
MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks very much, Joan. Welcome, everyone, to the NPOC ExCom meeting on Tuesday, 9th of April 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Joan Kerr, Ore Lesi, Raoul Plommer, and from staff, we have Maryam Bakoshi. We have apologies from Juan Manuel Rojas.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and also please mute your microphones when you're not speaking. Thank you very much, and over to you, Joan.

JOAN KERRI: Great. Thank you, Maryam, and hi, everyone. Can you move the agenda just up a little bit please? This is the very top. I don't commit this stuff to memory. Okay, so like I said, David will be joining us. Hi, everyone. So we survived Kobe. [inaudible]. Here's David, I think.

So we've survived Kobe, I guess. Raoul is still there. We were just about to say, Raoul. Okay. Alright, so what Raoul and I kind of discussed is if there's time after this, we're going to do the charter, just review the charter as well just to get that work done. I did do some changes and suggestions after the Kobe meeting, so hopefully, it's going to be a little bit faster, and it's near the end. But in any case, let's just go to the agenda then.

Ore did send notes from the Kobe meeting, and I did read them. So we need to get them up on the website as soon as possible.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I believe they were sent to the [inaudible] list anyway, but for sure the EC saw them. So let's make sure at least the notes get on the website and some pictures. So we'll get that as an action for Caleb to do. is everybody hearing me okay? I would assume, because no one says anything.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: Okay, great. So that's an action for the Kobe notes to go up on the website. And Caleb did a good job on the Facebook, he put some pictures up and I thought that was fantastic.

UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: Who was that? I'm sorry. Alright. So Ore, that would be an action for us just to maybe review some of those notes and put them up, the highlights from the Kobe meeting, and since we're putting them up slowly, you and I can just maybe add a paragraph about what we're going to do in Marrakech just to sort of tie that in since it's a few weeks later. So that would make it more relevant than just to put it up.

I think that if we can, and if David is okay with it, also put some highlights from the EPDP presentation. I think it was excellent, and I

think maybe that's something that we should have a separate call for the members to have an update on the EPDP, especially for maybe policy or something to do, because it was excellent. It really gave a good overview of what's happening. This is something I'd like to suggest.

DAVID CAKE: Yeah, I'd be happy to do that.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah. And maybe some highlights to go into the notes for Kobe, maybe two or three sentences. This is what the PDP is, and just a high-level highlight sort of thing for us to put on the website by Friday maybe. Is that possible?

DAVID CAKE: I'm going to try. It's going to be very difficult though, I'm on the road this week, because then I'm on the road [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: Okay, so then maybe what we'll do is just mention that it was done and maybe ask the members if there's something that they would be interested in having a separate webinar about. That might be the way to go. Alright, so it includes highlights of Kobe. Okay. Alright.

Next, the website. There is a separate document that says that it needs to be done, but we don't have Caleb on. I hear an echo. I don't know why I'm hearing – oh, that's better.

So Caleb needs to – maybe he'll be coming on, I left him a message as well. And there was no apology, so I think it must be – he may be coming on. But the website does look good, by the way. Dev Teelucksingh actually looked at it and he really liked it so far. So I did ask someone to review it just because – and he really liked it, so that's a really good thing because he's very good at community engagement, and him and I have lots of conversations. And a website should really be friendly, I think anyway. And I think our website looks like that, larger pictures, which is fantastic.

So we'll leave that for Caleb, and let's go on to ICANN 65 preparation. Now, yesterday was the [inaudible] supposedly – I hate to use that word, supposedly – for submissions for travel, has anyone had any issues around travel? Just a travel issue for ICANN 65. I don't think we have any issues around visas. I'm not sure. I don't think we do.

No, everyone else seems to be okay. Alright. So I guess we don't have any EC meetings, or we do have EC meetings but not constituency day or anything like that. There are policy meetings that need to be done, and then we also have to attend the GNSO meetings. I guess that's what it's all about. So what I will do is look at what the schedule says and sort of identify some of the key meetings that we have to attend and allocate people to attend to them so that we start to do that and make notes so that we can put them on the website, because I think that's where we're going, is that we've got to be participants in this process now.

So I will do that. I will look at the schedule and send it out for us to attend, so that's my side. Now, Maryam, just clarify for me, we have to have a policy meeting at ICANN 65, or an EC [inaudible]?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No. It's not [marked.] You can decide, so I'm just wondering, what's why I put the list of meetings, is you can decide if you want to have a policy meeting or just get on with the flow of the policy forum with other policy issues that have been discussed in different meetings. [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: [inaudible].

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, it is your choice [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: Okay. So, how does everyone feel? Should we have an EC meeting in Marrakech? We should definitely have a policy meeting, so there's one suggestion, I think so too, I mean it's policy focused. So David, you haven't heard from Travel. You're not [on alternate] for Marrakech, you're allocated a seat because Juan is unable to make it.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, [inaudible]. EPDP.

