
BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. Welcome to the NPOC charter call on the 24th of November 2020 at 13:00 UTC. This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record and also have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be gathered from the Zoom room, and I'm happy to turn the call over to Raoul. Thank you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Thanks, Brenda. Okay, so mind you, I can't see our comments from the last session in the document I have that [inaudible] commented on. I don't think that ... I'm sure we've made lots of comments. But has somebody worked them out, or is this not the right document?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: As far as I know, the document Brenda is showing on the screen is the current document, and I know that Ioana, after the last meeting, was going to go and clean up the document to where we have worked on. But yeah, that's as far as I know. But Ioana can expatiate on this when she comes on the call.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. I'm just going to have a quick look on my e-mail if I can see another one there.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Sure.

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: But it could really be that Ioana has tidied our comments up.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Brenda, can we start from the beginning of the document, please, just to see ...? Yeah, thanks. And if you just scroll down. Yeah, that's the one. We can just go to section four. Thank you, Brenda.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay, I found another document that has our documents on September. So here it is. I put it on the chat.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks, Raoul. That's quite strange. Yeah, that's very interesting.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, we don't want to do the same work—

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Twice. Absolutely. Thanks. I think probably someone has gone and reviewed that as well as this one. But this looks more up to date.

RAOUL PLOMMER:

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, I remember seeing these comments by [inaudible] and clicking onto the document, and I didn't see our comments there then.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, I wonder who that is though. I thought that was Ioana's pseudonym or something. Okay.

RAOUL PLOMMER: But okay, so in this one, we got quite far.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. Brenda, do you want to go to 4.0, I think?

RAOUL PLOMMER: No, we're at 9. No, sorry.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: More than that, yeah, actually, you're right.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, we've gone really far.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, so the other document is not up to date for some reason. Okay.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, I don't know where that came from.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Brenda, please scroll down again.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think Ore said that she would join us like half an hour late.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. We need to go back up again, Brenda, please. Yeah, 9.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So, okay, I think the first comment that we haven't replied to is number eight. It's got a highlight on NPOC participation in the ICANN empowered community, and Carlos has made a long comment there.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raoul, I'm sorry, I can't raise my hand as a cohost.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So I'm looking at the document, and 6.2, it talks about organizational reps and alternate reps being eligible to vote. That's not the case. So I'm not sure why we have alternate reps there. Brenda, 6.2, please. Yeah. It

says the following members—sorry, voting members. It says the chair shall establish on the NPOC website a list of the organizational reps and alternate reps eligible to vote.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Are alternate reps eligible to vote?

RAOUL PLOMMER: They can vote on OR's behalf, I think, if that's ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, so on organization—so it would only be an organizational rep except in the case of, exactly, saying ... But it's not something the NCSG does, so it has to be the organizational rep that has to vote. Caleb has his hand raised.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Go ahead, Caleb.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yes, so I was just listening to what Maryam was saying. Yes, for organizational reps, the alternates can vote in the absence of the initial rep—that's the organizational rep. However, before the alternate puts up any what I think we should perhaps put a caveat there to say that it

would be on the position of NPOC that the person will vote after reporting to NPOC based on the position that we have.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raoul, just a quick question for you and the EC. We are talking about, for NPOC, it is based on organizational membership and not the rep, right?

CALEB OGUNDELE: Oh, sorry to cut you short, I was mixing things up. The position that you held earlier on, I was mixing it up, I was thinking that the ExCom was going to be voting at the level of NCSG. I just looked through the comment now. I agree with your point that it's only the organizational rep that can vote, not in alternative this time around.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, so if the organizational rep cannot vote, then the organization has to choose someone else who will take over the position of the organizational rep, if that makes sense.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yes, I agree with you on that.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So they would have to do that.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yeah, because it will look like you're sending two ballots to two different e-mails.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Exactly, so those are the chances and double voting.

CALEB OGUNDELE: But organizational rep carries weight.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think I now understand the question Erika has made, that she's not sure she understands what's intended there. And to be honest, neither do I. I think we can just remove that. The following individuals are ineligible to serve as the organizational representative or ARs of their organization. That would include voting as well. And I think these people who are listed in A and B are individuals that we couldn't have as ORs or ARs in the first place, or even like it says in B, if such an individual is identified at any time by any member or officer, the chairs shall provide notice to the member requesting a replacement.

