

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
August 19, 2016
8:00 am CT

Operator: The recordings are started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Lance. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG ExCom call on Friday, the 19th of August, 2016. On the call today we have Tapani Tarvainen, Joan Kerr, Monika Zalneriute, Poncelet Illeleji, Robin Gross.

And from staff, we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi, and Chantelle Doerksen. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Maryam. I trust you have all seen the agenda I posted this morning. Let's start with a routine stuff which is new applications. We have only a few.

You all have that Google docs former open so we can review it. Okay, I trust you to if nobody complains. So let's take a look. There are two individual applicants.

First is (Pierre Necarson). His address is Mint Cleaning Solutions but no Web site given, no preference is given in the description of interest is I want to make sure my work in customers are protected.

Does anybody know anything more about this person? The description sounds a bit commercial interest to me. At the very least, I would like to ask for clarification of what is that work and what kind of customers and how it is considered noncommercial.

No opinions? Others? Okay, it seems that we have (Monica) and Robin both suggesting reject. Poncelet is typing his response. Joan - okay, well, in any case, we don't really need everybody's opinion at this point because we need a consensus to approve. So it be nice if I had Joan and Poncelet expressing your position here.

Joan Kerr: Sorry, my mute was on. I was speaking. Yes, I think I agree to reject.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Okay, since we are in agreement here basically that we will reject, based on her description, the interest is commercial. Of course, if they choose, they can reapply with better information in it turns out we have misunderstood something. But on the basis of this, we - let's reject. Okay?

Next, (Nadia Haloratch). Now we have her Web site at her references in the description seems very much noncommercial as for a second member (unintelligible) which is not a problem for us as long as it's not in the GNSO.

So nothing formally there. I see that (Monica) and Robin have indicated approval. Joan, Poncelet? Joan, your mic is on so you might want to say something as well.

Joan Kerr: No, it looks good to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, seems we're unanimous and approval as we should be. Approved. Okay, then we have one new organization here - (Open) Knowledge Finland. There is - I see that (Monica) has expressed a question about this representative but actually that is not a concern of ours, that in this application, the representative is represented in NCSG.

And if the constituencies want to different representative, they can ask for that. The constituency selection is basically something, just some information that we will forward just to send to the constituencies for approval at their leisure.

So that is not a problem here. We have had applicants who want both constituencies before, so that's not a problem. But otherwise, opinions? As for (a second), (Open) Knowledge Network in general is very much in line with our own commercial interests.

Any others? I can see that Robin, Joan, (Monica) approve. I (unintelligible) (Monica) has approval. You can see it there. Then consulate - okay, and (Chuck)'s saying he's fine with it, so it seems we all approve. That was easy.

Let's move on to another agenda. Next item, the vice chair question. And to keep it nice and clean, I wanted to have - I actually checked with (Rafiq) about this to just have a resolution of saying, but we actually - the vice chair's rights and duties would be even though I think this is something that would be clear enough.

But the proposal that I suggested is that we defined the vice chair's role, (we set it). The vice chair shall assist the chair, (unintelligible) by the chair in

fulfilling his or her functions under the (NCHA) charter, meaning that the chair's duty, if that's not - if that's clear enough.

So the vice chair would have no independent rights or to solve anything basically doing what the chair asks are actually of the chair can't (force it), they should do anything - but in agreement with him.

So the idea sharing the workload and having someone to be there during vacations and things like that. Any opinions, comments on this text? Okay, Robin, you have the floor.

Robin Gross: Hi. Can you hear me okay? This is Robin.

Tapani Tarvainen: We can hear you fine. Go ahead.

Robin Gross: Okay, great. Yes, I started to reach out to my constituency to try and get some feedback on this. And I've only (one person) back so far yet but you know, basically we're trying to get some understanding and clarification about what are the specific jobs and what would the duties be and concern that there would be - that it should be limited to non - or that it should be limited to administrative things as sort of part of the job description.

So, I mean, I'm still kind of - I just reached out yesterday to folks so I've only heard from one member of the NCUC executive committee back on it yet, so I think, you know, I think what we're going to want to do, in any event, it's really try to clarify very specifically about what these jobs and duties are.

