

ICANN

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
December 18, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Your recording has started. You may now proceed.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Martha. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCPH Intersessional Meeting Planning call on Friday, 18 December, 2015. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Tony Holmes, Christopher Wilson, Cheryl Miller.

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 Uh...

Lori Schulman: Rob, I'm sorry. This is Lori. I didn't hear my name mentioned in the rollcall.

Coordinator: Lori Schulman on the call.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Lori for joining.

Philip Corwin: Philip Corwin, I'm on the call.

Robert Hoggarth: Excellent. Thanks. Great, thank you all for joining. My apologies again for our Adobe connect infrastructure issues here. I hope we'll be able to resolve those. The good news is there's not a lot to display on the screen. And just challenges as an update in terms of queue management duress but I think we can manage.

Thanks all for joining. I wanted to stick to the general agenda that we had for our past calls. To give you a general logistics update in terms of the actual physical planning for the meeting, review where we are in terms of attendees and invited guests. I think we're in great shape they are. Revisit our discussion about the meeting goals and really focus the conversation on programming matters.

You know, we're starting to give some crystallization to those discussions which had a number of good brainstorming conversations regarding with the possible agenda items might be. And so I'm hopeful we can come to a closer place of closure with respect to that, at least in terms of topics themselves and not specific schedule items which I can add to the documentation later.

Let me touch briefly on the logistical side. Last night I apologize for having to send you a version 2.2 of the planning documents. A couple of folks noticed some typos in there. I wanted to know to reflect back that Markus Kummer has sent his positive RSVP confirmed his interest in the meeting, sharing the challenges he'll have to make travel perspective, getting from the board workshop in Singapore to your meeting. But we working closely with him and I think we'll be able to get him for at least one day.

In terms of other logistics with respect to the hotel, we're in the final stages of the contract for that. So I'm very comfortable that I'll be able to confirm shortly that we're all nailed down to the cross and eyes dotted with respect to the Doubletree Hilton.

We're still collecting feedback from all of you in terms of potential additional meetings that you be interested in having on that Wednesday the 3rd where we might need space either at the ICANN office or the hotel. We're preparing for eventualities.

If everybody decides to have a meeting and we need separate space for everyone, so if you all can continue your community discussions in that regard and let me know in the next week or two, certainly by January 1, if at all possible, with you all are planning to take advantage of sort of that side time in the day before the actual intersessional meeting to have any individual meeting that you all are planning on your own. Those agendas are you own but what I'd like to be able to do is provide you some space.

When we did it here in Washington last January a number of you were just able to make arrangements in town because there were close by offices or groups with whom you had affiliations what you could just grab some space.

My sense is that Los Angeles is spread out enough and there's enough challenges getting back and forth from a travel perspective that if you do want to have a meeting and you're comfortable with being close to the ICANN offices or at the ICANN offices I'd like to give that option.

You can always have something off-site on your own but I do want to at least be able to offer you all the space. And the sooner we know that the better we can plan. At the very least I want to be able to give you remote connectivity at

the hotel is that's what works from and meeting space perspective. But we just want to have all those logistics lined up in nailed down.

So please give me that feedback as soon as you can. And I'll reinforce that deadline in the next version of the working draft schedule just so that everybody's plug-in on that. For those who haven't been on this call of folks who haven't been able to listen to the recording.

In terms of attended I think we're almost to 100% Benedetta in terms of folks who've been identified to our coming from the different delegations. Am I right about that Benedetta? Are we pretty close to 100%?

Benedetta Rossi: Yes, this is Benedetta speaking. Yes, we're almost there. We want to confirm most of the finalists and we now have two slots that are yet to be filled. One is for the IPC and the other one is for the NPOC and we have all the other names of the delegates.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thank you all for doing a lot of hard work to get that arranged and together. It may surprise some of you who've done this for the last couple of years but we are actually about three weeks ahead of schedule when you factor in both the timing of the meeting and having actual main locations, places of originating travel and the rest altogether. So thanks very much for that. As I said before I'm hopeful that that would prove to be much easier in terms of the travel arrangements.

Joseph from Constituency Travel Team who is assigned to this project for us advise me that he is going to an earnest been reaching out to various activities over the next couple of business days to make some initial connections on some travel. I think he's talked to a few people already but he was closing up a number of arrangements believe it or not already for Marrakesh and pulling

some of those things together. So now he'll be able to focus on our projects in earnest. Please let me know

Benedetta Rossi: Rob?

Robert Hoggarth: ...if you have any -- yes? Go ahead.

