
BRENDA BREWER: I would just like to put a header on the recording, please. Thank you. You are on the NPOC Charter call taking place on the 17th of September, 2020, at 14:00 UTC. As a reminder, the meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the transcript and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is recorded via Zoom. Joan, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thank you so much.

JOAN KERR: Okay, great. Thank you, Brenda. Thank you, Maryam. All right, guys. We'll follow the same format we followed last time. Who will do the changes, Ioana or Raoul?

IOANA STUPARIU: I am happy to do the changes, it's okay. I have [inaudible].

JOAN KERR: Okay. All right. Okay. Great. So, we're going to start on 4.4. Is that the—

RAOUL PLOMMER: Either.

JOAN KERR: Where we left it? Sorry?

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.

RAOUL PLOMMER: It can be either of us. I don't mind.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Yeah. So, Ioana said that she will do it, so okay. 4.4 is where we ended last time. So, the question that we were discussing was the calendar days. So, in the comments, Erika was asking to clarify that, I guess. So, how does everybody feel? I thought we did answer that. So, the point is that it's changed. Is that what it is?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, that's correct.

JOAN KERR: Right.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So, that was gone.

JOAN KERR: Right. That's what I was going to say. Geez, I must be going crazy because I thought we did that. Okay. All right. Let's go down, then. All right. Everybody was good with the changes that we made. At least, there were no follow-up questions. Okay. Brenda, yep, thanks.

If you could bring it down, please, to the next highlighted ...? Okay. 4.4.3. Okay. Yes. 4.7.4. "Whatever EC votes are required by this Charter but

inaction by other members of the ... The chair is empowered to act in the further interests of ...”

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think we skipped 4.6. There is Carlos’s comment. I think we need to reply to that.

JOAN KERR: Right. That’s why I said it was highlighted. Okay. Thanks, Raoul. Okay. “The duties of the EC members are set forth below.” Okay. So, what was his question?

IOANA STUPARIU: He enquired whether this still is necessary. I also think it’s a bit redundant.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: I mean, of course they are set below or in the charter. Sorry for the noise, if you hear it.

JOAN KERR: No worries. No worries. We are—at least, I am—used to it with all the calls I do in a day. Yeah. So, how does everyone feel? I think that it’s ...

IOANA STUPARIU: I think we can take it out altogether.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: I don't think [inaudible].

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: All right. Let's take it off.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Yeah. I agree. And if no one puts their hand up or disagrees, for the record, I'm assuming that they are agreeing as well. Okay, great. Next. Thanks.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I'm sorry. Going back to ... There is a comment Carlos made. If you just go back up a bit? Thank you. Where is that, now? Oh, is that gone, now? Okay. Maybe that's gone because you have deleted 4.6. Yeah. Okay. Cool. Thank you.

JOAN KERR: That's what we were trying to address, was the comment. Okay. I recommend merging these two points into a new EC voting section. So, "Whenever EC votes are required by this charter, but inaction by other members of the EC prevents tasks and duties required by the charter to be executed, the chair is empowered to act to further the interest of NPOC." So, which two does he want to merge?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So, that's the four, and then five, where it says, "A chair should act as a tie-breaker with an extra tie-breaking vote." So, he's—

JOAN KERR: Yeah. [Justin] is saying to merge them together.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, yeah. So, he's proposing to create a new section called "EC votes," or "EC voting," where that can sit on there.

JOAN KERR: And merge them together.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, you can, but it ... Yeah.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, that will become a sub-topic and that's the ... Yeah. Okay.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah.

JOAN KERR: Got it.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [If you can move the] [inaudible], yes.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. How does everyone feel?

IOANA STUPARIU: Sorry, where is the comment? I can't find it.

JOAN KERR: Okay. 4.7.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. If you click on that?

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah, I get a [record of] what's going on here, and then your comment.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Okay. So, scroll up a bit. Yeah. Oh, again. The comment has disappeared.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. It's 4.7.4 is the ...

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah, I'm there, but I don't see the ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, there was a comment there a few minutes ago but there is no—

JOAN KERR: Yeah, it said “merge the two,” and we didn't do anything.

IOANA STUPARIU: 4.4 and five?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So, the comment was actually to create a new section called “EC vote” and to merge four and five so it becomes a continuous sentence.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay. So, basically, four and five, you make it separate, like you have 4.7, 4.8, 4.9?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Yeah. That's what he's suggesting.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay. 4.8, now eight.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: "EC vote," yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: How do a make a 4.8? "EC vote," and then one, and then two. Something like this?

JOAN KERR: No, he's saying just one sentence, so number two is part of the ... Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: Ah, okay. Have just one sentence. Okay.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. He says a continuation of the direction. So, that's the suggestion. Is everybody okay with that?

IOANA STUPARIU: I don't mind it. It's just ...

JOAN KERR: Yeah, it's for clarification, right?

IOANA STUPARIU: Everyone happy with it?

JOAN KERR: Yeah, it's fine. I like when things are clear. Okay. Any comments?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I thought it was all right].

JOAN KERR: Okay. All right. Thanks, Maryam, for—

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Just a quick one. I'm so sorry. I can't raise my hand. So, I think he was also suggesting that you take away, "In the event of a tied vote on the EC." The sentence continues with, "The chair shall act as a tie-breaker with an extra tie-breaking vote."

JOAN KERR: Oh, as a continuation. Oh, okay. I see. Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Okay.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. Closing.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, just that sentence, "In the event of a tied vote," right, on the EC? And the continuation of the sentence would be, "To further act in the interest of NPOC, the chair shall," right? That's what he's saying? Yeah. That makes more sense.

IOANA STUPARIU: "Further act in the interest ..."

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, that sentence—

JOAN KERR: No, no. It's done.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: It's done already.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, Ioana?

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah.

JOAN KERR: The first sentence ends with “further the interests of NPOC.” So, take out “in the event of a tied vote on the EC.”

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay.

JOAN KERR: That goes. Yeah. And then—

RAOUL PLOMMER: But sorry, there might be other cases of tied vote than just when it’s non-participation. I mean ...

JOAN KERR: All this is saying, Raoul ... The chair just facilitates votes, right? Unless there is a ... On the EC. This is specifically for the EC. The chair just usually acts as facilitating the discussion. But say two and two have voted; the chair can then act as a tie-breaker. That’s all it’s saying.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, but I think these should actually be separate points, there. I mean, there are different things, really.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. I see what Raoul is saying.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: The first one is talking about inaction by other members.