JOAN KERRI: [inaudible]. Yes, talking about the EPDP.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible] Can you hear me?

JOAN KERRI: Okay. Thanks. Yes, I can.

DAVID CAKE: Maryam? [inaudible] the EPDP is I'll be – if there is any travel funding associated with it. And I will actually need to attend EPDP meetings depending on – probably we have one alternate – we only have two alternates at the moment, but we probably should both have travel. But currently, we have three full members but not funded. So it's unclear if we're able to get some funding for at least two of those three full members. And I won't necessarily need to attend, but [inaudible] EPDP meetings. Though obviously, I might get called in at any point.

The EPDP [inaudible] doing anything since Kobe at this point, by the way, they've just been sort of organizing and ramping up the phase two, which will be beginning very soon.

JOAN KERRI: Did they find a chair? Just out of curiosity.

DAVID CAKE: We haven't got one yet, so poor Rafik is stuck with it. He's not very happy about that, I assure you. He's very miserable.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, it seems like a lot of work. But you have to be pretty knowledgeable about the process anyway, so I think he [inaudible].

DAVID CAKE: Yeah, I've only heard of one definite person who's applied to be the chair, and that's an interesting choice given that it's [Chris LaHatte] who I think actually knows very little about the policy issues, but I guess would be hopefully a firm hand on behavior.

They required a few people not doing it. I had someone tell me I should have gone for it [inaudible] the chair, and having seen what it did to Kurt trying to run meetings from Australia, I was not very keen.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah. It was just out of curiosity that I asked. So I notice that Raoul – yes, Raoul, I suggested that to Maryam already, that you take the travel slot from NCSG and that David would be allocated the NPOC travel slot. So that's how we approach it, because that was the only way that we could submit. So there you go. Yes. Alright, so where are we?

ICANN [67.] So the question on the table is two suggestions. One is we should definitely have a policy meeting, and the second one is taking advantage to have an EC meeting. So I agree, those are – I'd like to have at least an hour for the EC meeting since so many of us are face-to-face.

I prefer face-to-face meetings personally, but how does everybody feel about that? So David, would you be able to organize a policy meeting for Marrakech?

DAVID CAKE: Yes, absolutely. I think we'll have a bit to do.

JOAN KERRI: Okay, so if you need any help, please let me know because as you know, the rooms are limited, so we're last on the list for rooms, I'm sure, because everyone else, the hot topics I think have first dibs. How does everyone feel about having [an EC] meeting? Sorry?

DAVID CAKE: I would assume that they would put us in that first weekend again where there's a bit less demand.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, and that's good. Raoul, just to answer your question regarding NCSG, I think it should be okay. Yeah, alright. Okay, so we're going to do a policy meeting. And how does everybody feel, is there a yes or no about an EC meeting? Anyone have any objections to an EC meeting? No. Somebody's typing, so going to peek the – yes, and EC.

Yes, it's always good just to meet, even if it's just – we may have to even review the charter. Hopefully not, but alright, any other preparations that we need to do? Yes, Raoul, I see that. What I wanted to suggest is a

meeting with ALAC to review our Montréal second joint sessions to make sure that we really zero in on what it is that we want, the outcome of that meeting to be that joint session.

I know that they've always had it so it's information and NCUC doesn't like that, "This is who we are," etc., but I think that we need to do more. We need to get not just giving information of who we are and what the difference is between ALAC and NPOC, which obviously we need to really crystallize, but I think at the end of the day, what Maureen and I talked about was how do we go forward and share resources, sort of ALAC developing their own educational resources and NPOC doing it, and of course, we're small. How do we get together, how do we work together without stepping on toes to develop resources jointly?

And I think we should have that conversation face-to-face with John Laprise and maybe Maureen. She's pretty busy. How do people feel about that? Like it would be a session that we actually go through what we want to accomplish in Montréal, and we'll do that in Marrakech.

I can work with Maureen to – yeah, is everybody okay with that? It would mean that we would have to meet with them to do this. Go ahead.

DAVID CAKE:

[inaudible] time between Marrakech and Montréal.

JOAN KERRI: Yes. But [inaudible] going to be very busy because we've got the [inaudible] meeting, the school of Internet governance and things like that, so ALAC and NARALO is pretty busy with that. so I just want to make sure that we actually have a really good go forward plan so that we can just plan it and not having to have the meetings in-between – too many meetings. So this whole joint session was not just to have a joint session, it was how do we help our members, how do we get them engaged, how do we get them to participate. So that's the question we have to ask: what are the three things that we need to define to help each other?

alright, any other things for preparation for ICANN 65 so far?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, I've got my hand up.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah. Go ahead, Maryam.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks, Joan. Just a quick one, going back to the EC meeting, I just want to – I think we've got to make it clear that we will not have recordings for the meeting like we did at Kobe. Just so we know that it's not going to be recorded.