Because once that person is there, you need unanimity to remove them so you need to be very careful about this and have a very clear understanding about what this role would be in the limits of the world. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Actually given that the chair even has fairly limited powers to do anything, this is just mostly administrative tasks that the chair has to do. I don't see that there is any real problem there in that sense, that if you - if we define it like this, it's still up to the chair to delegate explicitly any tasks.

So - unless of the chair decides to go rogue, they can do it without - regardless of that with the vice chair can do, that the only theoretical case that I can think of that there would be a problem is that the vice chair would decide to do something impossible during the chair's vacation or something like that.

And somehow that does not really strike me as probable. I can't even think of what it would really be that the vice chair could do that would be a problem in this kind of situation are in any real situation that I can think of. Can you suggest something that would - a hypothetical scenario that would not work, Robin?

Robin Gross: Well, actually I was trying to think about it from the other perspective. What would be some examples of non-administrative things that you would want for this vice chair to do?

And so - I mean, because I think that you're not going to get much disagreement on an administrative role but if it is more than that, I think that (unintelligible) very carefully.

So what would be - I mean, can you think of anything that you would want this place chair to do that is not administrative? And then, you know, we can think about how that fits in with what people have in mind.

Tapani Tarvainen: Not really. That's what I'm trying to think of - no administrative things they do in the first place. Okay, voting on the policy committee, I don't think that is something that the vice chair would ever need to do.

And I'm not actually sure that would be (useful) but, likewise, voting in the finance committee, theoretically. But thinking about it, and I'm not sure what they would vote on.

But in principle, in any situation, let's say that the policy committee is having a vote when I know I will be absent and I would direct the vice chair to vote in a specific way, that kind of situation is considerable, technically not that initiative.

I don't foresee being away so long that I would not be able to prepare for that. That's an eventuality. Anything else? The same applies for the finance committee.

It might happen that, for example, one of our meetings would have to be chaired by the vice chair in case I'm sick or away or something but that's also very unlikely and if that were to happen, not really problematic since we operate in full consensus anyway.

(Unintelligible), et cetera, yes, well, again, I don't see that particularly likely to happen in such a short notice that it would fall on the vice chair. Okay, Robin, you wanted to speak again?

Robin Gross: Yes, actually, I forgot one additional point that has been raised for me to bring back to the meeting, and that is the possibility of having to vice chairs instead of one.

And you would, you know, have one that would be a member (of) the two different constituencies. Is that something that you've considered for you would be willing to consider?

Tapani Tarvainen: I actually proposed that a year ago and it went nowhere. But I might be willing to consider that but I just want to move reasonably fast for work with this and then it makes it even more difficult to define the roles of the chairs. But, yes, vice chairs - I do want to move on with that option.

And if you do, then we'll have to consider that whether these vice chairs would have to operate by consensus within themselves so whatever, but I'm thinking of a - practical scenarios here that we don't actually like right now but because I'm having trouble getting the elections managed in time because a number of reasons including Maryam's broken laptop and whatnot.

It would be nice to fall when someone, and so on. Of course, theoretically, there's no need for there to be a vice chair but, in practice, it would be nice to have someone to share these kinds of things in planning, schedules and all kinds of (things).

The vice chair charter is elected on a yearly basis so this will, in any case, happen again next year if it turns out to be, but I don't see anything - disaster coming out of this but if it turns out it doesn't work then we can always - well, I really cannot imagine any real disaster coming out of this.

I did chat with Rafik about it earlier and he said basically that - okay, I'll (unintelligible) personal messages kind of - in case we cannot come to a good decision made for deadline for non-objection in the (ACLH), okay, we have everybody present so that should not be a problem here.

So, another quote from Rafik - you will figure out in the call probably. I'm not that worried. So take that for what it's worth. Okay, Joan, Robin is asking what does (unintelligible) feel on the matter? I did ask Joan to agree to this in advance, of course. Joan, you want to comment?

Joan Kerr: Last year it was a different story. I think this year is, it's more my decision and I have the support of (NPOC) at the moment As far as I know. They don't see that it's taking away from my duties at present. I think it enhances it probably.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so - okay, I confess, I have one reason to rush this a bit because some planning another totally off the net vacation in September and I would like to have this settled before then so I can delegate the things that I know (we will perform) on that week for Joan to deal with.

