting DNS abuse with (unintelligible) policy making. Okay, Robin put her Sunday. I try to not miss a cross community topic session either. So okay, let's stick with the Sunday, Sunday 9:00 to 10:15 even though I don't really like that either but can't see anything better, or everything else is even worse.

Okay. Any other concerns for the schedule? Apparently not, so let's do it that way. I don't think we have anything else. I didn't have anything else for Abu Dhabi at this point, although just a few observations that as you may have all heard, I had some trouble with the travel slots that they were again (unintelligible) about incoming councilors not getting travel support. But after a bit of reservation, they agreed. So -- and I will bring this up. Okay, Robin, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Robin Gross: I just have a quick question. I'm just wondering if all of our councilors have confirmed that they will be attending Abu Dhabi just in terms of trying to get a headcount of who's going to be there and who's not going to be there. That's one point. And then another point, I don't know if Stephanie has contacted you in the last day or so but she told me yesterday that she hasn't received any word from constituency travel yet so she's getting a little bit nervous about whether or not she was put on the NCSG travel support list or not. So I wanted to raise that and just ask if we've got confirmation from all of our councilors that they'll be in attendance.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin. I'm happy to report that, yes, we have received confirmation of all our councilors that they are attending the last one today. And yes, Stephanie contacted me about it and I checked it. I had listed her as a traveler and complained and staff confirmed that they had mistakenly dropped her from the list and she's back on it now. So those problems have been sorted out. So we have all our councilors, both current and incoming will be attending.

And from our little group, actually everybody will be there as well I believe. Monica, your situation is still that you're getting test flights and you have figured out some way to pay for your hotel; is that correct? And I believe Raoul is coming. Raoul, do you know if Gangadhar is coming to Abu Dhabi?

Okay, so we'll hope he (unintelligible) our meeting remotely. Anyway, so far travel arrangements seem to be under control. Any other issues, questions, anything related to Abu Dhabi that -- like if you have something in mind that I should be paying attention to come to the meeting at this point please, raise anything.

Okay. And nobody had any other business either. Robin, you have your hand up? What else?

Robin Gross: I forgot to ask this earlier when we were in the membership database. I'm just wondering have we received everything that we've paid for with respect to the membership database? We got our full list of deliverables and the deal that we made with the company that's providing it?

Tapani Tarvainen: No, it's still halfway. There are still a list of things that should be done with the money we paid for the second stage. I hope to get at least most of that finished by Abu Dhabi but it's -- well, I'll have to keep on pushing even after that something. But -- and it's also likely that we may want to keep on improving it in some ways even after that (unintelligible) but it's unfortunately still not complete.

Robin Gross: Okay, but you think about Abu Dhabi or shortly thereafter, it will be -- we'll get what we paid for?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, more or less. Although, as I said, we may want to pay for more but the functionality we started with (unintelligible). (Sam Polish) may be looking but I hope to have it done just about by Abu Dhabi. I'm not making any promises because it's not (unintelligible) to me and because it's been taking

much longer than I expected to begin with. But all these things always tend to.

So that's still a work in progress. I'm planning to have a next meeting with Martin from the company not next week but the week after that. Haven't figured out a time yet but we'll try to find a time and anybody wants to join, please let me know. Let Maryam know, actually. She'll coordinate it. Anything else? Sounds like everybody is happy with this. We can then adjourn and close the meeting with (unintelligible) even though we have time left.

Okay, maybe a few words about what's still on our plate for the immediate future. We still have some unfinished business in the long-term that constituency review, I plan to have one more meeting before Abu Dhabi sometime in October or possibly (unintelligible) have a look at the date, but the second week of October most likely, two weeks before Abu Dhabi or three weeks. And I'd hope to get the constituency review moving on and that member (unintelligible) now it's been discussed in the NCSG discussion list as you know. We'll pick that up again and see what (unintelligible) we need to do with that.

And that's about it, I think, for the immediate future. I see somebody is typing. I'm waiting for Raoul to finish typing his comment just in case it's something important before I close the meeting. Okay, thank you Raoul, that's good to know. So I expect that the constituency review will not be finished before Abu Dhabi but maybe we can actually finish it in our meeting there but we'll need to see the NPOC's new charter before we conclude on their part. And actually, NCUC's new bylaws also will not be approved but we'll have to take a look at them as well in this context. So it's good to know that this is work going on.

Anything else or shall we call it a day? I see no hands up, no comments, so thank you everybody. It's been a good meeting and I hope we can get Gangadhar to agree on our decisions quickly. Goodbye, goodnight, good morning, wherever you may be. You can stop the recording.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much. Jen, please, you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you very much for attending the call today everyone. Goodbye.

END