JOAN KERRI: That's right. Yeah. We know that. We'll take good notes. We have a really good secretary. Alright, so if there are no other questions or issues around – okay, so please do submit your applications. Maryam, is your hand up again, or is that an old hand? Okay. Alright.

[inaudible] application.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible].

OREOLUWA LESI: Hi. Can you hear me?

JOAN KERRI: Yes, I can. Go ahead.

OREOLUWA LESI: Okay. In Kobe, we have spoken about doing a session in Marrakech. We spoke about that, but I think we haven't really discussed anything about that since then. We're thinking of doing something, I don't know, maybe on – we actually didn't really flesh out what we wanted to do, but we had just discussed maybe we wanted to do something. So I wanted to remind you about that.

JOAN KERRI: Right. Yes. Thanks for this. We were thinking about doing a joint session with AFRALO, right?

OREOLUWA LESI: Yes, something like that.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, something similar to what we did in – just to develop that relationship was what more what I was – because we work with LACRALO, we're going to be working with NARALO, that's [what they do, their regional thing,] and so I thought it would be really good to do something with AFRALO just so that – how does everybody feel about that? This is a different type of meeting, so it was just a suggestion just to sort of develop our relationship with the different RALOs as they call them, which is the regional representation. Do we want to do that? Because that would mean that we would have to plane the session with them and sort of along the same line of inviting people to come to the session. Or we could just have an informal meeting with AFRALO as well. So what do people think? Do you want to do a session with AFRALO?

OREOLUWA LESI: Well, I think since we haven't started the conversation with them, then maybe it's a bit late for Marrakech. Maybe we should just start having discussions with them, and maybe look at how we can share resources between our members, and then maybe think about doing something, I don't know, later on down the line.

JOAN KERRI:

Yeah, because our conversation is really with ALAC, which is the stakeholder group, like for example Maureen allocated who was going to work with us in Kobe, and she would do the same for Montréal because we did agree on two sessions and that it was best to do it in Kobe and Montréal rather than Marrakech. So alright, so let's just plan on Montréal then [and since I'm in] Montréal, a lot it will be on me to invite not-for-profits here. But yeah, I will do that then.

Alright, so I just wanted to put it out there. I don't want anybody to feel like they were [snubbed.] So we are trying to now start to collaborate. That's the mode that we're in.

Okay, thank you for reminding me though. Alright, CROP application. There was a notice sent. I think Maryam reminded me that I should send out another one just to remind people that there is a deadline, which is April 15th. So I will do that.

Do we have anyone that we want to particularly or anything to say about this? Have we received any applications? No, Raoul's answer is no, we just received some interest. Oh, we have received two. [inaudible].

OREOLUWA LESI:

Yes, so we've received one from Remmy and Olivier.

JOAN KERRI:

That's right. I saw that. I thought they just responded that they would, but I didn't see the – yeah. Alright. So I'll send out something again, or just use the same notice and just remind people. So yeah, Caleb and

Ore, you're going to be in Marrakech already. So I believe Caleb received a fellowship, if I recall correctly, or he's on the NPOC travel.

Okay, next, elections. Now, Juan's not here, but ICANN has sort of changed their rules around 90 days to 120 days, and NPOC has always had an issue of when an EC's term is completed, because we're in the process of developing everything, I'm going to suggest that we follow ICANN and NCUC with ending the term at the AGM. It just makes it clean, crystal clear, and it gives us time to have the 120 days satisfied for the election.

So in our old charter, it requires us to have over 60 days for the election period. So it's pretty hefty. We've changed that in the new one, but we still have to follow the old one. So the suggestion that I've made – and this is what I need feedback on – is that we don't hold our elections until after June, and then we would know who the new EC would be at the AGM, and then they would take over after the AGM, so it makes it very clear that's the meeting that the existing EC would be completed. Yeah, you can make it earlier, but NCUC does not have the length of time that we have for our elections. I think theirs is much – exactly. So ours is like 60 days between notification and it's pretty substantial. I don't know why they did that.

Right, that's exactly what we want to do, is to have the change at the AGM. How does everyone feel about that? Okay, so I will work with Juan for the notification and put for the next meeting and have the period so everybody will see what's happening. Are there any questions? So everyone should be thinking about – we can also send notification out if anyone's interested in being on the EC as well, so we

can start to get people informed. And we have to make sure that we send a notification for members to become active members as well, so I will work with Juan to do that. So yeah.

Notification can start anytime, so people can get active, and then nomination starts and all of that. It's quite a process. Anyway, I think that the notification has to go out so many days before nominations, so I have to look at those dates again. Yeah, 120 days [inaudible].