Benedetta Rossi: I'm sorry. This is Benedetta. We have people who have their hands up. I just thought I'd let you know. We have Lori and Rafik.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thanks. I'll get back to you folks. Yeah,, so please let me know if there are any individuals who are uncomfortable, not hearing from Constituency Travel. If they haven't heard up until now that does not trouble me but if there's not a connection or folks are nervous between now and the end of next week, please reach out to me. There will be some downtime ICANN staff between US Christmas and New Year's so I think it's just a matter of being aware that there will be that short gap.

I'm just hopeful that Joseph can make some progress between now and Christmas so that's a false can already get arrangements. He has as Benedetta shared with you, all find the email together the letter for those who need visas and I think Benedetta you provided the link to everybody. So please reach out to those folks within your delegations who will need in fact so that they can begin that process as quickly as possible.

From a queue perspective I believe Lori, you first and then Rafik. So Lori, you have floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi. Can you hear me?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes we can.

Lori Schulman: Good, okay. I just want to make two points. One, Brian Winterfeldt will be our seventh participant. So the IPC is fully represented. And secondly, I may have missed this and we've been typing inside the text, is the February 3rd day funded for the delegation? Or is the February 3rd day we would be paying for all of our hotel and everything? You may have said earlier meetings and I just don't remember.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, ICANN will cover that for folks who need the support. So that will be covered for that extra day. We've noted already for one of the group that's going to have a meeting that that requires folks to come in potentially on Tuesday, Tuesday evening for a stay at the hotel. So I wanted to make sure that thanks for giving me the opportunity to confirm that Lori.

Lori Schulman: I just want to follow up. Just so I'm clear when I communicate to our constituency that their funding then will be for members of the delegation itself. There would be no additional funding.

Robert Hoggarth: That's correct. Some folks had conversations and I know a number of you just because of your outreach and engagement strategic plans who've been partnering with Christopher Mondini and his team. Some of you with Jean Jacques and his team as well in terms of potentially leveraging outreach and engagement activities is - having not only an internal meeting but some potential outreach opportunities on the third.

Please reach out to Christopher or Jean Jacques as appropriate and get created in that regard as well because I know that they've all had the opportunity to review outreach and strategic plans and I'm sure would be delighted to help out in that regard.

Adam Peake has been on one or two of our planning calls just so that he can be attuned to what's going on in terms of planning for the intersessional. So please try to take advantage of that leverage resource as well if the opportunity presents itself.

Thanks Lori. Does that answer all of your questions?

Lori Schulman: Yes, thank you Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thanks. And I think we have Brian's contact information just from previous emails. But you may want to confirm that Lori by just, you know, if you can send us his new email I think he recently changed firms so I want to make sure that we've got the latest contact information. Thank you.

Lori Schulman: I'm happy to do that.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. Rafik, you are next in line. You have the floor sir.

Rafik Dammak: Hi, thanks Rob. Okay, this is just about the separations I mean for the meeting and the travel. At least I think one of our members and the leadership I mean he says that he just cannot make it because of the time, the period of time to get US visas is too short.

And we have - I don't want just want to -- I told you but when I raised the point several times, this meeting is too close to Marrakesh and many folks need workers who apply for a visa to Marrakesh. So that creates several problems. So at least someone needs to say that he cannot come and at least to have two or three people that probably need support. Having the letter I think

is the least requirement that they can get because to show that they have support and the reason to come to that.

We may need much more than just a letter. And Joseph really needs to hurry up in terms of setting all the details about the hotel booking and the travel, I mean the air ticket because one of the issues that we have to forget is that apply for US visa the first thing you need to prepare is the application but also to book the interview date and that is not something that can happen easily.

It takes weeks sometimes just to set up the day for the interview and we all are not even talking about how long the visa application process takes on. So is it possible that ICANN can give much more support than just providing an invitation letter?

I, myself, I went through many times the visa processing. It's not pleasant. I did pass before but at least for this time can you do much more than just providing a letter?

Robert Hoggarth: Yeah, thank you. I'm not sure from particular countries but that would potentially involve but please share with Maryam, Benedetta and me to folks for whom you think they will be specific issues so that we can work directly with Joseph to provide an extra level of support there.

Yeah, I would imagine particularly given some of the recent developments and what a number of you have shared with me in terms of heightened US scrutiny in the current environment that they may be extra things that we need to do there. And I'm hopeful that we can get everybody who is interested and able to attend.

