ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
December 9, 2015
7:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recording has been started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Toni. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCPH Intersessional Meeting Planning Call on Wednesday the 9th of December 2015. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Phil Corwin, Greg Shatan, Rudi Vasnick, Tapani Tarvainen, Lori Schulman

Lori Schulman: If you hear an echo, I...

Maryam Bakoshi: And from staff we have Robert Hoggarth, Benedetta Rossi, Ozan Sahin, and myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much. Over to you Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, Maryam. Can you please put up the agenda slide for us? And I'll wait for you to confirm because I can't see.

Maryam Bakoshi: The agenda slide is up now. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Great thanks. Welcome everyone. My apologies if I have a little poor audio. I'm in somewhat a noisy location at the moment. But the purpose of today's call is to give you an all update of where we are logistically in terms of plans for the meeting location and facilities, to check and see where we are in terms of the meeting attendees, do some confirmation in terms of the discussion we began last week or on our last call about invited guests, and then to review some of the discussions that we have regarding meeting goals, programming matters, and the potential for additional community meetings.

I'm hopeful that we can touch on all of those this hour and that supplemented with some additional emails over the course of time before our next call that we'll be able to move things forward with some alacrity. Does anyone have anything else they'd like to add to the meeting?

Hearing nothing and assuming Maryam that we don't have any hands, which I'll always ask you to alert me to, we can move to the logistics side. But anything, Maryam, from anyone's hands?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, there's no one in the room raising their hands, Rob. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay. I will ask you as we go forward. So logistical preparations and things, I've just returned from Los Angeles where I had an opportunity to review not only the ICANN meeting space but the meeting space at the Doubletree Hotel, where we have planned the stay.

Where we are in terms of that right now is that making the call to hold the bulk of the meetings at the Doubletree Hotel. The situation we ran into is that

I have an interest in - I'm going to give you guys as many slots as possible, and we also ran into some plans that we will have some presentations, as well as the need for breakout sessions.

And so when we literally went through and started laying out chairs, trying to figure out tables, and things like that, it was really going to be cramped in the ICANN office. Some of you have stated in the January 13 first pilot meeting that we had will recall that instead of a hollow square we sort of had two rows of tables facing each other, and we were just able to squeeze in 44 people.

When we tried to do a hollow square, it simply doesn't work. People are leaning up against the screens or folks are right up against the glass on the ICANN windows, and that's not acceptable for you and your delegates who are going to have to sit there for two days. Also the only way we could squeeze folks in was some rather thin, uncomfortable chairs.

So we've opted for the Doubletree location. Several of you may know that that's about three and a half, four blocks from the ICANN office. So what I'm hopeful we can do in being novel about the agenda for the two days is to have the bulk of the meetings in the hotel and find opportunities for delegates to visit the ICANN office, maybe have some breakout sessions over there, basically to give people a flavor of the ICANN headquarters to the extent you all think that that's necessary or appropriate.

So that's where we're proceeding. (Stacy), our meetings team member who is the expert with the hotels, is currently working on the contract. I'll share with you guys with pictures of the meeting space. I just had basically meeting rooms, empty meeting rooms, right now. But that's the step that we're taking in terms of those logistics.

I think it'll work very nicely. We've used the Doubletree on many other occasions for the SSAC workshop, for a number of registry and registrar meetings. So I think it'll accommodate our needs pretty well, give your delegates some space to spread out a bit, may offer us some opportunity to potentially expand the guest list a little bit. And so that's where we are at this stage with respect to the hotel and the location.

Do I have any questions or comments that anyone would like to make about that?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Robert. Lori has her hand raised.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. And I'll let you run the queue as well, Maryam, if you can. Go ahead, Lori. Yes, please go ahead, Lori. I cannot hear Lori. Perhaps others can?

Maryam Bakoshi: Rob, no we can't hear Lori. I guess she's on mute or try her on the audio bridge and see.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay well maybe Lori you can put some comments in the chat. I know you weren't in the Adobe Connect room earlier. Perhaps you're connected now -- if that works. But we'll come back, Maryam, or you can just make a note of that.