Any questions regarding the elections? No questions, no hands up, alright. Ore, did you want to run through some of the – anybody has any reports to do, first of all, of things that are – or if you want to go through it and say hasn't been done or things we should be focusing on, if you're still on. Go ahead, Raoul, first of all.

OREOLUWA LESI: Yes, I am.

JOAN KERRI: Wait one second. Let Raoul – he had his hand up and I didn't say that. Sorry. Go ahead, Raoul.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Alright. Can you hear me?

JOAN KERRI: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. So I think we had our elections at the right spot, and NCUC/NCSG have to make theirs early now. so both had it in September, but they're going to have the results by the beginning of July now, and I think ours were really already doing that, so we should really just start the election process as soon as possible to have the results 120 days before the AGM. So I think the last time we started in April, and it needs 60 days before the election starts, right?

JOAN KERRI: That's right.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So yeah, so that takes us already to today to 9th of June, and then it's 30 days [for themselves,] and a few days for the results. So we are already looking at mid-July if we do it tomorrow.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, but the thing is, Raoul, we don't have to know the result 120 days before. We just have to know it by the AGM. So what I was suggesting is that the election would, say, end, let's just say in terms of October because the AGM is at the end of October, early November. That's Montréal. As long as we have the results then, so it's moving back October, September, August and July, so the notification should go in July.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. Maryam just posted that the new EC will not have travel funding until after the AM.

JOAN KERRI: That's correct.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, sorry Raoul, and sorry Joan, can I speak?

JOAN KERRI: Go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I just wanted to clarify this a bit. So if the elections hold after July 15th, which is the deadline for Montréal, which is 120 days deadline, then the new EC will not have travel funding, only the old EC. But if the election is held before then, there has to be that discussion, would it be the new EC going to Montréal, or would it be the old EC? And when does the handover take place? So that's a discussion the EC needs to have. Does that make sense?

JOAN KERRI: Right. It does. That's exactly what I was trying to address, is that – I'm suggesting that the current EC goes to Montréal because [inaudible] there, so we have to backtrack from – so then a new EC would take over after Montréal. So then we have to backtrack the dates 120 days, because after, it doesn't really matter about the 120 days because they

would have lots of time after Montréal for the next trip, which would satisfy the 120 days.

So all we have to do is make the decision for the EC so that we know who won by the time we get to Montréal and we can do the changeover after Montréal. That's what I'm suggesting. Does that make sense?

RAOUL PLOMMER:

The reason why the NCUC and NCSG are making their elections early are so that they can actually send the new EC to AGM, and sort of that is where the [baton] is given to the next ones, because it would be the new EC starting there.

JOAN KERRI:

But I'm suggesting we don't do that. I'm suggesting the current EC goes to Montréal.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Well, we would be, again, off sync with the NCUC and NCSG then. And I think it has been sort of the habit that the new EC does go to the AGM. I think – that would sort of make it the financial year would really be the line for the new EC to make the trips, I guess.

I don't feel too strongly about this, but I think it would be good if we were in sync with the NCUC and NCSG.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah. Well, I think that if I could suggest that in the future that happens, I think right now to do that, it is going to be – because we've already committed the new EC, which you can't really do, old and new councilors get funding? They do?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible]. So for the GNSO, the incoming councilors get travel funding as well as the old councilors that their terms are going to be ending after the AGM or at the AGM. So [inaudible]. For the constituencies, it's different. No extra travel funding, it's just for whatever EC is in the seat at that time.

JOAN KERRI: Right. Okay, so how does everybody feel?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, maybe you would want to have this conversation with Bruna and just sort of find out what exactly they're doing, because this will be a first for them as well.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah. I'm just thinking that in terms of what we're doing in Montréal, we've already committed to doing certain things, and it's very difficult to commit a new EC to – when you've made a decision that you're going to do it, to tell them that they're going to do it.

How does everybody feel? I guess I can't make that decision. Okay, Raoul, your hand is still up. No. Okay, so here's a decision then. So there's no funding for both, just the incoming council meeting has no substantial [inaudible].

So the question is – here are the choices, do we have the election and the current EC goes to Montréal and then it's passed over at the AGM? So I don't know how the new ones would not be in Montréal. Or do we have the elections later? And that's a choice. Do we have it [sooner or] later, I guess? And start the election process tomorrow. Yeah.

Okay, so here's a question. Ore, I hope you can hear me. Do we start the process in April which we ended up knowing who the new – I have to look at NCUC because I don't think they have the 60 days like we do. We do not know who the new – April, May, June, until the end of June, and so June, July, August, September, yeah, that's 190 – October, it's really close, but ...

Let me follow up on this with Bruna and Stephanie, because I really think that it's a lot more complicated. And then we can respond. But right now, everyone feels that we should start in April, is that sort of the feeling, the way that we normally do? Yes? We're favoring that as opposed to a later one? Anyone? Okay, so we're leaning towards April. Okay, so we won't be able to – okay, alright, well, if no one has any objections, I will speak with Bruna and Steph, and see how they're doing, and then I'll just send an e-mail. And we still have time to then start in April.