Joan Kerr: Not - sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Yes, thanks. My understanding of what the role would be is - sort of (a stepping) role, if we can boil it down to that, where, you know, you're the chair. You're going to be continuing to do your - fulfill your role.

And if you're away on holidays, you know, things don't get bogged down or delayed or anything like that so someone is there to chair and to keep things moving.

That's how I interpret it as the first role. And secondly, to assist with anything that needs to get done so that it can get done in a timely basis. That was my interpretation of what needs to be done.

But the other issues that were brought up, I mean, maybe we have to deal with them but I thought that was sort of what you're getting at for this role, is more administrative, slash, a (step in) when you aren't available.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that was basically the idea. Would you be happy with that statement I proposed for the definition of the role? I think that's fairly simple and basic, but any problems with that, Joan?

Joan Kerr: No, it - no, I understood it, and yes, I have no problems with it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you. So, Robin, do you want to push this later or can we decide now?

Robin Gross: Yes, thanks. I would be hesitant to decide anything now before I got, you know, official word from my constituency. I've only heard from one person and, you know, I would be really hesitant to make a decision and then, you know, hear that they had a conversation this morning and I decided something really different from what they said.

So I'd better check in my constituency and see what they've decided on this matter. But I don't think it will take long. I know (Rafiq) is pretty good and moving things through quickly. So we'll get this done before your vacation.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so can we make a decision that we will put this pending an approval on the mailing list so we don't have to wait for another AC call in case it passes where the constituency is concerned?

Robin Gross: Well, I don't think we need to wait for a call. I think we just - we could, you know, wrap it up on the mailing list.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so, let's make a decision now that we - okay, so we'll accept definition I proposed and then...

Robin Gross I would need to check with the NCUC about the proposed definition as well because I'm not sure it would be satisfactory - satisfactorily administratively contained. So let me just check with them about this proposed definition.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so (unintelligible) pending proposal - (rack) approval by - when - by the NCUC, you want to...

Robin Gross: I'm not comfortable saying approval. I'm just not comfortable saying approved and so I actually get that message. So when we just say we're just, you know, I just brought this to their attention yesterday and we're awaiting feedback.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I guess we can even have a mini meeting by email but we might make a statement of a decision here that (absent) opposition or agreement on the mailing list on this later will be sufficient to clear the case. Okay?

So we'll leave it open until you get in the feedback and we can, if necessary, tune up that definition of the role, on the mailing list, approved the final text there and then assuming that everybody is happy with it and we can then elected chair, vice chair, as it were, by - well, "on the mailing list if we're - so basically we'll decide this on the mailing list is (everyone) is happy with it, okay?

Okay, let's move on. The next agenda item I have is we need procedures for removing members. It has been - will actually I was planning on doing this sometime anyway - we have several reasons for bringing this up.

The (unintelligible) being that we're cleaning up our member database and we've discovered all kinds of odd things there that should be at least checked and there has been some concern about eligibility of some numbers.

And our charter has this (unintelligible) 226 saying procedural rules saying that the executive committee shall create procedural rules for membership for existing members to maintain their good standing or for removal of membership for cause.

We have procedures, although not very well documented, for maintaining status in good standing in the sense of who gets to vote which is this annual checkup here.

But it would be good to have that better documented. But we don't have any rules for removal of membership. As far as I know, we have only removed members for - when they explicitly requested or in some cases, when they have ceased to exist in some organizations.

But we may need to consider the situation where someone becomes ineligible or does not fulfill the obligations they have agreed to when they joined or things like that.

So I propose we start to draft text for this purpose and I know that the charter says that any procedure will be subject to membership approval so it will take a bit of time to get approved.

A natural kind of processing we would need for that but I suggest that either getting full consensus on the (discuss) list for a vote should be appropriate, at least that is satisfactory and sufficient.

I guess if we get this put on the discuss list and out for discussion, there is full consensus that nobody wants to vote, then we may not need to vote. But if somebody insists on a boat, then I think we'll have to do that.

Any objections or thoughts on this? Okay, then how shall we go on writing these rules and procedures? I guess that something not to do - we can't really do talking. We have to start writing stuff but we might discuss some of the general ideas and principles for drafting text.