Yeah, and we'll just continue to have to work year-to-year Rafik in terms of the timing for this. Thanks for your admonition and reminded in terms of some of those concerns. I appreciate it.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, just if I can follow-up here. Yes, I think maybe not for now it's too late, but for next time. I think we get stuck the way that people think that we need to make and the decision meeting in January at the beginning of the year. I don't think that's the kind of requirement. Maybe we can maybe set another time in there.

And we have also to have in mind maybe we need to change to another location. We made this now the third time in the US. There are other countries other than the United States. I think and also to have in mind that there are things like holidays. When you have like winter holidays it means that no (unintelligible) can be done in that time.

So like next week and the week after probably you won't find - you cannot do that much. So we're the kind of term here into a decent time of project management. So now we have everything in February. Okay, we have to leave with that but just maybe for I kind of think that before 2017.

Robert Hoggarth: Yeah, thank you very much. And that may be one of the topics that we want to touch on during the meeting itself in terms of that annual planning. We can look at potentially a cycle or other suggestions in terms of when the meeting might work well. I know it's a big push for this meeting time and location wise.

The ability to have some discussions that relate to the IANA transition matters and things like that. So I understand that we're always going to have those challenges but if we can have some discussions at this upcoming meeting to

regularize things, to plan things more forward that would be super. Thanks for that - those recommendations. Let's see if we can follow through with that at the meeting and part of our agenda planning.

I have been able to make it into the Adobe connect room. I don't see any hands so I will be able to Maryam and Benedetta now to follow some of the queues. So thanks to whoever was doing the troubleshooting on that and fixing some of those issues.

Let's turn to - well, let me first ask you, are there any other questions, issues concerns, observations with respect to logistical matters or just the physical and scheduling meeting arrangements that anyone has? I'm seeing no hands. I'm giving folks an opportunity to come off mute.

I will slide into the next agenda item we had here which is meeting goals with a number of you identified on our last call as being something that would be of value. What I tried to do in terms of planning document was to identify some just placeholder goals or things that promptly thought in terms of individual topics were sessions.

Other than that basically what I reflected what the overall sensibilities that a number of you shared on the last call with respect to a desire to improve how you all talk together as a community about issues and how you conduct yourselves and pull things together on issues of common interests. It's still relatively broad and that sense.

I'll open up the floor for anyone who wants to make any more specific recommendations in terms of particular things that you're looking within your community to accomplish at the meeting or that you think that the group should be focusing on. Well, we'll talk about that for a couple of minutes if

anyone does have comments and then we can float to some specific topics. Does anyone have any contributions they'd like to make on the moving goal, overall moving goal perspective? I see Phil is typing.

I think we're in generally good shape in terms of the overall intent and expectation that you have in terms of continuing to make progress on relationship building, networking, the ability to find common ground in general in terms of just positive working relationships at potentially break down some of the barriers that a couple of you mentioned that can be created just through miscommunications or shortness one email communications.

I'd really like to encourage you all is if there are folks within your communities or as you think over the next couple of weeks in terms of overall specific accomplishments that you want to pull out, let's see if we can put them into this area. I'm still open to the perspective that as you talk about the specific issues or that the subject matter that you can also choose some things out of that in terms of specific accomplishments or things that you want to walk out of meeting and hand as viewed accomplishments of goals that have been met.

I know two hands raised, Tony and then Rafik. So Tony, I'll give you the floor.

Tony Holmes: Thanks Rob. Just to point out that there might have been a little bit of misinterpretation because I think, on the goals, Item 2 and Item 5 this potentially and overlap that I don't think what Rudi and I were looking to do. We're specifically focused on the review. Some of those issues that came out of review that we would probably be discussing a hook straight into the future at the GNSO as well. So I think possibly those two may overlap or even combine at this stage.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Tony. That's helpful and I'd appreciate any for the feedback that you and Rudi come up with in terms of choosing these out a bit. I do see how review matters will affect the future of the GNSO and I can envision you guys teasing out a number of just separate sessions that talk about some of the actual just, okay, is a recommendations, what do we have to do with the community to implement them?

What are our priorities and can we agree as a group as an NCPH sort of what areas we should focus on first or give the most energy to? And then I can see other discussions that talk about, all right, imagine that we are going to look at the future and talk about the structure. What does it look like? What would you like to see?

What would this community like to see? Fight it depends on how you guys want to approach that. I don't know if you an Rudi are having separate discussions about that if you guys want to tease that out on this call. You know that the next steps - go ahead.

Tony Holmes: I just want to say we plan to have some discussions. It wasn't going to be across this but we plan to set up a session and talk but it's not going to happen before the holidays now.