JOAN KERR: Right. Right.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. Well, then it means that sentence is not really complete. The second sentence, then, should be ... There should be a bit of clarification with that, or an addition to the second point.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think it could be 4.8.1. I mean, we've done that numbering earlier, haven't we?

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Are we going to change all of those?

IOANA STUPARIU: Like this, and it's similar to what we've done at 4.7.

JOAN KERR: Right. Right.

IOANA STUPARIU: [inaudible], so it should not be a problem. That's why I put it at the beginning like this. You have what you wanted.

JOAN KERR: No, no. You're right. Yeah, that's a good catch, Raoul. Yeah. I think that actually clarifies it a lot more, the way it is right now.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, can I suggest if ... Can you swap one and two?

IOANA STUPARIU: Yes, of course.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. I think that would be [inaudible]. Yeah.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Okay. So, "In the event of a ..." Oh, okay. So, it's saying what the chair does, and then the reason for it. Okay. Is everyone okay with this, or any other suggestions?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Let's carry on.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Okay. Ioana already changed the numbering for 4.9. That's one, two, three ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: So, the next bit is still at the end of that part, a little above, here, where my cursor is, here. "The chair shall act as a tie-breaker." That has Erika's comment: "I've not seen anything like this from a governance perspective before. I suppose that as long as the rule is transparent, then maybe they are okay."

IOANA STUPARIU: I mean, she hasn't seen it. I've seen it in many organizations.

JOAN KERR: So have I. Me too! Me too!

RAOUL PLOMMER: That's normal.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, I agree.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, just a quick question. So, in the previous ... I think it was four, when you talk about a majority vote, how does that relate to this?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think we went through that last time. It was ...

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, the three ... Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Let's not do that again. It's obvious what the majority, or simple majority, means. It's universal.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. We talked about that. But to answer your question, Maryam, this is just to point out a procedure that the chair can act in the interest, because that's what the chair is responsible for, the interest of NPOC. So, I think that's what ... And I think every ... I don't know. I agree with it.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, absolutely. I agree. I was just trying to look at the relationship between having a simple majority for a vote to pass, and then the chair acting as a tie-breaker.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. But I think what it's saying, Maryam, is that in normal circumstances 4.8 is not going to be utilized. It's just saying "in the event of." I think that's all it's saying.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Sorry. Just indulge me for a second. So, there are five people on the EC, right?

JOAN KERR: That's right.

IOANA STUPARIU: Four people.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Four? Right. Okay.

JOAN KERR: I mean, I think that we function as going through discussions and clarifying everyone's opinion, and then vote.

IOANA STUPARIU: Think about this, right? You have four members. Let's say one member is not participating, so you have three voting members. A majority would be two voting for, one voting against. That's simple. But in some cases, you may end up having two for, two against, when everyone is voting. In

that case, it's the chair's vote that makes the difference. That's how I've seen it in other organizations, and that's [inaudible].

JOAN KERR: Exactly. Me, too. That's exactly what happens. All of the chairing I've ever done, that's how it's done.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Oh, no. I don't have a problem with that. I was just trying to work it out in my head.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. Well, while you do that, Maryam, we can carry on with the rest.

JOAN KERR: Okay. Brenda, could you bring it down, please?

OREOLUWA LESI: Hi. I'm just wondering, 4.4 right now, that says "all EC votes called by chair," I think Carlos is also suggesting that this goes under the EC votes section. So this, 4.4 and 4.5, because they are talking about votes and voting.

IOANA STUPARIU: I am moving both of them under the new section. Also, I need to adapt the numbering.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, everyone agrees? Yeah, I think that's a good idea, to put it under the EC vote. Great. Because that was ... I think we had two separate sections that we amalgamated, right? Remember that? That was a nightmare.

IOANA STUPARIU: So, basically, I added it here at 4.8, EC vote. Now, you have one, two, three, four. I can change the order, of course. Let me just adjust the numbering. 4.3. 4.4. 4.5, now. 4.6, and that's it. 4.7.

JOAN KERR: Does that take care of it, Ore?

OREOLUWA LESI: Yes, it does.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay. I will also reply. "Moved."

JOAN KERR: Wonderful. Yeah. That makes it good. God. Anyway. The numbering is good. We can always look at the numbering system later, as well. Okay. Number five. Anything? Everybody is good with four? Yes? So far? I mean, we might look and find something, but so far? Yes? Okay.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yes. We have comment at five, at the NPOC policy, submitted by Carlos. If you press on where the pink cursor is, where I am? Who is there? Who is that thing? Who is making the screen ...?

JOAN KERR: Not me.

IOANA STUPARIU: Here. So, Carlos said, "There is no discussion about how the BC, or the NPOC, for that matter, defines consensus and makes decisions/recommendations." I mean, consensus, I think that's clarified. The question is about ... "Makes decisions/recommendations." That's ... I'm not sure what he's referring to.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. I'm not sure, either.

IOANA STUPARIU: And there is another comment. I think it's also relevant, the next one, at 5.2: "By a majority vote of whom?" Ah, okay. That's something different. Sorry.

JOAN KERR: I'm just going to extend my view, here.

IOANA STUPARIU: So, I think we clarified that there is no consensus but that we have majority.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. I mean, I think that's a type of consensus.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah. So, that's what we discussed, right here, that we need—

JOAN KERR: I think Carlos is specifically asking about the Policy Committee in this case.

IOANA STUPARIU: Ah, okay. Because it also said "or the NPOC, for that matter," so I thought that ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes. But on 5.2, it says, "Members of the Policy Committee can also ..."
Oh, it's only about removing the chair. That's right.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay.

OREOLUWA LESI: Okay. I think he is just saying that the charter doesn't say how we make our decisions, whether ... I know the part about the majority referred to a specific ... Oh, my screen is frozen. The part about where we were discussing about the majority referred to ... What did it refer to in particular? Let's see.

IOANA STUPARIU: No, but there is a provision. I was actually looking for the same, Ore, and in 4.5 it says that "all approval shall be by majority vote with a minimum of three members present." So, that's basically the general rule, the one that we moved, to now add the 4.5.4. Maybe I can start with that one.

JOAN KERR: But if it's already there, the Policy Committee have to ... It's just a committee of NPOC, so it would have to follow the rules.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah but, there, it specifically said that "all approvals by the EC." So, it needs to be just for the EC, not for other committees.

OREOLUWA LESI: Yeah. And then, maybe we should move that to number one?