Yeah, when does the new – the new EC would take over after Montréal. That's after the AGM. That's a long time to wait. Traditionally, it would – yeah. Okay, so I guess that's resolved. We'll do it, and then they take over. Yeah, [it's after Montréal] that they would – yeah, okay.

So the new EC would take over after Montréal, so the current EC would go to Montréal and the new one will take over. So that's what it would be. Right? Is everybody in agreement for that? Then I don't have to talk to Bruna if that's what we're going to do.

Alright, so I will work with Juan then, so the new decision then is I'll work with Juan to start the election process, and so we don't really have to satisfy the 120 days because it's after that that the new EC would take over. Okay. That's right, that's what I understand as well, Maryam, that the NCUC and the NCSG will take over afterward. Makes sense.

Okay, so the new decision is I don't have to speak with Bruna and Stephanie. We'll go ahead and that's the process. We will start at the election April, and the new EC will take over after Montréal. Is everybody okay with that? So we would be following the same process as NCUC, and that makes it easy because then they're new, NPOC is new, everybody is in sync.

Alright. So the action is that Joan will work with Juan to get the election process going, and we could discuss at that point who goes to Montréal as well. Alright. Okay. Everybody okay with that? Yes? No? No objections? Okay, Raoul, go ahead. Raoul, you have your hand up. We can't hear you if you're speaking.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. Can you hear me?

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, now we can.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. Right, so I think the only danger there is that we could end up in a weird limbo where the people are already elected –

JOAN KERRI: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, that's the thing, so I think –

JOAN KERRI: That's why I was suggesting we have it later, because I know if I was elected, I'd be like, "I should be doing something."

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. But I'm just –

JOAN KERRI: That's how I started the conversation, because then that's almost like the next face-to-face is in March, so you've got November, December, January, February. That's a long time. And then they're not even going

to – I think that if somebody is elected, they should be the one that's at the meeting in Montréal if they're elected in July or August. Right?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, absolutely. And that's why it's good to have the election so that we can give the constituency slots to the people who are elected, and then we will already have motivated people going to the meeting.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So that's why I think it is good to know the result before giving out the constituency [slots] in July.

JOAN KERRI: Right. So [inaudible] and then the new EC, then we'll have to make the choices of – I would say the focus would be the new EC, right?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah.

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, I think that's a fair thing to do.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Yeah. I'm totally in agreement with that.

JOAN KERRI:

And the official handover is after the AGM, but they could still be there and say for example [as] the new chair, I could still do it remotely or something like that. Business goes on, right?

Alright. Yeah, agree, Ore. Alright, so the official handover means that any – you make the decision that this is our last meeting, and this is their first meeting. What did we do last year? Well, it was almost the same people, so it didn't really make that much of a difference to be honest. But we have to make everything clear now, because new people are going to be coming onboard. So it has to be very clear.

So I will just talk with Bruna anyway and see if they're going to make their new EC goal, and that would be the decision. Okay, let's just move on. I'll follow up with it and let you guys know, but I get a sense that we're going to go ahead and then we can make the decision after. So Raoul, you have your hand up. Is there another question? [inaudible] if you can, can you tell us any actions that haven't been done and that we need to focus on from past meetings?

OREOLUWA LESI:

Okay. Yeah, I have a long list. Let's see. Yes, we can. Okay, alright. So this is actions that came out of our meeting in March. Well, all the meetings we had in March. Someone needs to mute their mic.

JOAN KERRI:

Yeah. Probably me. I will do that.

OREOLUWA LESI:

And Caleb, can you also mute your mic? Okay, so from our constituency day, we have a suggestion that we should put in a comment for the EPDP phase one report since the public comments are open at the moment. So I know we've had a discussion about that on the mailing list. So yeah, so there's that. And I'm not sure how we decided to proceed with that, but I think Benjamin and maybe Franco offered to write comments and then everyone else would comment. But I'm not sure if that's the process we're going to follow.

Then following up from our joint session with NPOC and ALAC, I think we already spoke about earlier, we wanted to identify some people who we could interview about PDPs, and let's see, we also wanted to – well, we discussed maybe developing a list of case studies of NPOC members and DNS issues that they're having just as a way to better explain what we do at NPOC and [inaudible] add to our members.

These are not really assigned to anybody, so they're just kind of out there, and we haven't really discussed them further, but they're suggestions that were made so I've put them down.

Then membership, Juan is going to schedule a membership call, so he's not here anyway to follow up on that, so that will be coming up sometime soon, I assume. Then our finance, NPOC bank account issue. I think the last discussion that we had was that Raoul would check with ICANN Legal to see whether our idea of incorporating NPOC as a nonprofit is in order and then depending on the feedback we get, we

would propose this idea to NPOC Discuss, to the mailing list, and we would basically take it from there.