Robert Hoggarth: Sure.

Tony Holmes: But it wasn't specifically around what recommendations are we going to look to support and take forward quickly. It was more a case of focusing on some of the issues that we felt were dealt with in the review that we, I think a lot of us have strong feelings about all those potentially different solutions. So it was tried to take that discussion forward will be started from.

So that really more towards what is Point 5 on the agenda at the moment. But I think you do have a point (Rob) and picking up on the review itself may be another strait but we're going to do that. We probably need to do that as I think you were implying in a separate session sometime across those two days.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, what I can explore, and I appreciate those comments. What I can explore is a conversation because I have in fact - we can particularly am not plugged into it but a chat with (Uberisa) with respect to sort of where they see the next steps and where can we be by early February. We might even have a short set up briefing by that group. We might invite other research to give some perspective on that.

And who knows we might get some volunteers to sort of lead that GNSO reviews/implementation discussion. What I will do based on your comments here is move you and Rudi in terms of responsibility onto that possible GNSO future and then will to follow up with you guys maybe the second week of January whatever after you teased out some of the potential issues there.

And if you are both comfortable with it coming from different stakeholder groups I think you'd be a nice team to sort of chair, co-chair that session and take a lead on that. Are you guys willing to do that?

Tony Holmes: Well, that's what we had in mind to do. So that wouldn't be a problem at all. I'm looking on this from a rather parochial perspective pick if you remember we had a conversation with the ISP had a conversation we met with the Board at the last ICANN meeting around this area.

And what we were looking to do is maybe get a little bit of impetus from the discussions in the intersessional that can help us as a constituency take that forward. But I think it's important for all of us for the NCPH to be involved in that discussion. So this is an idea of opportunity to actually take that off and have a broader discussion. So if there are people ICANN staff or I can involve members who have a particular interest in that having them around would probably be pretty helpful.

Robert Hoggarth: All right, excellent. We'll have some of those pieces both with the review of the possible GNSO future. I am aware that that has been some conversation between some NCPH members and Board members as a follow-up to some of the Dublin discussions and I know that there is interest in, if not having some formal meetings at least even perhaps some bird of a feather type meetings and Marrakesh to talk about some of these issues.

So you guys explore that. That might be a component of your conversations in LA. There's preparation for some of those Marrakesh follow-up meetings. So that's very helpful Tony. Thanks for you and Rudi for taking that one on.

And for the moment I'll identify those are two possibly different sessions and then we can play around with that one for a bit but I look to you and Rudi for the possible GNSO future leadership. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Rafik you had your hand up. You're next in the queue sir.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks (Rob). I'm proceeding with regard to the topics I guess is going to be hard to get more of an input in the coming days but if we set a deadline I think that we'll urge people to maybe discuss more how it is different to take

on the (unintelligible) constituency. So probably maybe in the first week of January it would make sense. So regarding the two items, the GNSO issue and the possible GNSO future, when I listen to you and Tony I'm not sure how you are you envisioning this because for that GNSO if you will we have the working parties still discussing about the implementation and so on.

Also, we know that GNSO will discuss that so I guess we are trying to figure out how the process can go from there. For the GNSO future it's something for this kind of - I'm not sure here what you wanted to achieve. It can also, if I can be kind of direct here, I know it can be controversial if we're talking about the structuring again cause at the end, even when we discussed before with our counterparts in CHE, and some reference meeting I think GNSI.

And we talked about how the GNSO refuted into the kind of assessment of the direction of the GNSO. So if we're going to talk about GNSO future and we didn't do this kind of assessment of evaluation it's kind of - I'm not sure how we can achieve that. I know that's kind of (unintelligible) for us and this can be an area for this agreement so we need for us to clarify here.

So just talking about possible GNSO future and I may think that some group will kind of push for some position it's not going to help and we are not going to really make any progress in the two days. So probably maybe we need to clarify here what we want to achieve.

And if there is this group I guess if Tony, (Andrew) and (unintelligible) will agree I would be happy to join at this point and for myself to understand what you are trying to work out there. So I'm just here I'm expressing some reservation because I'm not pretty sure what we are aiming to do with this item for discussion.

Tony Holmes: Can I answer that Rob?

Robert Hoggarth: Please do Tony.

Tony Holmes: Okay. There's nothing to be afraid of here Rafik at all because what we're clearly not going to come out with from a two-day discussion is an answer or even a proposal. That's not going to happen and I'm well aware that there's a pretty diverse excuse on the subject across the whole place. The intention of this is to identify the issues that we all see a problem with the current structure.