IOANA STUPARIU: Exactly. I'm moving it now. I feel the same. That has been changed. I think, now, it would be nice to say something for the NPOC Policy Committee, as well.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, here's the original discussion on how all the ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: I suggest we pretty much copy the way it's said in the EC—just, yeah, a simple majority.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay. Where would you like [inaudible]?

JOAN KERR: Just put it before 5.1. No.

IOANA STUPARIU: No.

JOAN KERR: No, because you have to define the committee first. Yeah. Yeah. Yep.

IOANA STUPARIU: So, it would be 5.2, and then I change the numbering. "Policy Committee." But do we have a list? Let's see who's in there as members. One, two, three, four members? No.

JOAN KERR: Well, that's what ... No. It's four categories.

IOANA STUPARIU: We don't need to have the mention of "with the minimum of three members present" because we don't have four members or five. We have an—

JOAN KERR: Right. Right.

IOANA STUPARIU: Number of ... So, a simple "by majority vote," then. That's it.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: Does it make sense like this?

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: Ore?

OREOLUWA LESI: Yeah, it does.

IOANA STUPARIU: I'm changing the numbering.

JOAN KERR: You're doing a good job. It's good for everybody to ask questions and clarify things, because that's what we're doing right now. Okay. All right. Are we happy with that, guys?

OREOLUWA LESI: Looks good.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Let's carry on.

JOAN KERR: Okay. All right. Thank you, Brenda. Yeah. Just a bit more. The next point to deal with is ... Okay. So, on my screen, anyway, it's the new 5.6.

IOANA STUPARIU: But we also have 5.3 which we have—

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: 5.3, if you can go a bit up, Brenda. See? There, yeah. We have quite a [inaudible] comment.

JOAN KERR: Members of the ... Also remove the chair by any other member of majority vote. What did I miss on? Members of the ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: Well, it's just the language. It says, "Members of the Policy Committee can remove by vote." So, I think Erika has just missed that.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah, exactly. What I would consider is Maryam's comment. I think it's important to mention that this does not affect the EC position the person has.

JOAN KERR: Right.

IOANA STUPARIU: If any.

JOAN KERR: This is just the chair of the Policy Committee position.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Sorry, Joan. Does that mean that the chair of the Policy Committee is not necessarily the Policy Committee Chair on the EC?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, it is. That's a voted position. Yes.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. So, the question—

JOAN KERR: It would have to be removed.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. So, it means ... Yeah. So, how does that relate to the EC?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I mean, that's why it comes back to ... There has to be some kind of a balance check with the EC.

JOAN KERR: No. I think what it's saying ... The committee wants to Policy Committee Chair to be removed, so it's not just off the Policy Committee. It's the position, period. That's what it's saying.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah, but I'm not sure that's okay.

JOAN KERR: Clear, right.

IOANA STUPARIU: So, maybe we just reframe from adding the possibility of removing the chair and just having removal of members, because they have not been elected, just the chair.

JOAN KERR: Right, yeah. Because that becomes ... Then we would have to hold an election. We would have to do the EC due process again, and then have an election. So, yeah. So, let's remove that, then.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Maybe we should actually add that the chair can only be removed by a vote by members of the whole NPOC or the EC. I would prefer it be the members because it is a voted, elected position.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: We can maybe write that, "With the exception of the NPOC Policy Committee Chair, members of the Policy Committee can remove any member by majority of vote."

JOAN KERR: And then what happens is, if somebody really wants a policy chair to be removed, they would have to come to the EC.

IOANA STUPARIU: Exactly.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, and the chair will have to, after the ... That's a responsibility for the chair and the committee to then do the due process. Yeah.

IOANA STUPARIU: So, it would look like this. Do check if it sounds reasonable.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, my first response ... I know the spirit of what we're trying to say. My first response to it, if I was a member of the committee and I really didn't think the chair was doing its job—I'm talking about the Policy Committee, now—and want them removed, I think, as a member, if I didn't think that they were ...

Speaking as a member of that committee, if I thought that that policy chair was not doing their job and was especially not having the interest of the committee and NPOC as a whole, what responsibility do I have?

I guess to go to the EC and say ... Well, it's a whole system that we had created before of removal of a member. So, I just think that, if I read that as a member, I would be like, "You mean I can't be unhappy and have a

chair removed? I'm a member, right?" So let's be careful how we word it, I guess is what I'm saying.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, because the members need to go through the EC or by 10% of the members by making that kind of motion. But we should also add something about, maybe ... Because the other elected positions, I think ... If the person is gone, then if it's less than six months to election—

JOAN KERR: You can appoint.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Then there is no appointment. But if it's more ... Oh, no. Then there is appointment.

JOAN KERR: Right.

RAOUL PLOMMER: But if it's more then there is a new election.

JOAN KERR: That's right.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Right? So, we need to think about the appointment, like who is going to do that.

JOAN KERR: Okay. Let's just look quickly at the procedures in section seven, just to see what it says, and then come back to section 5.3. Brenda, could you just go to section seven? Just so we're clear, because that's what it says we have to follow. Okay.

IOANA STUPARIU: "Leaving office, removal from office, standards of conduct," that's the one?

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, elected officer or appointed representative. Okay. That's resignation. Resignation.

IOANA STUPARIU: See? 7.5. "The other EX members, excluding the person in question, may by unanimous vote remove the EC member from office if he does not improve within three months." So, there is a procedure to remove that person.

JOAN KERR: Right. Right. Okay. I just wanted to be clear on that. All right. So, Brenda, could you back to 5.3, please? Okay. So, right there. Thank you. So, could we take out—this is a suggestion—"with the exception of the NPOC

policy chair” and just say, “Any member by majority vote, as long as they followed the procedure,” right?

Because I think we have to be ... Especially going forward, we have to be responsible to the members. Yeah. We’ll see. But what do you guys think about that? I just think that ... “Members of the Policy Committee can also remove any member by majority vote, provided all procedures are ...” Yeah. Okay. Good.

IOANA STUPARIU: The problem is that we don’t have procedures for—

JOAN KERR: Yet.

IOANA STUPARIU: Removal of any other member, just for the chair.

JOAN KERR: Right.

IOANA STUPARIU: That’s why what we could have written is that, “With the exception of the Policy Committee chair, which, for the removal of whom, members have to observe applicable standards of procedure, they can remove any other member by majority vote.”