So yeah, I think we can just remove that solely for the purposes of voting. I think that was possibly originally meant to be like something to make it clearer, but it's doing the opposite, so I think we'll just remove that and obviously, it includes voting. If you serve as an OR or AR, that includes that you can vote. So you guys all right with that?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Actually, my question was on 6.2.1, which says a list of organizational reps and alternative reps eligible to vote. So alternate reps are not eligible to vote, so it should just have organizational reps and taking out the [inaudible].

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, but it might be that instead of an organizational representative, an alternative representative is eligible to vote. It does say eligible to vote, so not necessarily all of those would be eligible to vote.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Well, it says and, so organizational reps and alternate representatives eligible to vote.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Hi. I was just going to say that it has to be or, because the idea is to publish everyone who will be voting. So if for example the organizational rep is ill and they've sent a notice to say, "Hey, I'm ill, I'm not going to be around for a month," then you'll put the alternate rep. Isn't that the point of having the alternate?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, Jacqueline, exactly, that's the point of having the alternate.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So it should be or, but the idea is to have everyone who is eligible to vote at that—

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, but there might actually be a case when there are 29 organizational representatives and one alternate representative. And that's the list of representatives that can vote. Do you understand?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, but all [will still be there.] [inaudible]

RAOUL PLOMMER: But it [can't be both.]

JACQUELINE MORRIS: I don't think you can have the organizational representative and the alternative representative.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Exactly. Not from the same organization. But if you have 30 organizations and 29 votes like normally and they use the organizational representative, but one organization, the person is ill and they have alternative representative, so now we have 29 ORs and one AR, and that's the list of those people eligible to vote.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Right, so or will still work there though.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, okay.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: If you have a list of the organizational representatives who can vote or the alternative representatives who have been approved to vote, then it will be the list of organizational representatives or the alternative representatives who are all eligible to vote in this particular vote.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. I think you're right, actually. The or doesn't eliminate having both in this case. Just hang on. Somebody's at the door. Okay, I'm back.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: On something else I just picked really quickly, it says it shall be published on the website 30 days prior to the election. That is not what happens currently on the NCSG level or NPOC, except this is a new rule that NPOC will implement, but that's not how it stands currently.

RAOUL PLOMMER: How is it currently?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So currently, we have it up until two weeks before the voting starts. That is when we close the check-in process.

RAOUL PLOMMER: How many days prior?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Two weeks.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: And does it really have to have a number of days there if it's going to make it easier?

RAOUL PLOMMER: You mean just not have a sort of minimum amount of days at all?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. I think just so that the dates, if anything changes in the future, you're not bound by the number of days in the charter. Again, you can add this in the procedure document, but not exactly in the charter.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Right. Where else are the elections like stipulated than this charter?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So we have ... I'll just put a link in here. Hold on.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Thanks.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: If we have rules of procedure, that would actually be better for the precision of the dates rather than the charter.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Sorry, Jacqueline, could you repeat that?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: I was saying if we have a procedural document that the EC can change at will, that would be an easier place to put specific things like number of days and so on, because the charter requires, or should require, more process to change than a simple rules of procedure document. It's like the difference between company policies and company procedures. You can always change your procedures but the policies stay. Try not to change the charter but you can change the details so you can say something like it is the chair will publish on the NPOC website this, blah-blah, and then in the procedures, you can say two weeks or if we decide to expand it to 30 days, you can change it easily because it'll just be an EC decision to change it from two weeks to 30 days or vice versa.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. That makes sense. So, should we take the 30 days out and ask to refer the procedural document?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Just as a suggestion, you might not necessarily have to say refer to the procedure document, but at the end of the charter, you would have an annex that has a procedure document there, but I don't know if it's absolutely necessary to add it to the charter itself.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, I think it would be good to refer to it here. I think we should put it here just so that we will remember it as well, and maybe in the end, once we're just polishing up the last bits, we can take those unnecessary references out.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Maybe add it to the comments section, probably.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, I think comments would be fine.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay, I added my suggestion, I made a comment about that as well.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raoul, sorry, I just put a comment in the chat. Maybe you can consider leaving the "prior to the election." Just a suggestion.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Oh, yeah. How is that? I'm sorry but I just had somebody who came from France and I have to make him welcome. So I will have to take a

five now. he was supposed to arrive earlier, but you know how those planes are these days. So, sorry about this. Maybe you can discuss further. I think the next point of contention is the 6.2.2.B. I'll be back in five minutes.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: All right. I think Ioana is here now, so Ioana, do you want to hold the pen until Raoul gets back?