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, this is Benedetta speaking. Lori is typing in the chat. She wrote, "What is the address of the Doubletree?"

Robert Hoggarth: Well it will be in the next draft. I don't have that in front of me. By memory, I believe it's...

Benedetta Rossi: It's West Centinela Avenue, I think.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, 6161 West Centinela Avenue. That's totally from memory and from my little uber app here on my phone, so. And I think, Lori that I put that link in the last - or in the first draft agenda version. I think there's a link there on that document, if you want to pass that on to folks.

Great. Well let me move on then to the invited guest list, and I'll turn the mic over to you, Benedetta. I know we have gotten some very good feedback. Right of the bat I'd like to thank all of you for what I know is not simple and easy work to start to coordinate delegations, getting people identified who are not only able to come but who can give the information at this early stage. So thank you all for making those efforts.

Benedetta, can you give us a sense as to how we are in terms of our goal of getting everyone's names and information in?

Benedetta Rossi: Sure. This is Benedetta speaking for the transcript. Yes we've received quite a few names already, which is great for planning purposes. So, so far I'll state it from each constituency and stakeholder group. We received from the BC, we've received six names out of seven, so we've got open slot. From the ISPCP we received all seven slots.

From the IPC, I have not received any names yet. From the NCSG we've received all seven. From the NCUC we've got five open slots and two received. And from the NPOC we have one open slot of the seven, so we received six.

Robert Hoggarth: Good. Thank you. That's very helpful and much appreciated for you all to get that stuff in. Benedetta is collecting that from Maryam and Chantelle and has been sharing that with Joseph, our travel coordinator. His managing the

travelers and effectively given the fact that the meeting is taking place a month later that it did in January 2015 and noting that we're getting names in early December, we're literally I think something like seven weeks ahead of where we were last time.

So I'm hopeful with respect to your travelers and knowing your arrangements much earlier, and I hope will helps us budget wise and give us a sense as to how the expenses are going to be coming out on that. That's important because if potentially we do have some more flexibility here either in budget or in (unintelligible) over at the Doubletree meetings rooms (unintelligible).

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, you're breaking up again.

Robert Hoggarth: I'm hopeful that by having this information earlier that that will give us an opportunity to be more effective in scheduling. Thank you for that information, Benedetta. Does anyone have any comments or questions they'd like to ask Benedetta or me on that topic of the delegations?

Lori Schulman: Hi, Rob, it's Lori. I just have a comment. IPC was delayed. It was totally my fault. My apologies. We have had more interest in slots, and I took a few personal days. So we'll have a list to you very, very shortly.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thank you very much, appreciate that. The other topic with respect to - as many of you know from the past meetings, we have traditionally invited the Nominating Committee appointee association with the Non-Contracted Parties House and remember you all select to be on (unintelligible). We are set to do that again, with the only little twist that I foresee is that the board is having a workshop in Singapore on February 1, 2, and I think part of the 3rd. So that may create some difficulties for Markus Kummer to attend.

After this call is over now that we know where everybody is in terms of delegations and the rest, I'll be extending formal invitations to those two folks, and we'll get some feedback. Just FYI, David Olive is going to be at that workshop.

He is flying back and he was able to find an itinerary where he is back for the full Friday part of the meeting. And so there is the possibility that Markus will be able to participate on at least the second day, if not sometime on the first day.

So I just wanted to alert you to that. Because once I get the feedback from those folks, that may create some additional flexibility in terms of spaces around the table. The question that Rudi you raised last week or the last call we all agreed that we would review and decide on at this call was whether to also extend the invitation to the Nominating Committee appointee who had no affiliation on the GNSO Council.

And, Rudi, I'd like to turn the mic over to you, if you have audio, to let you remind folks of that request, make some of the points that you shared last time to remind folks, and then we'll have a big discussion.

Rudi Vasnick: Yes. So, Rob, Rudi for the transcript. While the request was coming for the GNSO Council Nominating Committee appointee Carlos Gutierrez, who in fact doesn't have coverage for travel for the intersessional meeting, while he normally has travel covered by the GNSO Council itself. Carlos is also a member of NPOC, and he was requesting some support from us for his travel.