JOAN KERR: Yeah. We have to give them that responsibility, you're right. It will just be a controversy if anything goes wrong, right?

IOANA STUPARIU: Yes.

JOAN KERR: And that's not what you want. You want them to be actually doing the work. Yeah. Okay. What does everybody else think?

CALEB OGUNDELE: Just looking at it, that the members, and then the EC, has the power to remove just one person. That person is in big trouble.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, I think the question is, or the ... I think that you're right, Ioana. We have to specifically say it because, then, if the chair is to be removed, the members will have to work with the EC to do that. It's a separate thing because it becomes an election issue.

IOANA STUPARIU: Exactly.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. All right. You're right. Let's say, "With the exception of the chair," then, because it makes it clear that members can get rid of the person that's creating havoc or whatever, right?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. And in the end, I think we should mention how to get rid of the chair.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Separately.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Can you hear me?

JOAN KERR: Yep. Hi, Caleb.

CALEB OGUNDELE: I was just thinking, before removal, when there is conflict, have we thought of arbitration? Probably using the ombudsman? I'm just thinking.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Follow due process. Yeah. You can't just say ... Yeah.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Can due process be, then, established?

JOAN KERR: I'm trying to think of where I read that. So, is a "standard of procedure" the one that we're going to develop? Is that the ...? 5.3.

IOANA STUPARIU: I can refer to the point directly if we do not change the numbering.

JOAN KERR: Right.

IOANA STUPARIU: It's like the seven point ... What was it? Seven point ...

JOAN KERR: Five or something?

IOANA STUPARIU: Five, or something. Yeah. If you want, I can leave a note so that, at the end, when the numbering is done, I can ... This one, 7.5.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. It's good to refer to it.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay. And then, I can put a note here that ... Okay. This, here.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think we could mention how to get rid of the chair by just referring to the section of how to get rid of an elected position.

JOAN KERR: Right. So, to your point, Caleb, the end of the sentence, it says, "Before the removal or the decision is taken, the Executive Committee must notify." So, there is a due process that's set out. Is that the question you were asking before?

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay. Fixed.

JOAN KERR: Yep. Perfect. Right. Were there any comments from ...? All right. So, "With the exception of the NPOC Policy Committee Chair, for removal of whom members have followed ..." "With the exception of the ..." Yeah. Thanks.

"For the removal of members ..." "For the removal of whom, members ..." Oh. So, what about, "For removal of ..." "Members have to follow ... Geez. It seems a little awkward. "For the removal of whom, members have to follow applicable standards."

IOANA STUPARIU: Or we can just put this: "Follow the procedure detailed in section seven."

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Correct.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah. Okay. It should be fine, now.

JOAN KERR: So shouldn't it say, "With the exception of the NPOC Policy Committee Chair, to remove any members, the ..." Geez. I had it just now. Always, my mind thinks faster than I ... It's just a little bit awkward that, for the removal of whom, they have to follow the procedure detailed in seven.

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah. Sorry. It's legalese.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, that's what I said. There is always "committee" and "legal."

RAOUL PLOMMER: Hey, how about this? How about this? How about this? We say, "Members of the Policy Committee can remove any ordinary member by a majority vote."

IOANA STUPARIU: But then you have to define "ordinary member."

JOAN KERR: Right. I think what we're trying to say here is that members can remove members of the committee, but not the Policy Committee Chair, because that has a separate procedure, right?

IOANA STUPARIU: Yes.

JOAN KERR: So are we then saying that the members of that committee can remove ... "Must notify the person." "The Executive Committee must notify the person in question pursuant." Okay. So, that's the ... When it says "person," that's a member. So, I think we should say "member," first of all. Okay. Any member by a majority vote. Perfect. Okay.

IOANA STUPARIU: Better?

JOAN KERR: Yeah. "With the exception of the policy ..." Okay. All right. Because it was ambiguous to me. "Notifying the EC member so they can ..." "Before the removal or the decision is taken, the Executive Committee must notify the member or person." That's the last sentence. It says, "The Executive Committee must notify the person." It's fine. Okay. What do you guys think of that?

IOANA STUPARIU: I am fine with it.

RAOUL PLOMMER: It's good.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Good. It's clearer. Great. Any questions, objections? Okay. Let's go to the next one. Thank you. That was a good clarification. All right.

IOANA STUPARIU: 5.6 is the next one.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Right. Thanks.

IOANA STUPARIU: Just a comment. I will have to leave in 20 minutes.

JOAN KERR: Okay. Let's try to finish in 20 minutes, anyway, because I have ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Let's do that.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Okay. 5.6 is where we're at, right? "Policy may invite any other member to participate in the deliberations of the committee." So, why is that a question? I'm assuming this is supposed to be the same?

Maryam, you worked with Carlos, so feel free to clarify anything or question anything. We're happy with that. Because you've gone quiet—

that's all. Brenda, could you just bring it up, just a tad? I just want to see Carlos's comment. No. No, sorry. I mean down. Sorry. Just so that we can see 4.6 at the top. Perfect. Thank you.

All right. Organization. Okay. We did that. I'm assuming this is supposed to be the same as [inaudible]. What is "Presidential Committee?" I highlighted that. I don't think we have "presidential committees." Is that something that ICANN have? I don't know how that's in there. That's 5.6.1. "Advisory committees, presidential committees." I have no idea that that is.

IOANA STUPARIU:

It's probably a reminiscence from the previous charter.

JOAN KERR:

Yeah, so we should remove ... Yeah. We will remove that because I'm not aware of any presidential committees.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Yeah. "And other policy bodies" sounds good enough to me.

JOAN KERR:

Right. So, what was his question?

OREOLUWA LESI:

I think it was Erika's comments. Erika said, "Do these individuals need to be part of NPOC?" So, the first line says, "The Policy Committee may

invite other individuals to participate in the deliberations of the Policy Committee.” So, she’s asking for clarification, like, “Who are these other individuals?” Other NPOC members, or ...?

JOAN KERR: Well, we’re giving them the right to ... Well, how does everybody feel about that? First of all, I don’t think it has to be an NPOC member.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Well, okay. I mean, we are spelling it out in the point one and two, where it says, “NPOC members,” and two is ... Oh, yeah, but it does say “including” in the beginning. Yeah. Okay. So, we take the “including” out and just make it “exhaustive,” no?