The common issues that we share not the solutions. And to try and come up with some principles for moving forward that we can take into account as we each develop our own proposals around ideas as to how to improve things.

So if we don't get this discussion kicked off at a meeting like this I don't know when it's ever going to get kicked off because I think it needs to happen certainly as it impacts our house fundamentally.

It needs to happen at the house level. We never get the time to do this during a scheduled ICANN meeting and this is an ideal opportunity but it won't go beyond just identifying the problem where we all perceive that there are clearly issues that we have and trying to put them forward as principles that when we work a solution we should also prescribe to these basic principles.

That's where this was heading. So I hope that clarifies that for you.

Rafik Dammak: I mean okay if yes we are trying to say we identify here issues or I mean how people may perceive issues because there is also a lot about this section. I will

be happy to join this small group (unintelligible) to make it much more (clear) but at least you know I guess (unintelligible) to have here.

So if we can move forward (unintelligible) to - for myself maybe help me to understand a little bit more about what we can do here. I understand that we can just maybe leave some issues.

I know that we can do analysis in two days because again we would have really I guess just one or two sessions maybe to collar this. So (unintelligible) is just to kick off this discussion okay why not and really happy to join this.

Robert Hoggarth: Great thanks Rafik I'll let you three work out that, you know how you have your individual discussion about planning for the sessions. I'm delighted that we have engaged an interest in folks that support something together.

So one of the things we may do in - we'll probably just have one or two maybe three more calls from a planning perspective to prepare for the meeting is we'll get an update from you guys in terms of how that planning is going.

And please feel free as I get out the next version of this framework document to wordsmith any draft language that I put in just so we can tease that out a little bit. I'd be happy to play that role.

Rudi your hand is up so I'll give you the floor sir. Either on this topic or additional sessions that you'd like to chat about. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks you Robert, Rudi for the transcript. I fully agree with Tony and I'm sorry that I'm late I had some technical issues. It looks like I have to be (unintelligible) it's doing strange things each time I want to start it up from the browser.

With regards to the question of what does it mean, what are we going to try to (unintelligible) is based on the outcome of the GNSO review working parties group the last meetings we had we have been working on an Excel sheet where we have more details on the recommendation and they are flagged green, yellow or red.

Red means we don't recommend them or we don't want them for members. For the yellow there is quite a lot of discussions on how to tackle and how get it done.

And my thoughts were trying to have a look at all these yellow flags I can in that Excel sheet and then have a discussion among us as a working - the reviewing working party group became very small it was just four or five people sitting on the call and (unintelligible).

So we need more views from different people in how this can be handled in the future. That's what I wanted to add to the topic of reviewing or handling the review of the GNSO report.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Rudi this is Rob. That's very helpful on a couple of fronts. Tony did a great job before you joined helping us understand the separation between the GNSO review and flashing limitation matters which was item 2 on the proposed session.

The difference between that and the possible GNSO future which is item 5. And when I joked in the chat about volunteering you for things Tony posited that you and he with now the written edition potentially at your feet could work on that discussion and development of the possible GNSO future.

Your comments about the specific review and the implementation I think are also important. A number of you may recall granted it was about 6 years ago that the challenges that the community experienced (unintelligible) GNSO experienced was regard to implementing a slew of recommendations on process, on structure, on operations but with respect to the GNSO council and the GNSO as a whole.

That became literally a 3 year process that I think folks were very committed to but also at the end very tired of that. So if there is some work taking place among the GNSO review working group that you think can be leveraged or expanded where it can be used as a tool to encourage NCPH participation I think that would be a valuable area to look at.

It's not something that touches on a lot of the big policy issues but reflects and impacts I think very (operational) things going forward. That might be of value for you all to discuss it in at least one of the primary sets.

So wanted to make sure that if that is in fact your interest there perhaps you could share with this group just with this mailing list the Excel spreadsheet that you're talking about.

So that folks (unintelligible) and as we meet again to think about (unintelligible) what a session like that might look. Folks would have some good ideas about what if the working group view is red, what if the working group view is yellow or even green.

I think that might be very helpful so if you could share that that would be great and we might spark some volunteers to take on chairing that session.

Thank you for those comments.

And one of the things I will do in terms of teeing up the next version of this framework document is I will put sort of a little line next to each that say CSG co-chair, NCSG co-chair to give folks an opportunity to, you know, raise their hand or say hey I'd like to be responsible for chairing that part of the meeting.

