

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi  
December 12, 2017  
8:23 am CT**

Woman 1: Excuse me. The recordings are now started. You may begin.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Ira. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.  
This is the NPOC Charter Call on the 12th of December 2017. On the call today we have Joan Kerr, Juan Manuel Rojas, Raoul Plommer, and from staff we have myself Maryam Bakoshi and Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants if you state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Joan.

Joan Kerr: Great thank you. Yes I always forget about the recording. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I always say hello too as a generic term.

So this is a Charter Call and I believe Sam is trying to dial in so we'll know when he comes on. So Raoul sent out an email - oh Sam is here. Welcome Sam. Thank you for joining us.

Sent out an email about what we needed to do for the charter. We've been working on it and just to compare our look at the previous charter, the 3.0 and

see if we have forgotten any policy issues that we needed to deal with in the new one, 0.9. So I looked at it as well and tried to compare it so let's start - so Raoul I'm going to let it go to you because you're - you have the editing rights and Sam, did you - let me just - Sam did you have a chance to review the - both charters and do you have any comments and then we'll go over to Raoul.

Sam Lanfranco: I haven't had a chance to review it. I've been buried in work at the moment and I have to travel tomorrow. But I'm trying to look at it now but...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Sam Lanfranco: ...I just - I feel like I need to see.

Joan Kerr: Okay no worries. So what we're trying to do is look at - if we've missed anything that - administratively that we're responsible for as a constituency from the old charter. That's basically what we're trying to do because what the idea for the new charter is to streamline the duties and - so that we are actually doing what we're supposed to do which is to outreach and get people involved in the PDP issues at ICANN. So that's the task.

Okay so Raoul off to you and then we'll go from there. Hopefully Ganga will be able to join us and I'm hoping Poncelet as well. So Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: Okay hi everyone. So I'm delighted to see many comments here in our new document which - and the one we're going through now is the charter version 0.9. I'll send a link to all of us as well as the old document we originally got to review this charter. And I think we might as well start from the top and see if there's any issues about the comments that have been made. And I think after that we should go through the old document and try to find the matching part in our new document. It might be in a little different form than it used to

be so we'll have to look out for that. But I think as we move to comparing the three documents I think we should also make like a list of content in the beginning and I think that will make it easier for all of us.

So should we - should Joan maybe share the view of the charter version 0.9 on her screen like we've done it in the past?

Joan Kerr: Sure I'd be happy to do that if Maryam gives me share screen. Hopefully we could do that.

Raoul Plommer: I think - oh here it comes.

Joan Kerr: Are we on?

Raoul Plommer: Yes it's...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...it's starting to share. Hang on. Yes that's it. Okay.

Joan Kerr: Wonderful.

Raoul Plommer: Yes...

Joan Kerr: The first...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: The first click. Yay.

Raoul Plommer: I only need three computing devices to handle this call. One where I have the document on my desktop computer then I have the laptop where the Adobe Connect is running and then I have the call itself on my phone. And now it's actually useable but yes.

Joan Kerr: Wow.

Raoul Plommer: Never mind. So if we start from - there were some issues about the text color. Right. Okay so this is about the public interest software concerns issues. I think it's on red because there's been sort of not that strong understanding what exactly the public interest software entails and to be honest I don't think it's absolutely necessary there. We can add it in some external document but I think that itself is still sort of a minor issue for us and I guess I would support removing it if that's what you want Joan.

Joan Kerr: Well I just...

Sam Lanfranco: I agree.

Joan Kerr: Yes I just don't have a grasp, you know, as it is. I'd like to be - when I'm asked questions I'd like to be able to explain things especially if we're responsible for it and I just don't have a grasp of it and I've asked as you know different people what is it. So I think we can address it but we don't have to necessarily put it because it's (unintelligible) so that was my suggestion anyway.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. It's Sam and I - excuse me. I second that and later on we can say that (unintelligible) software (unintelligible) as we is that with an increasing durability of our constituency (unintelligible) the policy (unintelligible). But (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: It's a tool we use to (unintelligible) not the only charter.

Joan Kerr: Right. So Juan are you okay with that as well?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes (unintelligible) we really need to (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So we take it out?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Gone.

Joan Kerr: Great.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Just for the record - just one clarification for Sam. We agreed to do the references to the sections after we've finished with content. So just in case you think that they don't align we'll do that afterward.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Sorry Raoul. Go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: So the next comment is on 213 and it's about establishing additional committees to (unintelligible) working groups.

Joan Kerr: Yes so I saw that in the 3.0 and, you know, I always think about functionality that - my mind always is. And so, you know, what duties do we have and, you know, can we always refer to the charter is what I look at. So that was just something - I don't know if we want to state it but it was just something I saw missing in the organization and structure.

Raoul Plommer: Right. I think that Section 5 is also wrong because that's only about the policy committee. I think it's - hang on.

Joan Kerr: So while you're looking I think that we will probably have to print this all out and go through it almost manually, you know.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Just to make sure everything is aligned.

Sam Lanfranco: Where was that...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: ...establishing additional committees now? Is it a 2.1.1 or what? I mean, that's (unintelligible).