We consider this a bit strange as we see there are councilors from other constituencies that have travel cost - travel covered by the global GNSO and makes it a bit difficult. That's the reason why we are keeping one slot open in

case there is no solution for him. But we would like to have coverage for his travel done by ICANN and GNSO and not by the constituency itself.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Rudi. If I can address just sort of traditionally - and it's hard to say traditionally when we're talking about this only being our third meeting. But I can explain it.

And the history is that past meeting planners decided to extend any invitation to the NCA who was associated with your house as well as the board member selected by your house under the theory that they were essentially part of (unintelligible) the meeting.

Lori Schulman: Hello?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, Lori, are you...?

Lori Schulman: No, I'm hearing like thunder or something, or I'm sorry. I couldn't hear anybody.

Robert Hoggarth: I think I did hear somebody typing on their keyboard. I have moving luggage trays in my background but I don't think that was the sound, because I heard that as well. So everybody (unintelligible) please mute.

So that's the background on the NCA and the board members. So essentially what you're asking, Rudi, is seeking feedback from your fellow planners and community leaders whether to expand that invitation to the NCA who's not associated with house.

I would look at that potentially in two ways. One is that it's, you know, an opportunity for you guys to look at more folks. Two, it's ultimately a decision perhaps by your individual community.

You noted that other GNSO Council reps are funded. That's simply because (unintelligible) have their seven slots. It's the NCPH meeting of leaders within the GNSO. Communities who are selected view them as leaders from their communities that should represent them.

So that's sort of the background there. It's not a matter of, you know, just getting councilors to attend, because of course we wouldn't have registry and registrar councilors either. So I hope that's helpful for some context for the conversation. Maryam, is there anyone who's in the queue to comment?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, Robert. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. I'll wait a moment. If someone would just like to speak who wouldn't otherwise raise their hand, please go ahead.

All right, hearing nothing. Any follow up that you would like to do, Rudi, since my clarification? Otherwise I can call the question.

Rudi Vasnick: Thank you, Robert. Well your line is breaking up quite a lot and it's not so easy to have a full sentence heard in a decent way. So what I'm summarizing from it is that if in our case Carlos Gutierrez wants to travel, we should take him onboard of the NPOC travel slots, which compared to what I said is that when we see other councilors coming on not on the other constituency slots then I have some difficulties to defend that to my colleagues.

Robert Hoggarth: I am more than happy to have those conversations with your other colleagues, but I don't want to assume the conclusion of the discussion. I guess there's two options here on the table. One is do you all extend the invitation to the other NCA. Here we remove NPOC from the equation, at least from my perspective.

Does it make sense to have that person in attendance from a just an overall theory of expanding and building relationships? If that does make the case, then with (Marcus) not coming, that slot potentially could be open. Alternatively, you guys have made some plans in advance potentially to have Carlos there, so I'll sort of let folks approach it that way.

Any other comments or observations here? I guess the best way to do things without the audio difficulties and assuming that most of you are in the Adobe Connect room, we can have a show of hands that indicates if we have a consensus to include Carlos or not.

Is there anyone else who would like to join Rudi in supporting this idea? If there is, please speak up. If not, then I think that would be sign that there's not consensus for adding Carlos in his position as the NCA, obviously not excluding him for you guys selecting him. Would anyone else like to speak out in support of Rudi's proposal?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Robert. We've got Tapani and then Lori.

Lori Schulman: I was voting.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. So your hand was in favor. Tapani, are you in favor of Rudi's proposal as well?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. Is there anybody who objects to Rudi's proposal? Any hands, Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Rob. No one is raising their hands in the room at the moment. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. In that case at this stage, we've got three people who are in support of it.

Lori Schulman: Wait, Rob? Phil Corwin has asked for the proposal to be restated. So maybe people aren't clear. So if you could restate it, that might be helpful.

Robert Hoggarth: Certainly. Thanks very much, Lori and Phil. The - I'll summarize. Rudi, you can correct me if I'm wrong. The proposal is to add the - to the guest list, the invitation list for the meeting, the Nominating Committee appointee on the GNSO Council who is not associated with either house.