JOAN KERR: Yeah, because if you’re going to get help from an expert but they don’t want to become a member, or can’t become a member ... Yeah.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Just to ask about the Policy Committee. Yeah. Is it compulsory that it is only our NPOC members that can be members of the Policy Committee, or people from ... Or NCSG can also ... [inaudible] interests can also be part of the Policy Committee? Just thinking out loud.

JOAN KERR: I think that’s what we’re discussing now. What do you think about that? What would be your thought?

CALEB OGUNDELE: So, this leads me to say that we should make it open. The more the merrier. But we have people from within GNSO, as long as they have not-for-profit or non-commercial orientation, to join. But then, it should be specified that none of them can be chair of the committee, even after they remove whoever is the chair.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, but the chair is an elected position from the EC, anyway. So, that's a protected position. So, how does everyone feel? Do you want to be open? Are we saying it's open to non-NPOC members, or do you want it to be open? I think that's the question, right?

OREOLUWA LESI: I think that it should be NPOC members. I mean, if it's an NPOC Policy Committee, I think it should be made up of NPOC members, because I don't see how someone from another constituency or stakeholder can help to shape policy on behalf of NPOC. I can see us collaborating, or asking for information, or maybe getting clarification, but not to be part of the committee.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, hold on, Raoul. Jackie has her hand up. Hi, Jackie. I didn't know you were going to be on. Hi.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Hi. I didn't know I was going to be on either, but I presented and left.

JOAN KERR: Okay. Okay. Go ahead.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: You didn't need me to sit in the whole meeting. I guess I got in at a good time. I agree. I don't think that NPOC Policy Committee should include representatives from other constituencies. It may include non-members who could be NPOC members.

So, if there is somebody coming in, and they're checking out NPOC, and they want to see what it's like, and they want to volunteer on the Policy Committee, I think that's fine. But if they're already in another constituency and have another location for their voice ... Are you hearing me?

JOAN KERR: Yes, I am.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah. So, if they're already in another constituency and they already have another avenue to voice their concerns, I wouldn't think that they should get a double-dip by coming into NPOC, as well. But if they're someone who is new and is possibly interested in working with ...

And joining/becoming a member, who is part of the natural NPOC community, and they want to volunteer, I would allow them to volunteer

on the committee as an observer-type person—not necessarily ... Because they're not yet a member, and, who knows? They may never be a member, but they might be somebody in a non-profit organization.

The organization itself might not want to join but that person is interested. They're in the ... Do you see what I mean? That's what I was thinking? But not allowing a double-dipping from people who already have a voice in another constituency. Thanks.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Can I just quickly ...?

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Raoul, go ahead.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think we're getting stuck on this. I think all it says is that the Policy Committee may invite other individuals to participate in the deliberations. That's not even decision-making. I think I can see that as we invite somebody to have a presentation about an issue before the Policy Committee makes the decision. So, I think we could keep that quite open. And it's still dependent on the invitation of the Policy Committee, so it's not really an open club, that way.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Oh, no. I agree with that part. I just obviously missed a bit because I came in late. Sorry about that.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, no worries. I mean, we have to question everything. Caleb has his hand up, as well. Hold on. Are you done, Raoul?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, that's me.

JOAN KERR: Okay. All right. Go ahead, Caleb.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yeah. So, I actually agree with what Raoul said. But what I meant was that "the more the merrier" was what Maryam posted, that they should be observers. As much as possible, we should encourage people to come and be observers. You never can tell. That is also a way to do outreach.

Perhaps if you get someone in NCSG ... There is someone—I don't want to mention names now—that I know that is in NCUC but is currently on the NPOC mailing list. I think he once replied to me before. He is just an observer there at the moment.

So, we should encourage. It's part of a way of some of us doing outreach. What I know that happens in At-Large is that you might necessarily not be an ALS that has voting power for deliberations, but you can also participate actively in At-Large processes at the level of the RALO, as well. So, it's a push, but we should leave this line.

JOAN KERR: So, I agree. As Raoul says, it's an invitation. It's not that they're joining. It's an invitation, almost, so it would be the policy chair says, "Oh, we need some legal perspective on this. Let's invite so-and-so." I think that Jackie also says that it should be of a non-commercial nature. All right. Let's just go back up to it and make a decision—

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan?

JOAN KERR: So that we can move on. Yeah?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, just a quick suggestion, if I may. Is it possible, then, to call out that this ... Being non-members, or the observers, or something, because someone else reading that might not have this explanation and would think any and everybody can join. That's just a suggestion.

JOAN KERR: Sorry. I was muted. It says "by invitation." Brenda, can you just go back up and let's just read it and see? But it's a good point, because people don't read things in detail anyway, as we know.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yeah. I think what Maryam said helps to clear the ambiguity of [the invite]. Yeah. So, they will know their role within the Policy Committee.

JOAN KERR: Right. Caleb, is that an old hand?

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yes. Let me ...

JOAN KERR: Okay. Brenda, could you please go back up to 5.4, I think it was? Is that what it was? 5.5. Okay. So, do we want to further clarify 5.5., then? "May invite other individuals to participate in the deliberations of the committee." "Can be NPOC members, or their organization representative, or serving on the GNSO Working Group Advisory Committee." Can you go up a little bit more, Brenda? Sorry, down. Right there. Thank you.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Who is having the construction work going on? That should be Joan?

JOAN KERR: That's me. My whole house is being reconstructed.

CALEB OGUNDELE: I hope that's the room I'm coming to stay, right? That's what they're constructing.

JOAN KERR: You can stay in any room. We've got the roof being done, windows. Aye, aye, aye. Anyway, yeah, I can't tell them to stop. All right. Okay. So, what do we want to add to this, or not add, guys?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: What I was thinking is, along the At-Large route, there may be individuals who are sympathetic to NPOC who have knowledge, skills, and resources that we might be able to tap, who could come in as observers to the Policy Committee. They can offer to work and so on, but they would not be actual members.

Because right now, it's NPOC members or their organizational representatives who are working on GNSO groups, ICANN advisory committees, and other [inaudible], blah, blah, blah, and any NPOC delegate to the NCSG Policy Committee.

But I wanted to add an additional space for people who might be interested in NPOC but who are not able—their company doesn't want to join, their non-profit doesn't want to join, or they're interested but that's not the focus of their non-profit, or they might be thinking about it and just want to check it out.

So, I wanted to add an observer category for generic people—people who are interested in At-Large can just come in and join without actually having to form an ALS, become a member, or be an official individual member in the RALO.