IOANA STUPARIU: HI there. I'm trying to see where we are, I just arrived.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Okay. 6.2.

IOANA STUPARIU: I was reading the comments right now to see what you have changed.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, so 6.2.1, we're talking about organizational reps and alternate reps. It was decided that it was going to be organizational reps or alternative representatives. And then also to take out the 30 days because right now, it's currently two weeks within the NCSG, and then the number of days can be added in the operating procedures document and not necessarily in the charter.

IOANA STUPARIU: So, should we just not add any time limit at all?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes.

IOANA STUPARIU: So it's okay to leave it blank?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, just [inaudible] election, and then in the policy procedure, you can add that in.

IOANA STUPARIU: All right. And that point two, have we discussed that already?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay, so that's where we are, at 6.2.b. Who's ineligible to serve as the representative or alternative representative. Who suggested that? So it was Raoul.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: It says a current ICANN Org employee or a contractor in the last six months. But it needs to also have a current contractor, because now it says within the last six months.

IOANA STUPARIU: So I was wondering why—

JACQUELINE MORRIS: But it needs to be both. I think what it wants to say is an employee or contractor who is either current or who has been such within the last six months, because if you don't want a contractor who's been there within the last six months, you don't necessarily want an employee who's been there within six months either. So I think what it should say is a current employee or contractor or any employee or contractor who has worked for the organization within the last six months. Something like that. Or something like a current or recent employee or contractor.

IOANA STUPARIU: Is Raoul back?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: No.

IOANA STUPARIU: I was actually wondering why he changed the original framing, because it was—

JACQUELINE MORRIS: [inaudible].

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I think the original framing was proposed by ... Brenda, can you place your cursor on that comment so we can see the original comment to that, please? Yeah.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I'm back. Sorry about that.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, so scroll up a bit to the comments. I think there was a comment Carlos had—okay, so let's go back. Yeah, so my comment that the proposed wording is a current ICANN Org employee or a contractor of ICANN Org within the last six months, yeah, I think that's where Raoul took out the individual who holds any form bit. Ioana, does that answer your question?

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah, sure.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: What does it mean? Is it that if you are an ICANN employee and you quit yesterday, you can become eligible today, or is it that ... But if

you're a contractor and you quit five months ago, you can't be eligible?
But an employee can be eligible the day after they quit?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: That's a fair point, Jacqueline. So I think the word "current" needs to be revised.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: We could say current or recent within the last six months.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Sorry to chip in. I think the original text was quite clear. I don't know why we're trying to change it.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Agree.

EMMANUEL VITUS: That is more clear compared to the current one we're trying to frame.

IOANA STUPARIU: I agree, that's why I was waiting for Raoul to explain.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Okay. Maybe we can move to the next point. He said five minutes. When he comes back, then we can continue. We can come back to the point B and amend it.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I think this was something that was done last time. So if the EC agrees, I think this was what was originally there, what was removed now. So if the EC wants to revert to the original, then yes, by all means.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay, let's carry on. I reverted it back.

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay, so Raoul is back.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, I've been [just] five minutes.,

IOANA STUPARIU: Okay, great.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So we're on three now, the check-in process.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes. So my suggestion was to change it to through their organization, because it can't really be expected us to start calling this person home.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Except the member is the organization, because we don't have individual members in NPOC, do we?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes, you are correct. Maybe it should say individual, because it's really the individual that does the check-in process.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So then you won't be sending an e-mail to the member, you'll be sending the member to the organizational representative asking the contact information, and if you conduct the check-in and no response from the organizational representative or alternate representative, an attempt will be made to reach the member so that the organizational member so that they can appoint someone.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Right. Would you like to have a good at wording that to make a suggestion on the document?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Okay. If the outreach and engagement committee shall send an e-mail to the organizational and the alternate asking them to confirm or update their contact information, if NPOC conducts a check-in and no