Currently we have the NCA associated with your house as well as the board member associated with your house. Rudi's proposal is to expand that by one slot to Carlos. My understanding is at present, in addition to Rudi's proposal, Tapani and Lori are in favor of it.

And I've asked for folks to indicate if anyone opposes that. If someone would like to comment prior to indicating their objection, I'm more than happy to turn over the mic, or if there are simply any other comments that anyone would like to make.

Lori Schulman: I can tell you why I like Rudi's idea, if people are interested.

Robert Hoggarth: I'm sure Rudi would appreciate that. I'd be interested.

Lori Schulman: Well I guess I know this is the NCPH meeting and I get that, but I also feel there's such a division between the houses that if this an opportunity in a fairly neutral way to offer an opportunity for an observer, one who's been nominating by NomCom, presumably neutral, then why wouldn't we open that door? I - so I voted in favor.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Lori. Any other comments? Great, well reviewing the (unintelligible) for it, the fact that I'm able to identify some space so we don't have any logistical issues and no objections, I'll extend the invitation to Carlos. Three invitees at this stage, and I'll let you all know what sort of feedback I get from them as direct invitations.

Thanks, Rudi, for the proposal, and others for participating and asking questions or commenting. Let's move on to the next agenda item. I think this next half hour we can focus a bit more on specific programming matters.

You'll note that I all shared with you after our last call the first version for this meeting, the working agenda draft framework. I'm not going to create an acronym for that. What I've done at past meetings is basically just started the draft document and from call to call update on that to reflect changes in circumstances, proposals or ideas that the planners, you all, come up with.

So that's going to be essentially the format for our working document. As I indicated to you in my previous e-mail, it's based on how we approached it at only two meetings. So if any of you have suggestions for a different format, you want to change it up, you want to add things to it, please feel free to do so. It's purely a tool or a vehicle to help organize the discussions and sort of keep up us on track.

You'll note two particular matters with respect to that. First is that it's basically empty. All I've done is indicate that there's a slot, that it's open, that we don't have topics in them yet. You'll see that there are effectively about nine or ten sessions that are open, because some of the sessions are a lunch or a meal or the reception.

That being said, even though it's a lunch, we probably want to have a discussion topic or something for the participants to be doing during those periods. So there's a fairly broad scope and opportunity for conversations outside of potentially your own individual meetings.

On that document, I collected comments from the last call and I think I indicated that I also threw up other topics that had either been popular last time or that might be of value to you all. The purpose of the discussion right now is to say I have several topics.

And basically what I want to be able to do is give you at least as many topics as you have slots, and we have the luxury of more topics and slots that you can, you know, start having some debates as to ones with greater priority or how you want to get that information otherwise.

I mean at this stage of the agenda, I'm sort of throwing open the microphone to the queue for some of you to make suggestions about some other potential topics. I recall, Greg, that in the draft last time that we talked about some generalities.

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, your voice is breaking up again. So it's unclear what you were mentioned to Greg about, what the topic was.

Robert Hoggarth: The point that I was noting is that toward the end of the last call, Greg noted that we didn't really have, based on that discussion, substantive topics yet and that that was really the next phase of the call. So (unintelligible) think about that and if they had suggestion for substantive topics, and that's essentially the purpose of that in this agenda, if folks want to start throwing out some additional suggestions.

Benedetta Rossi: No problem. Rob, just -- this is Benedetta speaking -- just noting that on the chat about the previous topic about invited guests, Lori just made a comment noting that she's kind of confused thinking there were more non votes than votes. So I just thought I'd relay that to you since you can't see the Adobe chat.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. My only observation there would be that we've always sort of approached decisions by the planners by consensus. And having support and hearing no objections, I was not vote counting.

Lori Schulman: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: Your comments, Lori, were so persuasive that I think (unintelligible). I'm just letting folks potentially come off mute for any additional programming ideas, topics, or thoughts. It's not fatal that we don't get any today obviously. The interest in my push for identifying as early and often as possible is the past indicated that the faster and earlier we get the agenda together, the more meeting delegates felt that they could prepare for the meeting.