Man: Yes I think it should be in 2.12.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Yes that's correct.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Yes in the old document the heading of 3.2 was Duties and Responsibilities of the Executive Committee.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: I think we have the same kind of list of duties at - hang on. In Section 4, yes. The whole Section 4 is about the Executive Committee. And there...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: ...particularly it's 426 that has the duties of the Executive Committee.

Joan Kerr: Okay so then it goes there.

Raoul Plommer: Yes 426 in the new document.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Just as long as it's there and our duties are defined. Okay yes so just - is everybody in agreement that we should put that in first of all I guess.

Sam Lanfranco: Mm-hm. Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So that would really need to be its own section. Like after 213 we would make 214 and establish additional committees, teams and working groups. Is that what you're suggesting there?

Joan Kerr: Well we're part of 2.1.2.

Raoul Plommer: Uh-huh. Okay.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes that is better.

Man: Oh I don't know where these colors are coming from.

Joan Kerr: We can remove it if you want.

Maryam Bakoshi: (Unintelligible) is not (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: I think I can hear Juan but I'm not sure. It's very faint the sound.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes I can hear...

((Crosstalk))

Juan Manuel Rojas: This is Juan...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Yes can you speak up a little bit closer to your phone?

Juan Manuel Rojas: I was eating. Okay...

Sam Lanfranco: Good.

Juan Manuel Rojas: ...this 4.6 is not 426 but five because 413 is talking about (unintelligible) committee and (unintelligible) committee in Section 5.



Joan Kerr: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Juan can I stop you for one second please. We really can't hear you. If you want to dial out or you will keep to speak through the (unintelligible) mic but you need to speak closer to it.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Can you hear me now or it's...

Raoul Plommer: That's better.

Joan Kerr: Yes much better.

Juan?

Maryam Bakoshi: Juan you may speak now because we can hear you...

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay thank you. I was saying that section (unintelligible) we refer in the 2.13 in the last sentence in Section 5 because we are talking about the Policy Committee when the Policy Committee is Section 5. No (unintelligible) six.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes you're right. That is...

Juan Manuel Rojas: (Unintelligible) keep the committee with the number...

Sam Lanfranco: ...the Policy Committee.

Juan Manuel Rojas: ...that we have.

Raoul Plommer: Okay just bear with me a sec. I'm just going to check what it is on the...

Joan Kerr: Okay go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: All right hang on. Actually the one sentence we have in 213 it's like five rows long. I think we should really like put some periods in there. It makes it really heavy to read.

Joan Kerr: Hello?

Raoul Plommer: What? Hello?

Joan Kerr: Can you guys hear me?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay did you want - what section do you want me to go to?

Raoul Plommer: Hold on. I've got some weird issue here. What's going on? There was something going with the Adobe. Okay yes now I can see it. All right. So in 213 there is a big massive sentence that says who the Policy Committee shall consist of. Now that could be made - I don't know put a period in somewhere there halfway sort of thing because that's just like - makes it almost illegible. But basically it's about what the Policy Committee consists of and...

Joan Kerr: So Raoul we could say the Policy Committee shall consist of, semi-colon and then just have two - you know what I mean? You could do it that way.

Raoul Plommer: (Unintelligible) a list of them.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes that sounds far more understandable than what we currently have there. Then we only need to - so we put the Policy Committee shall consist of the (unintelligible) - shall consist of, semi-colon then release the NPOC Policy Committee Chair, elect the GMSO representatives, active NPOC members who volunteer for the Policy Committee, and those in the policy development - in the PDP working groups. And then we write one more sentence that after review by the NPOC - somehow formulate it so that those positions need to review by the Executive Committee.

Joan Kerr: Much more (unintelligible) acceptable. So then you've had to write 2.1.3.1 or A or something just to.

Juan Manuel Rojas: I think that we (unintelligible) the part with (unintelligible) section blah, blah, blah and just let like Raoul said just now (unintelligible) because (unintelligible) very much (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Yes I think we - if we put the...

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Joan. (Unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: ...some consist of, semi-colon and then just make a - put a little tab and then 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 different members of the Policy Committee. Yes? And I think...

Joan Kerr: Or A, B, C and D. Either one. As long as it's - but I thought I heard Maryam wanted to speak.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes. (Unintelligible)...

Joan Kerr: Did I hear that okay? Okay. Go ahead Maryam.

Maryam Bakoshi: ...(unintelligible) sorry my hand is up. Thank you. So I just wanted to find out...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: ...because like Raoul rightly pointed out it's quite a long sentence but if you state - if you list all the people who are supposed to be members of the NPOC Policy Committee why would the - then why would there be the sentence after review by the NPOC EC? Why is there a review by the NPOC EC? I don't remember exactly (unintelligible)...

Raoul Plommer: (Unintelligible) question actually.

Maryam Bakoshi: ...is there.

Joan Kerr: Uh-huh. Hm.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes because I (unintelligible)...

Joan Kerr: So are we...

Maryam Bakoshi: ...about the structure it should just tell you...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: ...the - who is going to be part of it. I think that's what the organization and structure part should do.