JOAN KERR: Right. And that's the other thing, too. We have to be careful about the word "individual," because then it becomes an NCUC issue too, right? So, I think, maybe, how we can clarify this is maybe say "other organizations," and they send ... Because we're going to get into a whole new thing with the NCUC with this "individual" thing.

And I think it's misrepresenting if we say that because all it is simply saying is that the Policy Committee can invite an individual to participate in the deliberations. I mean, it's very clear.

IOANA STUPARIU: I'm really sorry, but I have to leave now. So, if you can take over, Raoul, that would be great.

JOAN KERR: Thank you, Ioana, for your help. Unless we want to ...?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, sure.

JOAN KERR: Thank you.

IOANA STUPARIU: Bye.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: It's just that these two items are exclusionary to other things. That can't be, because the Policy Committee may invite other individuals, but those individuals can be one or two, unless we say, "May invite other individuals to participate in the deliberation with the Policy Committee. That can be one, two, or any other person that the Policy Committee determines."

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, why don't we add that in? It qualifies it, is that what you're saying?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, let's do that.

JOAN KERR: That's just qualified, and I think it's clearer. That's a good point.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: We leave it open. And if the Policy Committee says, "We want this person to come in," and they're not one or two, it's not a problem.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Because that's what we're trying to do, is to help the committee to function, right? All right. Raoul, can you do point three? So, that would be 5.6.3.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Hang on.

JOAN KERR: Yep. And is everybody okay with that? Yes? Yes. Yes. Okay. So, yeah, right there.

RAOUL PLOMMER: How's that? Can you see what I wrote?

JOAN KERR: Yeah, I can see it. I was just waiting for you to stop. So, does that suffice, Jackie? Is that what you were saying? Just to qualify that it's really at the invitation of the ... You know what we may want to say at the very beginning, at 5.6? It's, "At the invitation of the Policy Committee," right? And that everything is qualified. So, Jackie, is that point three what you had in mind?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yes, it is. Thank you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, that's good. That gives us an avenue to invite any interested party that wants to see how the policy work is happening. I mean, yeah, anything to create interest for our Policy Committee I think should be tried and tested.

JOAN KERR: All right. Everyone's good with it? Then ... Okay, raised hand. Ore, go ahead.

OREOLUWA LESI: Okay, yes. Maryam made a point about clarifying if the people being invited would be observers. I mean, I see in 5.1 it states who the members of the NPOC Policy Committee are, and it states that they have to be NPOC members.

But I'm wondering if we should add something in 5.6 that says something like, "The Policy Committee may invite other individuals ..." I don't know. "To participate and observe," something like that? That already says right off that they're contributing to the conversations but they are not involved in decision-making. Something like ...

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, why don't we just have four? That says, "All invited persons are non-voting," just to qualify it.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan?

JOAN KERR: Yeah, go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. So, just speaking to Ore's point, as well, just following on that. So, that sentence might read, "The Policy Committee may invite other individuals as observers." So, rather than having a number four, just as observers, just participate in the deliberation.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Just to add it there, and it takes care of it. is that what you're saying? That makes it—

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. Yeah.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. That's a good point. Perfect. Okay. Raoul, could you just add "as observers" in 5.6, the first sentence? Do you see that?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Or we can be even clearer and say "non-voting observers," or to participate but not vote.

JOAN KERR: Aren't observers by nature ...? I think "observers" means non-voting.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, observers are non-voting.

JOAN KERR: Always.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Something like that, yeah.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. All right. I mean, we don't have to put it, but if everybody wants it, it's fine. I've never seen a situation where observers vote. Okay.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Sorry, Joan.

JOAN KERR: Yeah?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Just going back to that sentence again. It says that can be non-voting observers. I think the observers should come before the end of the sentence.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. What I suggested was “may invite other individuals—”

MARYAM BAKOSHI: As observers.

JOAN KERR: “As observers.” That’s where I think it should go. Raoul?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Joan, do you want to take the pen and write what you mean?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: How about, “The Policy Committee may invite other individuals to participate as non-voting observers in the deliberations with the Policy Committee”?

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Perfect. Right there. Right where you’re ... Yeah, right there.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: “As non-voting observers.”

JOAN KERR: And there is an extra S in “observers.” Okay. All right. Are we happy with that? Ore, your hand is up. Is that an old hand?

OREOLUWA LESI: It's an old hand. But I think that we can do without the "non-voting," because I think the observers would be—

JOAN KERR: Yeah, just take out the word "non," I agree, because observers are non-voting. So, just take out "non-voting," and we're good. Yeah. Right there. Perfect. All right. So then, now the question is, do we need to have number three? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

JOAN KERR: Okay. We do need it. Okay. Let's go down. Next. Is everyone good with 5.6, then? Yes. Okay, good. Let's move on down. Elections. Okay. How is quorum established? "The chair of the EC shall be responsible for election agenda and meeting schedules." Okay. "If the chair is a candidate then the EC may appoint, if deemed necessary, a replacement in charge of agendas." Okay. "The chair shall send an announcement." So, how is quorum established? This may be better assigned responsibility for the secretary." What if the secretary is also ...? Okay, Maryam. Is that an old message, Maryam?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, it's actually just now.

JOAN KERR: Okay, go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. Going back to the four-point ... The one we just finished now, the end of that sentence, before it began to list the people who could join, says ... Yeah. It says, "That can be." So, the Policy Committee may invite other individuals to participate as observers in the deliberations of the Policy Committee. That can be NPOC members." So, could you probably change it to "including," rather than "that can be"? Or "that can be"?

JOAN KERR: Yeah. "Including" sounds better.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, "including," since you've already talked about the observers in the first sentence.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, I agree. It sounds better. So Raoul, yeah, just change "including" with the semicolon. Perfect. It sounds more "official." Okay. Great. Okay. Let's go back down to six, then. All right. So, Carlos is asking, "How is quorum established?" That's number one. And, "This can be better assigned for the responsibility of the secretary." No, I don't think so, because then we'd have to change a lot more than just here. Okay. If

deemed necessary, what do we need to change here? Because I don't get what we have to change, if somebody can let me know? 6.1.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Brenda, what's the comment to that, please? Can you click on it? Okay. It says, "This may be better assigned responsibility for the secretary." That's what Carlos is suggesting.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. And what's that stuff about quorum?