As it worked out in DC back in January I think that worked nicely. We actually had some folks volunteer on the day of some of the discussion to lead some of the discussion.

For preparations for this meeting it might be nice to actually have folks already identified so there can be a little bit of prep for each session.

Are there any other comments on not just these two items that we've been talking about in terms of potential sessions but some of the other ones? I don't know Lori if you had any discussions with Greg since the last call about this.

Before we left the last planning call he made an impassioned pitch for, you know, the common issue identification. Essentially have (unintelligible) that, you know, provides a list of those issues where you all have some ability to come to common agreement between the two stakeholder groups.

I don't know if we're able to tease that out without Greg on the call but has he provided you with any extra insights on that topic?

Lori Schulman: Hi, hi, hi Rob.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg I'm actually on the call.

Lori Schulman: Is Greg on the call? Can you hear me?

Greg Shatan: I joined a few minutes ago audio only as I was making my way into my office.

Robert Hoggarth: Fantastic.

Greg Shatan: Unfortunately I guess the short answer is that no we've haven't. That did not kind of launch between last time and this time so I think we should launch maybe a couple of threads for, you know, one thread for identifying the common ground issues where we can kind of have developed, you know, unified front or the like.

And another thread for identifying hot buttons or third rail issues. The third rail in the New York subway is the one that carries all the electricity that drives the (unintelligible) so you don't want to touch it but we should touch them anyway.

But I think if we start a couple of threads, you know, after the call and people can kind of just add them in with fearlessness especially with regard to the latter one. I think that would be a good exercise. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Greg we'll do that. What I'll do is I'll just in addition to providing the update here between the end of this call and the next call I can set up just a couple of those saying hey here is a third rail thread, here is the common ground thread. Please contribute suggestions.

I, you know, I want to continue to emphasize and a number of you have experienced this before this is your meeting and so you're catching me throwing more and more things at you all to say please volunteer or suggest these topics.

I don't want to find myself in the position as staff having to suggest things other than being able to perhaps tweak or give you guys some things to react to because I really want you all to feel that you come out of this with some value.

I think we've been successful on that in the past and I have no doubt that that will be the case this time as well. Cheryl I think I saw your hand pop up in the chat at least as a request. Would you like me to turn the mike over to you? And I don't know if you're...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no that's okay I'm just having some technical difficulty.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, well it's nice to know sometimes that the buttons are even working. This has been a challenging technology call. So thanks. All right so we're going to start threads on the proposal or potential issues 3 which is common issues defined.

On 4, third rail issues. We've talked about item 2 and 5. I think we came up with a fairly comprehensive agreement and list on the first issue that I had identified in the framework document which was procedural house issues.

I would appreciate feedback from folks in terms of whether the goals make any sense. So please take a look at that and feel free to wordsmith or suggest and edit to those.

I noted that they could all be separate sessions. You all have a better idea regarding some of your past conversations as groups whether the process for the board seat election, the selection process for the GNSO council vice chairs are one hour discussions or two hour discussions or 15 minute discussions.

So as you look at those procedural in house issues we could devote a morning to procedural issues, we could sprinkle them throughout the course of the day. The only - of the two days.

The only thing I'm going to be looking at in terms of planning and giving you all feedback is that it would appear that members or, you know, attendees of the meeting and I mean ICANN senior staff and Markus and potentially any other board members who are getting back through Los Angeles who could participate likely will not be able to participate much at all on Thursday.

Simply because the board workshop in Singapore ends Wednesday I believe. But David Olive who desperately wants to be at the meeting with you all has been able to find an itinerary where he's back for just about all day Friday.

So the only thing I would do is that if there are particular items you think senior staff need to be part of the conversations or need to hear some messages from you is all, you know, encourage you to slide those to Friday.

Other than that we can just sprinkle for any type of selection in terms of what order you want to do some of these things in. One of the - I don't recommend that one of the first out of the box is procedural and house stuff but you may find that from a consensus building or cooperative building atmosphere those are the types of things that might work out best starting.

But that's something we can talk about when we've nailed down some of these things a little bit more. Does anyone want to touch to the potential discussion of ICANN accountability issue?

I ask that because that was one of the reasons, you know, I responded to Rafik earlier. One of the reasons a number of you cited for the value of the (unintelligible) meeting being in this time period or (February).

What do you all think would be some potential discussion issues or items that would need to be coming out of IANA accountability type things? Any suggestions or thoughts that anyone has?