Then policy committee, I think David's going to schedule a meeting. I don't know when, but we're meant to have, I guess, a meeting in April. We discussed that, but there's been no dates set for that. So yeah. So Dave, I guess we'll get some feedback from you on that.

And then website issues as well. Okay, Dave.

DAVID CAKE: Yes, we need to get that. I will do that.

OREOLUWA LESI: Okay. Alright. Thank you, Dave. And then – okay, our NPOC website, so Caleb, you weren't on the call at the time, but there are some things that we want to put on the website, so I'll include those in the notes, but basically, we wanted to have some notes from Kobe, Dave is going to do a summary of his EPDP presentation and some highlights to include on the website, so those will be my notes after the meeting.

I think those are the major things. If I left anything out, please let me know.

JOAN KERRI: No, yeah, those coincide with my actions as well. One big thing that has to go on the website if we're going to do the election is that there has to be an announcement [inaudible] as well. [It's one thing] to go on the

Discuss list, it must be on the website for sure. So I think Caleb, it has to satisfy the number of days that it's on the website. That's part of the requirement. So when it's sent, it's got to be uploaded. It's imperative. So that's the other thing that has to be done for the website.

Alright, any questions regarding –

CALEB OGUNDELE: [inaudible]

JOAN KERRI: Yeah.

CALEB OGUNDELE: [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, I'll work with Juan and send you the announcement, let him or me send you the announcement so that you can put it on the website. Okay?

Okay, any other questions? David, have you scheduled a meeting for April for the PC? Number one, and number two is the comments that Benjamin and Franco, will you oversee that? How would you like to handle that?

DAVID CAKE:

Yeah, I will. The comment I was going to help with as soon as I get a minute, hopefully tomorrow, and just get them started with a sort of draft framework and get discussions started on the mailing list and so on, maybe [inaudible] some small meetings for it. But mostly talk with them to see what they would like [us to help] with. But yeah, so I've just been crazily busy.

As far as the meeting, I just need to compare it to my crazy schedule, but that should be fine. That's something I'll do tomorrow and get back to Maryam.

JOAN KERRI:

Okay. Great. So for this month, it'll be really good to have a policy meeting and a membership call as well, so – okay, great. Any other questions? Any other actions regarding actions? I'm not sure if anybody is using Trello. I don't think anyone is, so we've decided just to sort of do this action thing, which it ends up getting things done anyway. But we'll keep a running tab on it as well.

Any other business that somebody needs to bring up? No issues? Okay. Alright. So we can call this part – if there are no other questions or objections – of the meeting. It is 10:00. Does anybody have time to do a bit of time on the charter? I'm available, and I think Raoul as well. Does anyone else have some time? And Maryam, do we have time to do it in terms of AC?

MARYAM BAKOSHI:

Sure.

JOAN KERRI: Okay. Is everyone available to do the charter then? Is that what I'm understanding? Oh, well that's great, so let's call this part of the meeting to an end then, and ... Okay, so Raoul can work on it now, so let's do that.

Do you want to do your screen share, Raoul? Do you want me to do it? Nothing like doing it now. Sorry, Maryam, if you want to [guide him through it,] because I've usually done it by Skype.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible] I'll just make you a presenter, and you should be able to see that option. If you go to the top right. Okay, great. So you should be able to see "share screen."

RAOUL PLOMMER: Can you hear me?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, please go ahead, Raoul.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. Basically, we went through all Joan's comments in the document in Kobe. Well, not all of them. We're still missing the last – actually, there's only [1A4] left, which has three sections, the dues, transparency, and amendments to charter. So that's very straightforward. I think it

was Joan's comments were really just changing Executive Committee to EC and some others. So there's not really any big issues there.

And the issues I saw in the document earlier that we already went through in Kobe, so there was like four issues that are highlighted. The first one was in 3.1, it was what the exceptional circumstances are for normal registered organization to join.

Second one was 3.5.2, that's the subject matter experts and that we should integrate them into the EC duties. There was 4.1, and I guess that's really the biggest change we were talking about doing, and that would really be reducing the size of the EC by two. So we would be taking out the vice chair and the communications coordinator. Now, obviously, that's not going to affect the next EC, but the one after.

And the final issue was about nominating the treasurer. I'm not sure. There was some talk that the treasurer who was also put into the Finance Committee of the NCSG, that they would have to be independent of the EC. I'm not sure of that. Could be possible, but I think that's something we need to check.

JOAN KERRI:

Yeah, No. Hi, Raoul.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Go ahead.