We had also discussed on our last call that some topics might require some pre-meeting work. And you'll see in the document I believe indicated a goal that we have the agenda together by the end of this month, giving you all, you know, a full month to do - chat with your community, prepare thoughts

(unintelligible) some pre-discussion calls or matters to get prepped for some of that stuff.

I mean it's okay we don't have specific suggestions today, it just, you know, tightens the timeframe for (unintelligible) those things. I think it's still doable though. Maryam, (unintelligible)

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes hi, Rob. Can you hear me?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes so we have Tony on the chat here. He said, "I suggest the GNO restructuring - GNSO restructuring on the last call." And we have two raised hands in the room. First is Rudi Vasnick and then Greg.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, Maryam. Yes I tried to capture that, Tony. If I didn't do that well in the document, you know, flesh that out a little bit for us when you look at the document or give me some feedback via e-mail. That would really be great. Because my sense is that there are probably within that general topic a couple of different discussion items that might end up being your own session, but we should tweak that out a bit and any thoughts that you have after looking at just what I generally put down there would be very helpful.

I think Maryam said Rudi then Greg. So, Rudi, I'll turn the mic to you, and then Greg will follow you in the queue.

Rudi Vasnick: Thank you, Robert. Rudi for the transcript. Well I agree with (Tony) that indeed there is need for some time looking into the GNSO restructuring. And I'm referring to the fact that the GNSO review report and the comments from the review working party will be available at that moment too. We would like

to have some discussions on the recommendations that are coming from the review to see how our house will try to work out on some of the proposals that are in the recommendations.

I think it's quite important that we are able to prepare ourselves for eventually some larger discussion in the Marrakesh meeting that will focus on this kind of restructure that is also in the recommendations of the GNSO review. And beside that one, I think that the IANA transition is something that will go together with all the debates and also ask if the IANA transition proposal is accepted. There will definitely be some discussions on restructuring and review of charters and bylaws. So I would like to have something on the agenda in that sense.

So I'll pass over the mic to Greg.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Rudi. I'll take note. I'll reflect that in the document. Thank you, Greg. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Rob and all. Generically thinking about the substantive topics, I would probably divide them into two broad categories. One is areas where the CSG and NCSG traditionally differ or disagree or find themselves on the opposite side of those issues and try to see if we can find common ground or at least, you know, have a full and frank discussion of those issues.

Perhaps you were hinting at one of these in your last agenda topic, which was compliance issues, which, you know, goes into a whole host of related issues if we're talking about contract compliance related to abuse reporting and things like that.

There are probably, you know, a few other hot button or even third rail issues that if we're brave enough we can try to discuss and get at least a better understanding of positions in a, you know, fairly, you know, away from a big ICANN meeting or from, you know, calls with other agenda items. It seems like an opportunity to do that.

And the second generic topic would be things that we potentially could agree where we don't necessarily disagree or we may have actually even found ourselves aligned and where we can try to build some, if you will, group power in - it's in looking for instance at the GNSO Council working recently, you know, it's clear that the registry and registrars find themselves aligned a lot more easily and more often than we do.

And as such that gives them certain governance advantages and decisional advantages, particularly within the council but not only within the council. And therefore the more that we can develop a communal view on things across the non-contracted parties groups, the better off we are in the long run. And if we have a, you know, we can think about both the methodology for doing that, which is, you know, to some extent a part of the process but it's, you know, looking at it as policy but issues are not merely procedurally.

But, you know, if we could identify some topics generally where we could, you know, build some, you know, common positions and grow together, that would be fantastic. I don't have anything to add to those GNSOs, if you will, but generically that's how I would kind of frame the issue. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: And I think a great way to sort of structure some brainstorming on this. So what I'll do is try to reflect that in the document in a way to sort of tease it out so then that can prompt some brainstorms. The way that the planner is structuring the January 15 D.C. meeting was we had a chair from each SG sort

of co-chair each session. And so I like the idea particularly on some of these areas where you may differ even if the goals is simply some of these sessions, as you suggest, Greg, to better understand.