I'm just waiting for folks to come off mute and then quickly reviewing the chat to see if anyone else had any other comments there. Well the only thing that had some to mind for me and I have no idea whether this is of any value to you all.

Is that I think Fadi has shared on at least one or two of the calls and he may as well in Dublin is that there are efforts underway now sort of as pre-preparation recognizing that it would be irresponsible not to plan for potential approval of the community plan that gets submitted.

Where (Aqua Metala) and members of his team are already sitting down and potentially planning for how certain aspects of the transition would be implemented.

I don't know if you guys see any value in getting an update on that type of activity. Being in Los Angeles we would have staff right there who would be able to do that.

Rudi your hand went up just as I started to say that so I doubt that you're commenting about that particular suggestion but I'll turn the mike over to your sir.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Robert. Rudi for the transcript. Well it's related here to the IANA transition and the accountability topic. As we normally in January there will be quite good view on where it is and where it goes.

And I think that there is need for maybe a bit more clarification on the direction that ICANN and eventually Fadi and Akram are - see where it is going to land at the end.

The transition itself can have a different format. I think it's important that we have a good view on it and that we have a good discussion on what we think would be a good transition model and plan and which one would not be a good one.

As we know that link to that there was quite a lot of financial and structural impact. So I would propose to have Fadi and maybe Akram being available to explain what they have in mind and could bring forward the plan.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you sir. I have Tony and Phil in the queue as well. Tony I believe you're first to either react, respond to Rudi or any other comments. You have the floor sir.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks Rob. I just wanted to say that I think there needs to be an item on the agenda for this. The problem is putting any data around it now. We don't know how this is going to go across the next few weeks.

But whichever way it goes and whatever happens there is definitely a need to have a slot, hopefully the transition by then would have been great and we will be looking forward to its implementation.

But there are a number of issues around this and a number of aspects that I'm sure we were picking up on. And if we've reached that stage and all is well we may want to start thinking about accountability track two as well and linking that in.

So whichever way this goes there is a need for a slot. I just think it's really difficult to hand this one down at this stage Rob when we have a later call probably a couple of weeks before we actually get together in LA.

I think it would be pretty apparent what we need by then but to do it now is pretty difficult.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Tony that's helpful. Phil, you have the floor sir.

Philip Corwin: Yes (unintelligible). I think we want to - I would suggest we want to - and this assumes of course that some plan has been accepted by early February and the implementation is going forward to review all of that.

But I think we ought to look at what if any new expanded role and new responsibilities does GNSO have since, you know, this is one half of the GNSO, the non-contracted side, is going to have in the post transition environment?

The GAC, you know, we've been trying to coordinate with the GAC better. The GAC has enhanced authority in the new environment. The GNSO becomes one of the chartering organizations which has to participate in any escalation process to enforce accountability and does that require the council to be more proactive because, you know, I mean council isn't all the GNSO but council is its operational stage.

And it tends to be rather technical, be rather considering, you know, motions, PDP's, working group all of that but really look at are we going to have to expand our responsibilities and our oversight and be more proactive in exercising accountability functions because we can no longer rely on - the

community can no longer rely on U.S. Government when there are concerns about directions ICANN is taking.

So it's not better form than that but I think we ought to think about the transition changing responsibilities and changing some operational matters and getting ready for that. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Phil. I'll try to capture some of that because you raised some interesting points that are not necessarily even dependent on certain benchmarks or timetables between now and February that are potentially worth discussing.

And it's interesting I hadn't even thought about the potential that maybe you create or the GNSO is another vehicle that's outside the council that's got the responsibility for those escalation issues and the rest or you change the responsibilities and the expectations of the council itself.

That's interesting yes once you start to dig deeper and deeper you can have a whole two days just on some of that and I'm sure ICANN or some of the various SO's and AC's may do that in some upcoming public meetings as well.

Thank you. Any other comments on IANA accountability issues? I will reflect your general consensus and agreement both in the chat and your comments guys that this is something that's going to have to probably wait a bit. But what I will do is I'll reach out to Teresa, Akram and Fadi to note that this is on your agenda and that we'll want to be prepared for some senior staff participation and discussion on the topic.

I'm not sure as many of you who have seen Fadi's holiday message or otherwise communicated with him in various ways you guys indicated that March 12 is his final day.

So I don't think he's too focused on what's going to happen after March 12 but I know Akram really is. And so feedback from his team I think will be very important on that topic.

There were a couple of other things that I had added here just more brainstorming. The only one that anyone actually flagged in our last discussion was the contractual compliance matters and Greg you noted that.