For starters, like, at the least of the reasons, we might want to get someone removed and how we proceed in that case? I'm not sure if we have (unintelligible) somebody wants to get out.

Okay, that's really in a separate case when somebody becomes - well, when somebody dies, you have to be removed. I guess that's an obvious case but it might be worth listing.

An organization ceases to exist, that's another case. And then the difficult ones are when someone's eligibility to membership - for membership changes. I know that we have in the rules actually appointed, if anybody has doubts about somebody's eligibility, 229, there should be a request - make a request to the NCSG to review that.

Presumably likewise in the case when somebody does not uphold their responsibilities as a member. I'm just looking at this. The charter is not very clear on that but when they apply, they agree to uphold all purposes and principles. So that might be something that would be a cause for removal.

Are there any other situations where we might want to remove a member - anybody can think of any? Yes, good point, Robin, a situation where somebody changes their (unintelligible). There are a couple of situations there.

We have actually had a few cases where somebody has been an organizational member and has requested to become an individual member. We have one actually right now that we will have to deal with at the next meeting I think.

That's something we really can't do, I think, in any other way than, really, to (generate) a new application and moving over. But the categories, and the other sense, you may have thought because we have the individual sign or we have the different categories, whether it's an owner of a domain or otherwise interested and - there were three categories, I think.

So that's something we should definitely consider, whether a member should notify us when they switch categories in that sense. And in that case, should that actually be acceptable or should they be taken as a new application or things like that. Is that what you had in mind?

Yes, that's non-commercial enough - it's basically the same as when we are (sending) applications and when somebody's status changes, then that is basically cause for removal and - but that's the general eligibility. Did I understand correctly your concern about switching categories? Robin, you're fine with that...

Robin Gross: Yes, yes, because we just - I think we just need a process in place so we know what each member is eligible for membership under and then if that changes, you know, we have a process whereby they just go through that category process.

So I don't think that is a big deal but, you know, it's a new charter and we're learning, discovery things that - (holes), if you will, that we didn't have that would be nice to have. This is our chance to fix it - first chance.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, actually, we're still operating under the old charter but, yes, we can do that on the old charter as well.

Robin Gross: Well, it's our very first charter. Yes, it's old in the sense that it's a few years old. It's the only charter NCSG has ever had.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, 2000 - no, I guess that's - well, whether that's old or not, I guess, is arguable. But anyway, that's in the - that's actually a good point to bring up that we'll have to take into account when we build our new member database, that one feels that we want to have an there is the category under which a member has been considered eligible or (applied for) and provide means for changing that. So, yes, that's something to consider. Yes, who was that?

Robin Gross: Oh, gosh, you just - I think you read my mind of what my question is because I was going to ask you, what did you have in mind in terms of how we pull this together?

Should a couple of us just sort of start drafting and come back to the group or did you have something else in mind or - in terms of a process for moving this forward?

Tapani Tarvainen: Actually, before going to that, I have another issue. It's when we have to consider is that what's the process when we actually start considering the removal of a member?

For example, you may want to say that the initial step would be the chair contacting that member and asking if they think themselves to be eligible. Give them an opportunity to explain at this point and so forth. And that what point, we don't agree, so what happens? But that's the procedural issue.

Now the question you asked, how do we build this? Yes, we need to start drafting it. I guess we can set up space somewhere in some wiki or email or whatever and whoever is interested in here - we need a small team.

Perhaps we cannot - okay, Robin is volunteering with drafting. I will have to be involved in that as well. Does anybody else want to be involved? Should we ask somebody else?

Okay, everybody wants to join in the drafting it seems. Okay, Joan didn't yet, but I think, well, this is - we have a small enough group that we can address together.

With somebody want to do first draft and then circulated for others for comment or should we find some - okay, maybe that's the way to go. It seems that Robin is volunteering to do the first draft.

I don't think we want a too perfect draft to start with, just list all the issues. We've open. Whatever you don't have, it's just moving reasonably fast. Okay, so we - let Robin do a first draft, circulate it on the list of them will move on from there.

Okay? Okay, let's move on. Next item we have on the agenda is (here about) preparation. Primarily, we need to decide when and what meetings we want in the schedule.