response from the representative or alternate is received, then you will try to get on to the member organization so that you can inform the member organization that their representatives are not responding. And if we fail to reach the member or either of the representatives, that member's status will change.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, that does sound good to me. Looks good.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: All right, yeah, I write British, not American.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, I prefer that too but we need to be consistent, and I think in our name, it is the American version.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: That's fine, we can just go through and replace.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Looks good to me.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raoul and Jacqueline, I just made a comment in the chat as well. For the check-in process, only the organizational representative is contacted and not the alternate reps.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So if the organizational rep doesn't respond, then we just ...? Because the alternate is there to be the alternate. So if you can't get on to the organizational, should send an e-mail to the alternate before going through all the ... Because basically every organization has two representatives, the real representative and the backup representative.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, so for the check-in process for elections, we don't do that. We only contact the organizational rep because if we contacted both and both responded—so the way it's set up, it's an automatic process and both responded, then they'll be put on the ballot. I don't know if that makes sense. Yeah.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Okay. Well, can we do it like a second round? so if they haven't responded, then you send to the alternate. If the alternate doesn't respond, then you contact the organization and say hey, neither of your representatives is responding, what do you guys want to do? So make it like a second round.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: But you have to have—yeah.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: So when you send the e-mail to the organizational representative first, and you do the check-in, and there's no response from the organizational representative, you send the e-mail to the alternate representative. If neither one has responded, then there you contact the member organization and say, hey, neither of your representatives is responding, do you want to put a new representative on? And they can vote. Or do you want to just ignore us?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: That's a good suggestion, but so we're adding three steps in the process to an already complicated process.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: One. Yeah, adding one step. Basically, if the organizational representative doesn't respond, the one step you add in is send to the alternate, and then continue as normal.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So if the organizational rep does not respond, then we send to the alternate rep and then if that person doesn't respond, then we have to contact somebody in the organization to check if ...

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Right, but that happens anyway because normally, you send the e-mail to the organizational rep and if they don't respond, then you go to the

member organization. So adding in is if the organizational rep doesn't respond, the e-mail gets sent to the alternate representative, and if they don't respond, then ... So there's one step we're adding in there which is sending to the alternate representative. And if they don't respond either, then we continue as normal. Is that too much?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes. That's [not all] we have right now within the NCSG. So if we're adding this step, it would have to be discussed on the NCSG level.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Okay. I just thought that part of the reason of having an alternate rep is if you can't get on to the organizational rep you get onto the alternate. I thought that was the reason for having an alternate.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think it definitely is a good idea to contact them as a second priority. That should definitely be the second point of contact if OR fails to answer. But Maryam might be right that it might be on the NCSG level. We've basically amalgamated our elections in every way.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible]

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Or you could take the process out from the charter and say that you'll perform a check-in process and send the check-in process to the

procedures, and then you can ... So we don't have to deal with it right now, but you send it to the procedures, because the procedure could change. Because this detail here is actually a procedure.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So I think anyway, it works now the way it's set up at the moment, set up with the NCSG, so this is now, I think, compatible with that.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I have a question for you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So it says an attempt will be made to reach the member organization by other means, e.g. telephone calls or request through other contacts. Who will be responsible for doing that?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: If I may, I don't think you need to contact the member organization by other means but by their official means, their e-mail on the website or whatever information that we have for that member, we can't go calling on, "Hey, do you guys know about this company or that company?" I think that would be way too much. I think what would be best is just to reach the member organization by their official contact information.

[inaudible] should at least update that, go on the website, find their form or whatever or send an e-mail, and that's it. Because otherwise—

RAOUL PLOMMER: So Maryam, you asked who's responsible for that. Who's responsible for arranging the elections?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So the chair and ICANN staff.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Have you ever done this, that you'd be contacting these organizations that haven't replied?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No. We don't contact them by telephone or anything. Just like Jackie was saying, the best thing we can do is by e-mail, but that's it.

RAOUL PLOMMER: But have we done that?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Not that I can remember, to be honest.

RAOUL PLOMMER: All righty then. Mind you, there is a lot of talk in the NCSG about or dwindling membership, and I think getting this process good could go a long way, actually. Sometimes all that people need is a little nudge and they'll get on it again.

Maybe we don't need to say what are the examples of these other means, but I think by other means is a good one because that basically leaves all kinds of ways of contacting them. And it's ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Doesn't that leave it open for interpretation?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Or we could just say—

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yes. And I don't think that's a bad thing. Even if you just send one e-mail that is sort of within that other means, then that's it, you've done it. So it doesn't ... We could just take the rest of this out, like having telephone calls, I don't think we're ever going to do that. So having maybe e-mail once, at least to the AR, would be a start, and I think when we're really seeing who's active and not, before putting them on the passive list, should maybe try to contact the organization as well.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Or should we just say an attempt will be made to reach the member organization, period? And don't describe by any means. We will just

attempt to reach the member organization and let them know and leave it. No other means, just an attempt will be made to reach a member organization.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Well, okay, if we say by other means, that's really anything that is not contacting the OR or the AR. If we do that, you send an e-mail to the—