JOAN KERRI:

The person that we nominate for representation on NCSG doesn't really represent NPOC, so we [inaudible]. They're representing the NCSG Finance Committee. It's kind of weird. So our treasurer that represents us would either be someone else or if it's the same person, they cannot be representing NPOC.

Weird, you would think that that would be the opposite, but that's basically what it is.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Okay, so I think out of the points I raised or we raised in the document, I think the most crucial one is that 4.1 should be taking out the vice chair and the communications coordinator roles. How do people feel about those? Because that's, I think, the biggest choice here.

We discussed this with Joan, and I think part of the rationale behind it was that we'd actually have the same number of EC people as we'd have travel slots, and then we'd still have the CROP slot for any other member of NPOC who's been active. And I think at least for now, we are a small-ish constituency, so maybe six members in the EC is a little overboard. Go ahead, Ore.

OREOLUWA LESI:

Okay. Yeah. So I'm thinking about all the duties, the current responsibilities of the vice chair and the communications chair. I guess we distributed to the other EC members [inaudible].

RAOUL PLOMMER: So I just want to clarify that. It wouldn't be automatic that all EC members would get a travel slot. Obviously, they have to be active as well. But I guess that would be the norm. But if we had an inactive EC member, of course, and we'd rather give it to an active who is not in the EC ... please continue.

OREOLUWA LESI: Okay. Yeah, that's fine. I was just talking about the responsibility. So for instance, all the things that the vice chair is responsible for doing now would, I guess if we're thinking of removing the vice chair, then whose responsibility would be [inaudible] some to the other members of the EC, and then same thing with the communications chair responsibilities.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Joan?

JOAN KERRI: Thanks. So what we did was we went through the responsibilities of the vice chair, which is really to support the chair, and in the case of the chair not being able to chair the meeting, that the vice chair would do that. So then there would be sort of an understanding of someone who would be like the secretary or something like that to chair the meeting. Because there were all the duties, so there was a lot of overlap, and a lot of confusion. It creates a lot of confusion when there's overlap in duties. So if there was a duplication, and for example the communications chair and the memberships chair had a lot of overlap, so other than the website, it is a duty of the membership chair to

actually communicate with the members, but so is the communications chair.

So what we did was basically go through all the duties and say, [going forward,] if this is an operational issue, it's better to have those duties define and crystalized to a specific person rather than have it, "Oh, this person does it or this person does it" because it creates confusion. So that's why those were suggested to be eliminated. It were just because of the double duties.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Yeah, we also decided to instead of having a communications coordinator and a membership coordinator, we decided to have outreach and engagement coordinator. So then it really becomes clear that that person is communicating to our members and the general public.

And I think to the question that the vice chair, I think we'd have a rather small EC, and I think we could have – for example if the new chair wasn't able to attend the meeting or something like that, he could always ask the whole EC of who is willing to do that, and if it was some kind of a perk, like some of these SO/AC dinners or something like that, we could try to make that rotate so that every EC could cover the chair in case they couldn't make it.

Basically, the new EC would consist of the chair and three other EC members. What do you think, Dave?

DAVID CAKE:

[Good question.]

RAOUL PLOMMER:

I think I heard you say good question, but nothing [after that.] Go ahead, Joan.

JOAN KERRI:

Great, thank you. So while we're waiting, the whole idea, Ore said it's about Redundancy, but it's also the larger impact – if we're going to go out there and say, "Okay, this is the new NPOC" and we're branding it and showing we streamlined it and really it's a [leaner] organization, it's an example to not for profit on how they can also look at efficiencies within their own ECs and organizations, because a lot of not-for-profits, as everybody knows, are overworked. And part of why they're overworked is all of these meetings and these responsibilities, and if they look at streamlining it so they can do their mission, that we stand as an example, not just about informing them of issues surrounding the DNS but also how to look at efficiencies within their own operational entities as well. So I think it's a much larger picture, I guess, is what I'm saying.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Okay. Yeah, Dave had a very good comment that if we don't have a vice chair, we need very clear rules of who takes over from chair if not available. And yeah, that's true. But I think we could just word it that the chair [delegates] responsibilities to the EC as a whole. And for

example if the chair suddenly quits, well, do you have suggestions for that? Or if something happens to the chair.

DAVID CAKE:

[Can you hear me yet?] So [I've actually] become chair of [NCUC] under this circumstance where the suddenly, quit, and that was just simply that it had to be one of the EC had to take over the remainder of the term. Three people un-volunteered and there I was.

But the procedure doesn't need to be complicated. It just needs to be very clear what it is. So if a chair is absent for any reason, it can just be that the rest of the EC must have a meeting and select one of them as chair until the next election, for example. So basically the NCUC procedure.