JOAN KERR: Yeah, that's what I said. I don't understand it.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. You don't get quorums in elections.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Brenda, can you please go to "elections" and see what the comment is, please? If you just click on "elections." Okay.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. I don't know what he means by it because I ... I'm trying to figure out what he means. Maybe that's something we can clarify. I'm assuming he's talking about section six, right?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I'll check the comments and get back to you on that.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. I'm just going to write that down. I think we can just move on with that one because I don't know what he's getting at.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Let's do that.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, Maryam to follow up with Carlos. Okay. And now, "better assigned to the secretary" is the other point, as well. So, what does everyone think? I'll say my opinion.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I don't think we have exercised anything like that before. We haven't done that in any previous elections.

JOAN KERR: Right. So I think, if we change this, we have to revisit the charter, because there are other places where it says ... You know. And I don't really want to do that.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Elections only need a quorum if it says so in the bylaws or whatever, because there are some times when they say that, if you don't get a particular percentage voting, then ... To make sure that members are actually active.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, we do—

JACQUELINE MORRIS: But it's not in our space, here.

JOAN KERR: No.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So, I don't think it's important.

JOAN KERR: I don't think so, too. I was trying to think of, how do we address this? So, Maryam is going to find out what exactly he meant. But then, the second part of it is this should be ... "The duty of the announcement and etc. should be assigned to the secretary." That's the other issue.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan? Can I step in quickly?

JOAN KERR: Go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: 6.1. It says, "The chair of the EC shall be responsible for election agendas and meeting schedules." That is currently being done by myself.

JOAN KERR: Exactly. So, it's done by ... I was going to say ... When this was written, it was a different system that we were using. So, it really doesn't ... But the chair oversees it. They still send it out.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, the chair oversees it. They send it out. Yeah. You might need to reword that.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. I think that this is just pointing out what the duties of the EC is, but that they work with, obviously, support staff. But I don't think we really have to say that. Or do you think that's what it has to say? Because so far, we've been doing it ... Like you set it out, you do the reminder, because the responsibility of the actual voting is now a staff function, right? Where it never used to be. Does anyone want to change this? This is the question.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: I don't see a need to.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. We don't need to change that. I mean, it's already "if deemed necessary," so it's not really heavy language.

JOAN KERR: Right. And also ... I mean, I've done it for the last three years with Maryam. It's done very well. She sends it out, I send it out as well. So, we still satisfy ... I mean, the chair still satisfies the duty, right? Okay. So, the follow-up to that is just to clarify about the quorum, but I don't think that's an issue for us, either. But it may be something we're not exactly understanding, so let's move on.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, sorry. Just going back. So, where Carlos made the statement, the comment, if you could please just reply to that comment so that we're tracking what NPOC doesn't agree with or what NPOC hasn't—

JOAN KERR: Raoul did it already.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, not for ... So, it was, "How is the quorum established?" So, for the one we just finished, which is the "deemed necessary." So, if you could just reply as to what your agreement is on that so that, when we are looking at this document again, we know that it has been looked at?

JOAN KERR: Okay. I'll so that afterward, then. 6.0, quorum. Okay. All right. Let's go ... 6.2 is the next one. "The following individuals are ineligible to serve as the organization solely on the purpose of voting." Okay. And another constituency, to Jackie's point earlier.

So Erika says, "Not sure I understand what's intended here: voting generally, or elections?" "The chair shall establish, publish on the website, and the following individual ..." "Or serve as organization or alternatives." Yeah. "Solely for the purpose of voting."

Brenda, could you just go down just a little bit to the 2.2.2, so I can see the next ... I can see A and B together? No. Yeah, right there. Okay. "An individual who holds any form of permanent or temporary paid position within ..." Okay. I don't know if we need any clarifications. I'm not sure I understand what's intended, here. "Voting generally, or elections?" Well, I think we're talking about elections.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. I commented, "Eligible for becoming elected." I think that's what we need.

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: For voting, but it's for elections because the heading is—

JOAN KERR: Elections, right.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So, this would be what would be happening for elections.

JOAN KERR: Right. So, it's not voting generally, because we had that in a separate thing. This is specifically under "elections," right? All right. So, I think we're good there, too. I can't ... Right. So, Raoul, could you ...? I'll do it later. Just to put my comments in. So, that's Erika's ... So, are we all agreeing that it's just for the election, because it's under that section? Right?

OREOLUWA LESI: Yes. Raoul's response, I think you should edit it, because he wrote "eligible for becoming elected," but it's becoming elected and also to vote in the elections.

JOAN KERR: Right. It is an election vote, yeah. All right. Next one. "Any persons who are ineligible is an individual who is a paid position." Okay. So, "Proposed wording: a current ..." So, Maryam is suggesting, "Proposed wording: a current ICANN Org employee or contractor within the last six months."

Okay. Man, oh man. I'm very popular today. So, yeah, that wording sounds good from Maryam. It's very clear. But why the last six months?

Oh, because they may not have ... That's when we do our active membership. Is that what it's alluding to, Maryam?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So, we're just following the train of thought from yours, what you said—

JOAN KERR: Right.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible] positions within the last six months, so we just [worded] that.

JOAN KERR: Right. Yeah. That makes sense. So, just cut and paste that, if you can. "An individual who holds any permanent or temporary ..." Yeah. So, can you copy Maryam's, Raoul? The wording? "A current ICANN Org employee or contractor of ICANN."

Sorry, Raoul. You were saying? For 6.2(b), yeah. Right there. Yeah. Perfect. It makes it clear, because that's when we start to do our activation—active member status, anyway. All right. Is everybody happy with that? Okay. No hands up? Okay.

Brenda, if you could go down, please? Three, okay. Aye, aye, aye. Check-in process. "Before ... Outreach and engagement coordinator shall send out an ..." So, now the check-in process becomes the engagement coordinator. Okay. "An attempt will be made to reach a member by

means ... Telephone or other.” So, I thought this was covered in 6.1, because the chair sends it out. Is this double-duty?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Joan, right now we don’t make an attempt other than sending e-mail, so definitely telephone calls.

JOAN KERR: So, the membership chair or the engagement person will be responsible to do that as a follow-up, is that what you’re saying?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Well, not during check-in but, maybe, yeah. I mean, that can be done if NPOC wants to do that but, currently, we don’t do that during the check-in process. So, it’s just e-mails that are being sent. Yeah.

JOAN KERR: So, is it highlighted to say that it’s going to be done or to remove it? That’s the question.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Brenda, please can you go to put your mouse on there? Let’s see what the comment is. There. Click. Thank you. So, “Is an additional attempt contemplated, i.e. and attempt or multiple attempts/reasonable attempt? Also may want to have some requirement ...” Okay. So, well, we don’t really do that, so I don’t know if—

JOAN KERR: Yeah.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible] do in the future or ...