I could foresee a template for some of these sessions where each SG has an opportunity to share their perspective of the issue and then having a broader discussion among the groups. And you could adjust, you know, turn the dials depending upon what the topic is and sort of what you might want to accomplish there. And each, you know, set of co-chairs might have a couple of conversations before the meeting to see how they could pull that off.

But thanks very much for that suggestion. I'll try to convey that in the document itself and then we'll look for further brainstorming from folks. In the differ or disagree category, I would present contract compliance issues, as you suggested, sort of put it under that umbrella, and then we can play around with that a bit.

Because it was not -- thank you for the credit -- but that was not in the back of my mind when I put that on the list. It's just one that I know that Steve Metalitz always asks about. So I said oh I know that this will be on the list, so thanks for that. And (unintelligible) Greg prompted a brainstorm get in the queue or speak up.

Maryam, do we have any other hands at this point?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, Robert. We've got Rafik on the queue. But before then we've got two comments in the chat. The first one is from Tony Holmes. He says he supports Rudi's view of the report of ICANN. And Rudi Vasnick agreed with Greg's proposal. Thanks very much.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, Maryam. I will ask you, Rudi and you Tony, for a challenge that you all could think about how you might structure a GNSO restructure session or sessions. That would be very helpful. I really liked Rudi's idea about that at least a session potentially on the GNSO review recommendations we could have some short summary by the review team - by review team members or by ICANN staff sort of outlining the various recommendations.

I know that there are some that had caused some particular attention and discussion, but there are others as a result that probably aren't getting the attention that they deserve. And since you all have responsibility for implementing some of those recommendations, having that discussion among the group I think would be good.

Thanks for that, Maryam. Rafik, you're next in the queue and you have the microphone, sir. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks, Rob. Just to respond to I think to get more clarity, I guess for now we are just - I just think some topics we are not agreeing on the list, because at least for NCC with the transition to new leadership we may need some time to discuss within what kind of maybe - what kind of topic we would like to suggest. So that's what I want to be sure that we are only now maybe suggesting some ideas.

On the other hand, also maybe we need to have in mind what we want to achieve in the two days. I understand Greg suggested about having I mean the two categories of what we can agree and other topics that we disagree. Maybe it's to listen to each side, but also maybe this meeting I would like to stress what we can achieve, what can be our outcome from the two days. We're going to ask people to fly for a long flight, so we need to make this kind of

more productive and having some substantive outcomes. We can discuss, sure, but so just to have this in mind what we can get from the meeting.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Rafik. And congratulations on your recent selection. I know that that was holding up some of the feedback and discussion that you just mentioned. Let me put you on the spot. I mean do you have at this point any thoughts as to what you think be of value in terms of meeting goals and expectations?

Rafik Dammak: I think one of - a clear and current topic may be for the last - from the last day was really to work with some procedures of staff like for selection for the vice chair and so on in the GNSO. I just kind of think maybe we need a group of people to start working on that beforehand and just leave the meeting kind of maybe to (unintelligible) that quickly. But this is just - should not be a big deal, but if we can do it by L.A. meeting, it would be very helpful to move forward.

And also I think there was some suggestion of we can approve the kind of discussion between the two groups and to have something regular, a regular session in ICANN meetings and I think that was suggested last time. So this is the kind of thing maybe we need to work on is to make things more smooth between - and within the NCPH.

Regarding a more substantive topic, I don't have a suggestion yet. I'm not sure what we can really discussion about the GNSO review and the report itself, because it's going to OEC and depending what kind of process they will initiate there. So.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, Rafik. A couple observations and I'll sort of go in reverse order. I think in terms of the OEC, if I have my calendar right, the OEC will

just have met in Singapore as part of the board workshop. And so the timing may work very nicely. We'll have some sense, several before that meeting because that's the next official meeting of the OEC at the Singapore workshop in terms of where they are. So we might have some guidance for that sort of placeholder session for that. We'll certainly have some updated information.