I don't know if you all have any appetite for discussion about community resources and budget items. We'll be farther along in the FY 17 ICANN budget and operational timetable in early February.

So that might be something. And (unintelligible) noted that the meeting takes place relatively close to Marrakesh so you may all want to have some discussions about upcoming matters that you expect to do in Marrakesh, do some strategizing.

There is also the whole (unintelligible) of meeting B that I think even the SO's and AC's are trying to work though. But I'm posited here in the draft that there may be a value in having an NCPH component within the meeting B structure.

I don't know if there is any appetite for that. And then just the overall issue about whether you want to potentially investigate a communique. I know a number of people liked that concept after the January DC meeting earlier this year.

But I think you'd have to begin to come together based on recommendations from a number of you on what that topic might be or what that area might be prior to heading to Los Angeles.

So I don't know if anyone has any comments on any of that or whether we just leave those open for some written input. I'll look for hands or invite anyone just to speak up if they'd like to chat about it.

Hearing nothing I'll leave that open too to further input from you all in writing during, you know, some quiet time that you experience over the next couple of weeks or so.

I did want to address one thing now that I'm in the AC room that I saw a brief exchange that Phil and Benedetta had from a travel perspective. The constituency travel team has advised me that they would in all circumstances or all possible circumstances like to collaborate with each of the supported travelers in terms of not only the hotel but air fare arrangements as well.

Similar to what we would do for an ICANN public meeting. That's just very important from a recordkeeping perspective, budget management perspective and the rest.

Joseph has told me that he's hoping to utilize one of the systems that we use for the January meeting. And some of you who were over in DC didn't have that pleasant experience in that there is an aspect of the program that they have been developing that lets people do some of their own booking directly.

So I'll let him explain that to individual travelers in that regard. That might help some folks from a scheduling perspective who like to do things on their own.

And I'm not completely familiar with how that system worked last January but we got some good feedback on that. So that's something that Joseph may share with you that you can utilize.

In terms of travel yes what we're looking at is being able to accommodate everybody's travel schedules and the rest. If there are issues about, you know, Red Eyes and things like that that's something that we can certainly work through with Joseph.

I know for example issues that folks have with some European flights meaning that most flights leave mid-day so that's just not possible. So we will be as flexible as we possibly can be with respect to all of your delegates in terms of travel arrangements.

Not only in terms of flight availability but flexibility in terms of the meetings that you've got to get to at the start of the week as well as getting out at a reasonable time in the evening or the next day.

So please don't worry about that and if you have any issues there I can't imagine Joseph not being cooperative but Benedetta and I are more than happy to work with you on this.

Before we close, Phil you've raised your hand. I'm more than happy to give you the floor here for a final (3 to 5) seconds.

Philip Corwin: Sure, yes thanks Rob. I won't be long here. Yes my experience with council meetings is that we're told by ICANN travel, you know, how much they'll - what the top end is of what they'll cover for airfare from a given region.

And I've never had a problem like booking your coach fare under that ceiling and getting a reimbursement. My concern was more than if we're going to be doing a full day on Friday and finishing at 5:00 the earliest you could think about getting LAX and getting out would be sometime in the evening, you know, with LA Friday traffic.

Which means basically if we're not being reimbursed for Friday night at the hotel we're being required to take a Red Eye. And that's not my favorite form of transport especially after...

Robert Hoggarth: Understood.

Philip Corwin: ...two and a half days of intensive meetings.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes so please where we have situations like that please for you or for other members of your delegation please let us know about those and we'll work with you on it.

Yes I've become way too familiar with the - in the winter months the 11:20 flight out of LAX back to DC. It's great getting in at 7:30 am. Well thank you all very much.

Again thanks very much for all the work in getting the delegations in. There has been very helpful input here on some of the programming matters. I will do my utmost to reflect those in a version 3.1 of this document.

I don't anticipate asking you all to get together again until probably late in the week of the 4th. So we can perhaps target the 6th or 7th maybe even the 8th for getting together again.

I think it's necessary just to make sure that we're putting this agenda and having you all think about it. I know there are so many other things going on right now but I'm already getting nervous about, you know, looking at the calendar and seeing February 3, 4 and 5 here.

So we'll shoot for that time period and if any of you have an opportunity to look at or think about some of this stuff over the holidays please do so. Otherwise thank you very much, have a wonderful holiday season and Happy New Year and we'll chat with you all the first week of January. Thank you.

Man: Thank you all bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you all for attending the meeting today. Martha you may now stop the recording. Thank you very much.

END