JACQUELINE MORRIS: No, an attempt will be made to reach a member organization, so usually there's a secretary, there's a chair, there's contact information on their website, but we will attempt to reach them and we don't prescribe any means. We will attempt to reach them. And then if reasonable attempts fail to reach the member or its representatives, then we ... So it could be when you attempt to reach the member organization, we could pull out all the stops and call them, e-mail them, call friends, etc., or we can send one e-mail. If we take out by other means, we can do whatever we want. If we want to go whole hog and run down every possible way to contact them, we could, and if we decide to send one e-mail to whatever e-mail address is on the website, we could do that too. It allows us, if we just say we will make an attempt to reach them, it doesn't say what we have or do not have to do. It leaves it open. What do you think?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Right, so I think that by other means is really just completing the sentence. It leaves it totally open. It's like an attempt will be made to

reach the member organization. If you put period there, it's a little abrupt, I think. Just saying by other means means that you will do something else than contacting the AR or the OR. That's it. That's all it requires us to do. And I think we should be required to do something on top of contacting the OR and AR. Well, we just found out that we haven't even contact the AR. So we've only contacted the OR, and we should definitely have at least another go at it. This is something that could actually have more sort of people stay active with us if they get that nudge every year.

JACQUELINE MORRIS:

Well, then how about an attempt will be made to reach the member organization itself?

RAOUL PLOMMER:

Yeah, I thought of that as well. I'm fine with that too. That's a nice way of completing it as well. Okay, so that's it. Okay, I think we can move on to the next one. So that's an inactive member may remain ... Erika's asked what happens after two years, and then I added this last sentence, after which they will be removed as a member. So I think that answers Erika's question. Are you happy with that?

JACQUELINE MORRIS:

Yes. Obviously, we will have a process or procedure for trying to contact inactive members and get them active again, right? That's a membership thing. Just a thought. You don't just put them on an inactive list and say "bye."

RAOUL PLOMMER: To be honest, I don't think these are adhered to well. I think we're not really doing the sort of after work with people who become inactive. I think we make zero effort in getting them back.

Okay, so 6.4. Are you still with me?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yes.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Caleb [has] left as well. Oh well. Hi Emmanuel, didn't see you there.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, I have to leave in a little bit myself, but let's keep going. Erika's thing, the 6.4 was that whole thing about too much power to the EC.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. I don't know if it is.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Well, we could say that as needed, determined [inaudible] nominating and voting and such procedures. We could have a system where the EC creates stuff, sends it out to the membership, and if there are no objections, it becomes the procedure.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So, what do you mean, like we'd vote for this procedure?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Well, a vote but a negative vote. So if we say, okay, we want to change and create this procedure for nomination of voting, we create it, we send it out to the members and say if there are no objections, this will become our procedure in two weeks. And then if somebody objects, then we read their objection, figure out what it is, that kind of thing. That kind of gives it a little more democracy but without too much extra work because if you wait for people to actually come and vote for it, then what happens a lot of times is that it never actually ... People don't vote and it sits there, because if somebody is really upset about something, they will say, "Hey, I object to this." But if there are no objections, we go ahead. We kind of assume consensus and move along.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So how would you word that in 6.4?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: I would leave it just the way it is. It's just that it would be something additional in general, this is what the EC will do, and that should get rid of all of Erika's issues about giving wide latitude to the EC.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Right. And I guess it does have the as needed. So that could be like a reason, for example, some kind of security reason, we would need a separate [inaudible] to vote or something like that.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah. I don't think we need to bother with the wide latitude thing in every line if we just say, "Yes, we will consult the membership." Then all of the wide latitude and executive power thing will go away as long as we consult the membership.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. Okay, so 7.2. We're two thirds gone.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Why did we change to Suppleant?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think that was loana's suggestion and I think that's good. I'm hearing another call.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Oh, sorry. That is where I need to go now.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Oh, okay.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, suppleant, I don't know, I'm not ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, I think we covered Erika's concern. Ioana used the word suppleant instead of vice chair. I think that was the whole issue Erika had there.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Right. Okay.