I really like some of your other suggestions. What I'd like to suggest to you all is if it would be helpful from a staff perspective I can - I'll throw out some straw man goals and see what you guys are willing to commit to. You mentioned some of these procedural matters that only seem to become of course a priority for the choice time or an election time or whatever. And I am more than happy from a staff perspective to help program (unintelligible).

I think the staff (unintelligible) things from a project management standpoint, helping you establish some groups and some timeframes, benchmarks and things like that, I think we could make a number of suggestions. And again, I'll just do that as part of the responses and some brainstorming.

So for example, a goal of the meeting is to establish a process for appointing the NCPH board member by date blank and having this written and in a formal procedural manual. Another one could be, you know, to also work the community to schedule an NCPH session at every ICANN meeting. And dovetailing that with the new meeting team and things like that, I think that we could get some fairly specific (unintelligible) coming out this meeting so you are all comfortable, it can be done and it's something that you know that you've got staff support to achieve.

So I'll play around with that in this document. And, you know, when I produce Version 2.1 or whatever, we'll just ask you all to look at that and review that.

And I'll call out some of you specifically who've made some suggestions maybe on some leadership role or some editing role there.

Maryam, do we have anyone else in the queue?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes hi, Rob. We've got Greg in the queue.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg again, just coming back briefly after Rafik's point. I do- I think wholeheartedly that we need to look at the entire agenda with regard to outcomes and goals and not merely topics. Otherwise this just puts on the talk shop and it's a long flight even from New York to Los Angeles just to have a two-day chat.

As enjoyable as it would be, it would be 100% more rewarding if we actually have goals and outcomes and focus beforehand, especially if we manage to achieve some or all of those goals at the end. Then it would be worth flying all the way around the world for, although at some point if you're flying all the way around the world, you haven't left. But in any case, we should think about things that are kind of open issues. You know, clearly the vice chair selection process is one that needs to be looked at.

We have been talking about it for the better part of two years, if not longer, and we came close to a solution, then we had two kind of quick attempts at just slightly different solutions. We finally managed to get ourselves out of the loop. But it was not a painful - it was a painful process to both view and participate in. If we could actually resolve that, that would be fantastic.

And another kind of topic that's both process and substance is that I think we need to talk about how we talk about each other and particularly how we talk about each other's structures. So this kind of falls to some extent under the GNSO structure issue, but I think that there are times that I've observed just in the last few days on the GNSO Council list where we bring up, you know, we each of the two stakeholder groups does things differently with regard to the relationship between constituencies and stakeholder group, you know, subsidiary, privacy, things like that.

And I often seems to - the discussion, you know, quickly gets a little testy on that point and I think we need to talk about that we need to try to get beyond trying to score points on each other in that regard, because it's happened more than once just in the last few months. And it's something that if we can try to talk about that, you know, I think we could, again, you know, try to avoid unnecessary disagreements and come to some common understanding. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Greg. I will attempt to convey those thoughts in the document. You're helpful with that vice chair selection process. Conceivably that would be a session in and of itself, and then you all can play around with how much time you think you need to achieve that.

Some of these things I don't think allow for just a one-hour discussion. So you may want to have, you know, expanded plenary sessions on some of these topics or, you know, have a discussion of it the first day and then a discussion the second day, or something like that.

I want to (unintelligible) that suggestion and the direction this discussion is going is you're actually looking at this is a working session, not just hi we're issue spotting, actually having the expectation that there will be a conclusion.

Can I ask the question, but I don't want to unless I know - I want to give anyone in the queue an opportunity to speak. So, Maryam, anyone in the queue?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Rob. No there's no one in the queue at the moment. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thanks. I want to follow up with just briefly that the, you know, the concept of a communiqué. That's something that came up on the last call. It's something that's been on some of the emails that gee that's a good idea. If you all choose to move forward on something like that, you might want to pick the topic or the focus of that communiqué before the meeting rather than deciding on it at the meeting.

And I think someone suggested perhaps some pre-work even, a subcommittee or something like that to work on a document like that. The topic to be determined, the process to be determined, but is there a sense that that is something you would all like to do, and is that something that you want to have happen organically or something you want to plan?