But as long as there's something, it's got to be very definite, like this is the procedure – it's better if the procedure – normally, vice chair is also the chair if they just don't turn up for a meeting for some reason, they're ill or whatever. But yeah, you absolutely need – the meeting can sort of deal with a chair being absent. You absolutely need a procedure for what to do if they resign or get very sick or any other issue, and it just needs to be unambiguous. So it could be the rest of the EC selects a new chair, but it's got to be something that's clear. Essentially, you just need some direction to lead you out of crisis.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Okay, so I think we are in agreement. There's four people who agree that we could make the EC a little leaner. I guess we could go through

the other two points in the list, so what the exceptional circumstances are for a nonregistered organization to join.

[inaudible] I have in mind at least that it could be an organization like an LGBT organization in a country where being gay is worth a death penalty for example. So we just need to word that somehow. I can't really think of – like basically, if the laws of the country are against human rights, I think to be a good reason to allow a nonregistered organization.

DAVID CAKE:

My feeling is that rather than trying to enumerate all possible circumstances, or even a select set of circumstances, we should just have a procedure whereby the EC can make that decision. And it is a tricky one, because we can't overrule NCSG. We can't [perform] membership. We'd have to work out some process whereby if they're not really eligible to be a member of NCSG, we might just have to – we have to give them some representation without trying to overrule the NCSG rules.

I can think of lots of situations where, as you said, sometimes where an organization can't really be a legal entity. Occasionally, there's times an organization chooses not to be for some odd reason. But they do happen, and they don't always need to be very significant, like [inaudible] because the organization is controversial. But what can we do if it doesn't fit within NCSG, really?

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Go ahead, Joan.

JOAN KERRI: So I'm always thinking of how can we help people, but here's the issue. NCUC represents civil society, and we represent not-for-profit operations. To be operational, you have to be an entity.

Now, when I first came on to NPOC, one of the issues that was –

DAVID CAKE: [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: Sorry? Can you guys hear me okay?

DAVID CAKE: [There are odd circumstances where –]

JOAN KERRI: Was he still speaking? I'm so sorry, I thought he was done.

DAVID CAKE: All I can say is there are some circumstances where it's possible to be an organization that isn't a legal entity, but that has operational –

JOAN KERRI: Right.

DAVID CAKE: And one of the examples is there are unincorporated organizations with no legal existence but that create legal entities on a per event basis. [That is one odd] [inaudible] for example.

JOAN KERRI: Right. But what I was going to say, we did all discuss and agree to having that statement in the charter, so I'm not backing out from it. But I'm just saying, first of all I think we have to identify – I think that's what you're asking – what would be the exceptional circumstance. I think that's the issue that we have to identify. But I just want to bring up when I first came on, Maryam and I actually had to redo the database, and we had [inaudible] the membership was really high, but many of those organizations were projects that were under an entity such as a church, like there were many [– we're supposed to say places of faith,] but they were under churches, and they were actually projects.

So yes, there was an incorporated entity that oversaw them, but they weren't an entity. So they didn't even exist by the time we were doing the database. So I guess my question would be we have to clearly define what those exceptional circumstances would be and not step on toes of civil society, because we do not represent civil society in any way. That's NCUC. That's the distinction between NCUC and NPOC.

So I think we have one member that actually fits under that situation, which is the [group from Kazakhstan.] They are a government entity that's a not-for-profit, and they felt – NCSG almost a year to be part of NPOC, because there was no other way for a not-for-profit to exist in that country.

So that's an example where even though not-for-profit is not really government, it was under government. But they proved that they were a separate entity, I guess. So I don't know. I guess this is a time where we're not going to look at broadly at what we're supposed to do but actually specifics of what NPOC represents. I think that's what it comes down to.

And if we're going to go forward and focus on operational, I think we have to [inaudible] absolutely that it's about an organization that is a legal entity and own a website, because that's the only way it's operational for NPOC. And I've gone through these documents, and reading it, that's what we're about, very clear. So I think maybe we should consider either that we'd say [these are the consensus] or removing that.

DAVID CAKE:

My feeling is that we say it's exceptional circumstances. There just needs to be an explicit vote of the EC that explains [where it's operational.] I don't think we can enumerate all the possible circumstances.

I kind of think sometimes in these exercises, there's an attempt to kind of – the future EC will have facts, we do not, and we can't anticipate all of them. Sometimes it's better to just leave it until a future EC that has facts we do not.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So does everyone agree we should call it today and call it a day? And maybe agree to meet again next week at the same time or the week after.

JOAN KERRI: So Maryam is away, so it may be the week after. I think Maryam's away next week. So all of the meetings have to be either via Skype or a schedule the following week, including [EC] membership.

Okay, so we'll have a Doodle sent out, and that's it then. Alright, and if anyone –

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks so much, everyone –

JOAN KERRI: Go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan? Close?

JOAN KERRI: Yeah, go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible].

JOAN KERRI: So I think we're done. Raoul is saying to wrap up, so I think we're done for now.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, everyone, for attending the call. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]