I wonder if Maryam, Chantelle, could you get us the initial tentative schedule template for this (place) so we can look what there is and who is that we have available?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Tapani. Yes, I've asked Chantelle to upload the document. She will be doing that in a minute. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: And this is also something we need to coordinate with the constituencies so we can't get a perfect position at this point but let's have a look on what we can do. Okay, we have it on the screen.

Let's see, what meetings do we want? Usually we have one general NCSG, I think, than the meeting with the board. And a meeting amongst ourselves, I think, is a committee meeting although it's normally open to all members to join if they so want.

And as I understand, we should all be in Hyderabad so we'll then have a normal, proper meeting out there. Okay, looking at this on the full screen, what's the constituency - they have actually moved to somewhere else.

I must confess I have not taken a good look at this yet. And this is not still too generic to make it easy to see how we pull this off. There is already the ICANN board and the noncommercial stakeholder group's meeting on Sunday.

So that's one already fixed although subject to change but still we can accept that proposal. I think the board will not (unintelligible) anyway. For our executive committee meeting, we can look for any freehold we can find, although we would prefer to avoid any overlaps with other NCSG, NCUC, (NPOC) events. I believe (NPOC) had in mind some outreach event here. Joan, Poncelet, you can remind me. Did I remember correctly?

Poncelet Illeleji: Sorry, Tapani, can you repeat what you said?

Tapani Tarvainen: I understand (NPOC) is planning...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: I understood (NPOC) is planning an event.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes, (NPOC) is planning an event in Hyderabad and I think (unintelligible) the details are still being worked out but we have an event coming up, yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: into know the planned time? Have you any idea of that - when that will be in the schedule?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Tapani. This is Maryam. So looking at the schedule, it would either be Thursday, Friday or we can look for even being on Monday. That's what we're discussing with (Klaus), so that's the game plan at the moment.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thursday, Friday. Let me see. I'm trying to - now, it works out that - that is day one or day two. Is that correct?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's day one and day two because those are capacity building and outreach sessions so we can utilize or (prepare) and alternatively, then we can squeeze and four on Monday or so.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, also the - (SO SG) working sessions, do we know when the GNSO sessions would be? We don't want to overlap with the council session. I'm trying to figure out where the constituency day here is supposed to be but I guess it's been revised in such a way that it doesn't really exist anymore.

Maryam Bakoshi: I think it's (that) Tuesday and Wednesday. That's my thinking because it says intra and cross community work.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, do we know when the constituencies are planning to have their events?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, not at the moment but I'm looking at Tuesday and Wednesday as well because not everyone is coming in on Thursday and Friday.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so I see that - I guess that our representatives from NCUC and (NPOC) don't know about the plans anymore than - either. Okay, I guess we can't do all that much at this point. Let's just say that those other three meetings we're going to request.

Okay, the board meeting which is already on this tentative schedule in the normal NCSG session and the executive committee meeting. And that will try to coordinate with NCUC and (NPOC) so that way there won't be any overlaps that we can avoid. Okay, I see Robin, you want to - you have raised your hand. Go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes, thanks. I agree that we should do those meetings. But we also have the NCSG PC meeting, the policy committee meeting. I'm not sure if you request that are that something that the chair of the policy committee requests but I'm just wanting to (flag) that as an additional meeting that will want to make sure gets in the overall NCSG request.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, good point. Yes, good point.

Robin Gross: We might want to think about if we want to do something strategic with one of the other stakeholder groups or SOs. I know in the past we often met with at large to discuss some of our common interests.

I think it might be worthwhile to meet with some of the contracting parties, specifically the registrars may be at some point, have a joint meeting where we could try to figure out how we can work together better since we're often on the same side of policy issues.

I'm not necessarily suggesting it for this meeting but maybe. I think it's something we should think about, you know, trying to do a little bit more of the cross community relationship building to work together with some of the other stakeholder groups on these issues.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you. Yes, good points. I will - we definitely need the policy committee meeting and I guess we'll have to - okay, I'll take it up with the policy committee chair or chairs.

But I think we better consolidator requests anyway, so it doesn't make sense to leave it to say you handle this and will have to coordinate and consolidate this anyway. So that's one meeting to add to the list.