And I hope I framed the question there that it is helpful to get some feedback on. Any hands or comments that folks would like to make on that topic?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Rob. Yes so the comment from Greg, he says, "Communiqué is a good idea." And he further points out the need to have goals going in and outcomes at the end. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Very good. Thanks. Well (unintelligible)

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, you're breaking up again.

Robert Hoggarth: Before the next call, if you all could think a little bit about some goal language, some expectations that you have, please share that with the list and I'll crank that into the next version of the framework document. Thanks for the admission, Benedetta.

The last thing that I don't see us getting a resolution on as a group on this call but that I wanted you all individually to resolve if possible is that concept of (unintelligible) that you have as individual (unintelligible) on the Wednesday before.

In talking with the meeting planners, we need to have that information by the third week of this month. So in other words, in order to make sure that we've got the contract set up, the right meeting (unintelligible), scheduled either at the ICANN office, we need to know whose definitively going to have a meeting on Wednesday and whether you want it to be a full-day meeting, a half-day meeting.

I'm going into this thinking that morning we have an afternoon meeting. We have a sort of informal cocktail reception at ICANN for everybody that's in the night before. Please give that some thought. And I know some of you are already having those conversations, but if it possible by the third week of this month, so, you know, next two or three weeks, that would be extremely helpful from a planning perspective.

It's also going to be important from a traveling perspective, because we're already getting to (unintelligible) for a meeting, but we don't know that the meeting's even going to take place yet. So we want to be able to make sure that travel requests actually matched up with the agenda and want to be able to serve people the best we can.

So if you all could please continue your internal discussion about that. I'll be asking you about this on the next call. Benedetta or I will probably be following up with Chantelle, Maryam, and you guys individually just to confirm who has expectations for a meeting and who doesn't. We'll also have breakout sessions as you know. So it's - this just an option. We know it was something that was of value to you all last time.

And then one final thought. We are looking, as you will note on the working draft agenda, for a formal reception on Thursday night with an opportunity like we've done in the past to invite prospects for outreach within the Los Angeles or Southern California area to come to reception, meet people, chat and stuff like that. So also be having that in mind please in terms of who you might invite to that, because we'll also need to have counts and know that we're on track.

If we're going to 150 people, I don't want to make provisions for 75. So if you all can be getting that together, that's a much longer tail in terms of a deadline. The real focus right now though is on the Wednesday meetings.

Are there any final thoughts that anyone would like to raise that we didn't touch on or that we need to be ready to discuss other than just programming matters on the next call that we have?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Rob. We have a few comments in the chat room, and then one raised hand from Philip.

Robert Hoggarth: Let's do the raised hand and then we'll just capture the comments.

Philip Corwin: Yes Phil here. Thanks for running the call, Rob. Yes in regard to a possibility of a Wednesday session, I haven't checked flights yet from the East Coast, but, you know, I could be out there for an afternoon session but it's not going to be a full day session on Wednesday.

Robert Hoggarth: (Unintelligible)

Philip Corwin: I couldn't hear you, Rob. You broke up completely.

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, you're not audible at the moment.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Phil. (Unintelligible) You're right, I mean I've done the East Coast to West Coast. You can make plenty of afternoon meetings. But if somebody is coming from Australia or Singapore, we want them to make other arrangements. So it's just a matter of confirming at this stage sort of who wants to have the meetings and when. But thanks for giving us a sense that it can be all day or half day. I appreciate that confirmation.

Well thank you all very much. We're at the top of the hour. Again, this time and day seemed to work, so we could look at our next call - I don't know that it's necessary to do next week but given that this is the 11th and two weeks from now would be very close to U.S. holidays, perhaps we should look at a time later next week.

I'll work with Benedetta and Maryam on getting another call scheduled with you all. We may do a doodle poll. As a result, I would really appreciate feedback as much possible by e-mail and we'll be getting out the summary document of this discussion and an updated framework as soon as possible so you can all begin to react to it.

Thank you all very much. Thanks very much for the input on this call. I think we've made some progress. Moving forward, thank you all very much. Talk to you all again soon and see you online.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Rob. Thank you all for attending the meeting. (Toni), you may now stop the recording. Thank you.

END