RAOUL PLOMMER: It's a new word for me, actually. Never heard that, suppleant, before. But nice to have words—

JACQUELINE MORRIS: It's kind of French. I'm kind of not finding it. Okay, go ahead.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So 7.7 is or appointed. You all right with that? Anyone holding an elected or appointed position in NPOC cannot hold another elected position within ICANN.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raoul, just a quick question. If it's an appointed position, why can't they hold another elected position if this is just an appointment? I don't know, I'm just asking.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Well, it depends on the power that the appointed position has, because it's something that I've seen in several other areas in ICANN right now, is there's a sort of double dipping, being able to vote or make policy in two different places so you get your opinion in two different ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Okay.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: It's kind of the same thing ALAC has done as well. If you're just a member, that's fine, but if you are somebody who has any sort of organizational power in another constituency, it's like ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, I think what I was asking, really, is [it says they cannot] hold another elected position. So does it matter if they hold another appointed position?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, if the appointed position gives them any sort of power over what gets decided or done, [inaudible] treasurer.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I agree. I think we have one or two appointments at the moment. So it's not like a throng of people that could be doing other things. If we appointed somebody, that's usually being sort of, I guess, enough of a responsibility.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So Raoul, take the case of the NPOC EC, being in the NCSG EC. How does that work?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: It doesn't [particularly for here.]

RAOUL PLOMMER: [inaudible]. Yeah, cannot hold another elected position elsewhere in ICANN. How about that?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: That would work, or in another constituency. Not another constituency, in another ...

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Elsewhere in ICANN, NCSG is still elsewhere in ICANN. NCUC for instance is still elsewhere in ICANN.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay, let's put outside NCSG then.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: No, it would have to be outside GNSO, wouldn't it?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I mean, we definitely don't want somebody from the Commercial Stakeholder Group having an appointed or elected position in NPOC.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Okay.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Does that look good to you, Maryam?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, I think as long as the EC agrees, that's what matters.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Actually, now I remember why it was worded like that, because we remembered the example of [Dave] who was elected for both the NCUC and the NPOC ECs. So we wanted to rule that out as well.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, I remember that. Sorry, just a quick one. [inaudible] cannot hold another elected position, so what if you took out the elected and say "cannot hold another position?" So if it's an appointed or an elected position.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yes.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: And then following that sentence, the NPOC elected or appointed officer must resign from their ... So if we took out that “elected” as, again, so from their position, so that’s on the third line. Yeah. Must resign from their—says elected position, so if we’re taking out the elected there, my suggestion is to take out the second elected.

So going back to that sentence in 7.7, the second sentence says if elected for another position elsewhere in ICANN, the NPOC-elected or appointed officer must resign from their—okay, so if elected for another position. But if they're appointed, is that fine? Because it sort of contradicts the first statement.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: We just need to take out the resign from the elected there, must resign from their position.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah, but it’s saying that if elected for another position elsewhere, so we’re talking about elections there, the NPOC-elected or appointed officer must resign from their ... Okay.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: From their position in NPOC immediately.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes.

RAOUL PLOMMER: So hang on. Do we actually want to say if elected for another position elsewhere in ICANN, or should we again say outside the NCSG?

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yes. if they're elected or appointed to another position outside the NCSG, the elected or appointed officer must resign from their position in NPOC immediately. Because for example, if you're appointed for NomCom, NomCom people aren't elected, a lot of them are appointed. But if you take up a position in NomCom, you have to resign from NPOC immediately, for example.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: [So it's not just if elected for another position.] So just say if elected or appointed for another position outside the NCSG, the NPOC-elected or appointed officer must resign from their position in NPOC immediately.

RAOUL PLOMMER: All right. I think it's number eight then with Carlos's long comment. Would that be a good place to stop, you think, for today? I think we've got five minutes left.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah. I think that would be a good spot, because ...

RAOUL PLOMMER: I think it's just the two of us anyway.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Okay.

RAOUL PLOMMER: And Maryam.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, I have my other meeting, I'm just watching and waiting for them to call, because it's one of those meetings where I have to say a very tiny bit and they haven't called on me yet. So that's why I'm still here.

RAOUL PLOMMER: All right. Okay, well, lucky at that, we got most of it done. I think there is only sort of four issues left, and that's not much. And of course, the annex, the amendments to the charter. But yeah, we've done good.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Okay. I have to go now.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay. Thank you, Jacqueline. Thank you, everyone else, as well.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you so much, Jacqueline, thanks, Raoul, thanks so much, Brenda.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]