And this intra - inter-constituency stakeholder group meeting proposal is certainly worth considering if we can find time for that and we - but it takes some thinking to decide who we want to talk with at the time and to see we have a one-on-one with the registrars stakeholder group or just constituency.

I don't even know. The stakeholder group, right? And - or somebody else? Maybe we should take this up - leave this brewing for moment and - or would

you want to make a specific proposal already that we try to organize just one-on-one with the registries and registrars or (invite) them...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, go ahead.

Robin Gross: Well, I'm not sure that, you know, I think it's something we should start talking about and thinking about strategically and really just kind of off the top of my head that I thought, well, you know, the registrars are closest - are closest to the end-users and so we share issues with them.

That might be one candidate. But we've met with at large in the past, individual users. We've had a number of things in common with them. Maybe before - you know, maybe before I were to make any sort of formal request,

I would just want to informally check in with some of the readers - the readership and whatever group we wanted to meet with to see that it's even worth trying to pursue schedule-wise. I don't know.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, that's certainly worth, at least, thinking about and trying to reach out to (other groups) starting maybe with the registries and registrars because we certainly have quite a lot of common ground.

Okay, I don't see that we can make much more concrete progress here at this point unless someone wants to, say, volunteer for reaching out to some specific group on this, and we can go on talking about this on the mailing list as well and certainly coordinate with the other - our constituencies, the activities.

Okay, I'll put that on the discussion list. That's a good point, Robin, so we can do that as well. Is there anything else we need to consider to talk about regarding Hyderabad?

Like, everybody is confident they will get a visa in time. Okay, I guess not. Let's move on with the agenda. The next one I have put in the agenda is the constituency reviews.

As you hopefully know, our charter requires that we review all constituencies. Actually says an absence of any other review criteria from the board, the NCSG AC will have a review of all constituencies every two years to determine if any recommendation would be made to the board regarding a change in status of any constituencies. I don't think this has ever been done before, actually, but it should be done every two years. Robin, you might remember better.

Robin Gross: Yes, I remember very well. It is one of the issues that has slipped through the cracks. It has never been done before. You're right, we need to come up with a process for doing that. I'm glad you brought it up.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so will put that on our agenda for the incoming year. I don't think we want to rush this too much. So I think - well, I note that besides the NCUC, I think we still have the one candidate constituency which I think we should either tell them to become active or more likely to drop them out of candidate status having not (unintelligible) in years.

Otherwise we'll have to go through the list of questions. I suggest that we should do this one constituency at a time, I guess. And I understand that NCUC is a presently planning to review and planning to change its bylaws.

We might want to wait for that to happen or, alternatively, we might want to communicate with them about that in (unintelligible) but maybe it's easier to wait for that process to finish.

Otherwise, most of these questions are - we need to answer. If you look at the charter, the questions we need to review it at the constituencies still have a defined noncommercial purpose and meet the criteria defined in two, three, one.

It is - actually, (that's probably relevant) in the candidate constituency case but we saw details there. And we have to note that they have maintained a dynamically public discussion list.

They must have participated actively in the relevant NCSG and GNSO policy development across working groups or work teams. I don't know if we should perhaps start by defining some kind of limit or what's the minimum participation, but I don't think we should set the bar very high there.

Must have participated actively in submitting comments and other policy statements with the NCSG and the GNSO, likewise. Must have at least ten participants who sign onto an updated SOI for (unintelligible) the constituency.

When procedural issue here is that since we have representatives of constituencies in the executive committee how shall we decide this? So representatives of each constituency be recused when they - recused themselves for judging themselves or should we just move it by consensus?

And actually if we do, it seems that the way to go is that we would have a consensus at maintaining the status of any constituency rather than rejecting them because if we have to decide that someone maintains their

(unintelligible), I'm not sure which way that would go but my feeling would be it should be - go that way, so.

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, go ahead, Robin.

Robin Gross: Okay, so yes, I was thinking about this and I'm not sure it makes sense for people to recuse themselves on the committee because we're all members of one or the other of the constituents.

So I'm not sure that would really work but you know what I do think we should try to do is come up with a process that's maybe - gives constituencies a chance to see where there may be some deficiencies and then fix it before we take a final determination as required under the charter.

So, you know, we could take a look at, for example, to the transparency requirements. Say, oh, well, there are some issues here on transparency for this constituency and, you know, sort of like - not a preliminary or a flag and then that can give them a chance to fix that.