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, how does everybody feel? Do we want to ...? We sent out multiple reminders for the check-in process, but do we want to make the attempts for calls or ...? What does everybody think?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: It doesn't say that you've sent multiple e-mails. It says, "There shall be an e-mail to all members, [asking them to complete] their contact information." And then, "An attempt afterward by other means." But it doesn't mean that you ... Because, for example, telephone calls, it doesn't mean that you must make telephone calls, it just means that you may be able to reach the member by other means.

You can delete the telephone ... You can delete the examples and delete the "and." So, "By the requested deadline, attempts will be made to reach the member by other means." If reasonable attempts fail, then, boom, they'll be inactive.

JOAN KERR: Okay. Anyone else?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think we could, in the future ... I mean, we already have more ... I think we have more inactive members than active members. So, we should maybe do one round of activation, and not only send them ... Maybe send them personal e-mails, or try to phone them personally. But I don't know. Would that actually be something that, I don't know, Maryam could do before the elections? Or anybody who was doing the check-ins.

JOAN KERR: So, the first question—before you go, Maryam, answering that—is, do we have numbers on the membership database? That's the first question.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. I think it's something over 100 members.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, but do we have their phone numbers?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think there was something like ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, the phone numbers is not a required field.

JOAN KERR: Right. So, that's the question I wanted answered for us before we answer this.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. But I think it can ... If we leave it ambiguous, I don't know if it's that bad, really. I mean, what organization tries to go through all those old members to activate them to do something? Especially not in not-for-profit organizations. I don't know. How much are we really expected to do for that?

JOAN KERR: But what I'm saying is it's saying, "Example, phone calls." If there are no numbers then the person would have to go to their website, look up the numbers, call. That's just one example of one organization. So, it's one of two things: we either start to collect phone numbers so that we could do this, or you send a letter to ... An e-mail not just to the actual member, but to the organization as well, which we should be doing, anyway.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes. The letter one is definitely a good idea, to try to reach the organizational member through the organization, because there might be somebody who would actually be interested in doing what the inactive member isn't.

JOAN KERR: Or they didn't get the e-mail.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Well, if we ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, it's possible.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: These are just examples. If we just take out the examples, then we don't need to worry about telephone calls or requests. We just make it very general and say we try to find out. We make reasonable attempts to access the member. And it's an organizational member, because we don't have individual members. So, if anything, we send an e-mail to the official—

JOAN KERR: Organization, right.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: E-mail/call that thing, and that's reasonable. We don't have to totally define that and make it ... Because it may be that, later on, we might decide to use our ... Or something new comes up that's not a telephone or something later on in life, and we will use whatever. If we just remove the example, then we don't have any stress.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, the example you're talking about is an attempt we made to reach them by other means?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: The example telephone calls or requests through other contacts.

JOAN KERR: So, remove that.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Just say, "Attempts will be made to reach a member by other means."

JOAN KERR: Which means what?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Attempts will be made.

JOAN KERR: But we have the ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: Can I say something? I think we could just mention that, if that person is not activated, then we will reach out to the organization in question. I think that's quite reasonable, and that should really be done in every case, so that should be there.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: But isn't that what it says here? "Shall send an e-mail to all members," and the member is the organization, the person the organization ... A representative.

RAOUL PLOMMER: No, it's not.

JOAN KERR: We send it out to the representative.

RAOUL PLOMMER: It always goes to the individual who was the organizational representative. It doesn't go to the organization.

JOAN KERR: Right. But I'm saying that—

JACQUELINE MORRIS: But that's what it says at the beginning of point three. So, in that case, "Shall send an e-mail to all organizational representatives," instead of members, [inaudible] of the organizational representative of the members, active or inactive.

JOAN KERR: So I think that, if I'm hearing correctly ... Jackie, your hand is up, still. Is that ...?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Oh, no, no. That's the old hand.

JOAN KERR: Okay. So, if I'm hearing correctly, NPOC really wants to make that extra attempt, right? We're all agreeing on that. I think nobody is going to disagree with that. So, I think what we have to say is that the attempt will be made to reach the member organization, right? As opposed to the individual. Isn't that what we should be doing?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yes.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, that's my suggestion.

JOAN KERR: Right. So, that's what we need to put down. And take out the "telephone," for sure, because I know we didn't ... That's why I asked the question, because I'm not ... I know we don't collect the phone number. "An attempt will be made to reach a member organization." Yeah. "Through their organization." Yeah, perfect. And take out the rest. Yeah. Perfect. How's that? Is everybody good with that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: I have to leave to go to another meeting. So, I'm gone. Bye-bye. Sorry about that.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. We could call it quits, the rest of us, as well.

JOAN KERR: Yeah, I think so, because I have other ... And my house is going to get even more noisy. All right. I asked them to stop for a little bit. All right. Can we schedule another meeting? And also ... Yeah. Maryam, could we schedule another meeting? Do we want to schedule it now or just do it by ...?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Sorry, Joan. Sorry, Joan. Can we just do that last bit on the 6.2? It's quite an easy one. It says, "An inactive member may remain on the inactive list for two years." And Erika's question is, "What happens after two years?" I think we should really put there that the member is removed from the member list.

JOAN KERR: Yes, perfect. Perfect. Put that down.

RAOUL PLOMMER: And then we can say that, "Okay, we've done this. Next bit we need to do is 6.4."

JOAN KERR: Yeah. Okay. I'd like that. That qualifies it. That member will be removed. All right. So, is everyone okay with having another meeting? I think this is good. We're really clarifying things. A week from now, is that good? Let's propose it on the Skype NPOC chat so everybody can agree. Hello?

OREOLUWA LESI: Sounds good. Okay.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Let's do it.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, I'll ask the question on the Skype first, to make sure ... I'll put down that the proposed date will be next Thursday at the same time, unless somebody absolutely cannot do it. So, that's one. We need to also have a call with Maryam, if anybody is available for a few minutes, or we can schedule that separately, as well.

So, the question is ... We'll stop here. I will put a call on the proposed date on Skype. Maryam would like to speak with us. We can do that on Skype, right, Maryam? Or do you want ...? We can stop this call now and continue.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, that's fine. We can do that, as well.

JOAN KERR: Yeah. So, let's call this. So, the recording for this is done, and we will
schedule the meeting for ...

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]