And then come you know, rather than just issuing a ruling that, you know, you're not good enough on this issue, really try to work with the different constituencies to make everyone passed the test, if you will. Does that make sense at all?

Tapani Tarvainen: That makes perfect sense to me and I definitely agree. That's the way we should go. Let's set up a preliminary evaluation of the constituencies and then pass the results of that that it looks like this might be, you know, marginal.

You might want to respond to that or adjust your action or something like that and maybe even do a few rounds of that so that the process will be - if we start by going through the list, check each constituency on how they seem to fit in negotiate with them and say, "Come on, you don't quite fit this," or, "We're not sure that this fits."

And so, yes, give them a chance to explain themselves or improve on whatever or something like that. So we also do not want to have a result if we end up rejecting all of our constituencies have not left. That would be kind of bad.

So the process proposal is that we - should we start by making a list of these? Okay, we have a list of the things that we must consider here. We might want to make them a bit more concrete, how we review them.

Then go through that list for each constituency and as a tentative preliminary assessment, then interact with the constituencies and ask, well, what you think of this? Did we misread this or did you forget to document something we missed or whatever?

And then when we get back from them, then we review the situation again, maybe give them time to improve on something or things like that. But the purpose, indeed, is to make - help everybody pass but just to - the idea here is that maybe we need to, you know, sort of remind them that you should do a bit better here and there.

Is it tend to - sometimes it happens that people get lax in some places and outside we're looking at it, (so we) can better see how think should be improved. And I guess that's part of the idea, if not the main idea, of this preview (scheme here).

Okay, does that sound agreeable to everybody? Okay. Now I see Joan indicating approval and I (unintelligible) correctly so we are agreed on this process.

Okay, any other comments here? No? Okay, let's move on. The final item I had is that we have a plan, is possible charter revision as Robin has already pointed out that there may well be need for revising our charter.

Actually, it's almost certain that will have to do that at some point, a new ICANN charter and all that. That is something that takes quite a while and I don't think we should now go into detail about what we need to change there but, of course, you have something that you want to bring up already, that's fine.

But plan out just process and timing perhaps. Okay, one point - coming back to the last one. I suggest that we try to get started after Hyderabad. I think we are too busy until then to do anything about this review process.

But the plan is come I think, maybe in Hyderabad, in a meeting, actually talk about this already. I think we can try to prepare the plan. Then all the better. But still time with review would be mostly between Hyderabad in Copenhagen and hopefully completed by Johannesburg.

But for the charter review, the process I guess would be basically we start by collecting needs - what we need to start, what needs to be changed, what kind of gaps we have noticed in our charter, what kind of new requirements have come up in the CCWG accounting or anywhere else?

And we may want to go through the charter with an eye for gaps, look for conceivable imaginary but possible situations where we might find that the charter does not provide for what to do and we might end up in a deadlock or need to go out reading it with - between the lines as it were.

Imagine all possible disaster scenarios, what can happen, what should the charter - that the charter does not provide for? Does this sound like a good plan?

And, again, timing is the issue here. Is it likely that we will be able to complete this within a year? How optimistic - how much do we want to rush it because the transition process is still in the works?

I'm not sure how - if we may end up finding new problems coming from there for new issues coming from there if we rush this too much. Robin, you can't comment but will be - okay, you already raise your hand. Good. Go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes, so I just wanted to comment on the timeline for this. It's going to be unfortunately a much longer process than I think any of us would like but that's just the way it sort of baked into the charter right now.

Once we come up with the changes that we want, we need to approve it and we need (unintelligible) to approve it. So we have to have a membership wide vote. It needs to be approved by 60% of the members.

And then it goes to the board of directors once our members approve it and they have a look at it and they may want to make some changes, in which case it comes back to us for another approval.

And when we agree on the board agrees, then it goes out for public comment. So unfortunately, it will be a longer process than, I think I would like, many of us would like. But there we have it.

I think probably at least a year, to be realistic, to be realistic. I think, you know, let's try to do a quicker, as quickly as we can. But some of this isn't in our hands. Some of this, you know, we hand it over to the board and they put it in there - on their agenda and they might not get to it for several months.

So, you know, to some extent, the timing isn't going to be in our hands but I would like to move as quickly as we can on our own side to the extent that we can to try to get some of these fixes in place.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin. Yes, I tend to agree with that kind of - the timing (concerns). Possible timings that would be that - okay, the first - after we draft up - right up the proposal, we will have to, of course, circulated a bit in the (unintelligible) but we have to put it to a vote with our members.

And I rather (unintelligible) not get that done in - even to that stage in less than a year, meaning that we would build on it during the next NCSG election next summer.

We just might want to get it faster so that if we get to vote sometime in the spring, but - and then, because as you said, it's likely that the board will want to - since, of course, we can try to interact with the board in between but I somehow suspect they will not be too helpful in that until we have a ready proposal at hand. So I suspect we'll have to vote - have our members vote on it twice.

Poncelet Illeleji: Hello, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, Poncelet, you want to speak?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes, hello. Tapani, yes, Poncelet for the record. I just wanted - I agree with what Robin said and what she just said, but since the initial steps is in our hands, if we start early, by spring of next year, then we now know that, okay, maybe we have been able to do what we can do by spring next year and it is left to the board to get back to us and maybe likely even make some changes again then it goes back to vote.

But if we - we should try to get a timeframe and give ourselves the timeframe and let our membership base know that, okay, we want to try to complete this exercise by spring next year. At least we will be able to put that pressure on ourselves.

That's why I want to look at it because if we - as you said, it can go for one year. I totally agree and if we leave it on our side for one year, then we have another three, six months for the board to look at it and get back to us.

Then we are now talking about 18 months, so we should try to make our own timeframes much stricter. At least that one is in our control. If we get our membership base involved earlier, that this is what is coming up. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Poncelet. You make a good point. So we might want to try to set ourselves the goal of having a proposal we are ready to put for vote by the Copenhagen meeting.

So start by collecting all of our - yes, so that's our aim - the proposal from our side, ready to be added to the board would be ready by Copenhagen. Of

course, we do know that all timelines tend to slip but we need to have a goal to go for.

And it's not an impossible goal even though it may be a difficult one. Okay, so that's the plan. I presume the board will take its own time working on that but in theory, the fastest way, I think, to get - actually can go on that weekend, get the revised version after fighting with the board for approval for the second vote of our members in the next summer, next year, this time and then we would have it actually approved in a year.

That's - well, theoretically possible at least. So we can try that. But for now, the goal is to have the proposal ready by Copenhagen. And how to go about it, I think we need to have - set up something like a wiki page where they collect proposals, suggestion for change, advertise it to our members, say, "Hey, come on. Put it - this is what we're planning and if you have any suggestions please come up with them."

And at some point, after we collect enough input from members and read the charter, (unintelligible) ourselves and think of that, then we'll start drafting a new one.

That would be after Hyderabad but again, I think, we might have - in Hyderabad have a discussion about this if we have time in our sessions there as well.

I see that at least Robin increase on the wiki. Anybody else have any comments? Okay, I guess I can ask Maryam to start the wiki page for the purpose.

I think we can trust ICANN wiki for this purpose and set up one on an independent Web site, right? It's public stuff anyway. Of course, if ICANN staff start censoring our (blasts), then we'll have to do something about that but I somehow don't think that's likely.

Yes, it seems Robin agrees that with the idea that we can talk about this in Hyderabad. So we'll put this on the Hyderabad NCSG meeting agenda. Okay, since we're in happier came in about that as well.

And that was the last thing on my agenda. Any other business anybody wants to bring to this meeting? No? Okay, see you in Sweden. Okay, a comment about the next possible meeting - sometime in September.

The problem, as noted, is I made have trouble finding any usable date in September so - okay, let's leave that pending depending on how we get (around) with the vice chairs issue.

But the possible dates would be the - basically we'll try to keep to the Fridays. We can't make 2nd of September in any case but - and I hope not the last one but something like the 23rd of September I might be able to do actually.

But - so keep Fridays of September or early October open for the call for now, okay? So we're done? Thank you everybody. Continue on the mailing lists and then the next meeting, and so. Okay, bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, everyone, for attending the meeting. Lance, you may now stop the recording. Thank you very much for your time today. Goodbye.

END