Raoul Plommer: I think it's - I - so my view of that is that the EC should have some say into who is in the Policy Committee. I think otherwise it's - that's just left for the PC Chair to decide, wouldn't it?

Maryam Bakoshi: No but that's correct but if you have already stated it that it will be the Policy Committee Chair (unintelligible) is represented, here's who are also NPOC members and any active - so if - you have actually stated out the people who can be in the Policy Committee. So my question is, you know, what exactly would the EC review again after you have stated that these other people who will be members of the PC?

Juan Manuel Rojas: (Unintelligible)...

Joan Kerr: If I...

Juan Manuel Rojas: ...that (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: So I have a question then. Is that addressed in the section below, 4 point - the - because I do agree with (unintelligible) that there should be some - I guess maybe review's not a good word but it - I'm fine with it personally but that there is - we have to ensure that those guidelines are followed. I think that's what that's trying to say.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes (unintelligible)...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: I think basically the Policy Committee would say that when there is a case that new members coming into the Policy Committee. I mean, from a start the Policy Committee isn't a big organ. So if there's new people the Policy Chair would make a - like tell the EC that and then the EC would say yes or no basically. I think that's why it's there.

Maryam Bakoshi: I remember - it's Maryam speaking. I remember in the former - so in the charter we are using now it tells you the number of people, I think it was eight that would be in the Policy Committee. So obviously you cannot have more than eight people in the Policy Committee. And it - yes it's important that the EC reviews it but you can add that sentence I think under the EC rules and responsibility and then it just makes that sentence a bit cleaner and clearer. That's just my suggestion.

Raoul Plommer: Sure.

Maryam Bakoshi: I don't know.

Joan Kerr: Okay. I see what you're saying.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: You just want it to - this is what it consists of. That's the structure is what you're saying. Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I mean, basically I can think of a situation where there is already eight people in the Policy Committee and let's say a new member would want to come in. So that would basically mean that we would need to take one out and I think that's already something that the EC should be involved in and not just the members of the Policy Committee. Of course we would listen to their view on that but I think the EC should have the final say in that.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Sam Lanfranco: ...make a suggestion.

Joan Kerr: Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible) yes. How about...

Joan Kerr: Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: ...or those who - yes. Can you hear me?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. How about the - those who volunteer that the chair of the committee (unintelligible) then to the EC and the EC approve or not approve.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. That sounds good to me.

Joan Kerr: Okay so do you want to change that whole 2.1.3 then?

Sam Lanfranco: It should be easy to reflect that.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Come on.

Raoul Plommer: In fact the - in this new charter 5.2 it says the Policy Committee shall not exceed ten members in size. And I think that's what we really need to refer to in 213 where it says - oh boy. Hang on. Actually Juan when you said that the section - yes now the section 4 - where the 426, that place is wrong because that should be 5 something. But on the previous one, the one that is highlighted red in 213 I think that does need a reference to the Executive Committee section because what it's referring to are the limits set out. I read it off it's the limits of the EC. So that has to be found in the EC section.

Juan Manuel Rojas: And if you do this (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Hello?

Raoul Plommer: (Unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Hello? Oh okay. So are you going to change the - that sentence and put it into the section or are you going to (unintelligible) or do Sam's suggestion?

Sam Lanfranco: I typed in the suggestion there on the right.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I'm just clarifying what are you looking for directions for.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes I would like to see (unintelligible) process. (Unintelligible) request and be approved by the EC only if that means then we have ten people we say that somebody (unintelligible) it's not (unintelligible).



Raoul Plommer: Okay. Is somebody writing the 213 again or?

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Am I doing that?

Sam Lanfranco: I guess I can do - I guess I can - well I guess I can try to do it.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible). Okay let me see if I can do it (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Okay. While Sam's rewording the 2.1.3 I'm looking for the limits of the EC that this 2.1.3 is referring to. I can't really find anything better than challenging the EC decisions. I think that's the most relevant. I think thing that it's actually putting limits on the work of the EC, and that would be 4.2.7, challenging EC decisions.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay I did some adjustments. There are three choices. One is just to leave it at the first sentence, and the other is to include - extend that (unintelligible) in section whatever. My preference would be just if you reshape this (unintelligible). Maybe I could (unintelligible) sentence.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Yes actually, yes I guess the limits set out is really of the Policy Committee members, not EC limits. So basically that first reference to another section, which now stands at 427, should really be something that's referring to the policy document section - I mean the Policy Committee. So. And that is 5.2. That's where it actually spells out who can be a member of the Policy Committee.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. I'll just change that.

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, 5.2 -- 5.2. That's where it is. The NPOC PC shall include the NPOC PC chair and the elected NPOC GNSO Council representatives, active NPOC members, PDP members, yes. So that's really the limits that it's referring to. 5.2, yes. That's it.

Sam Lanfranco: Then I would drop that second one with that last one. It's just redundant.

Raoul Plommer: That would mean...

Joan Kerr: Raoul? Hold on. Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: Yes?

Joan Kerr: Just one quick thing. This section is about is the organization and structure, so I think we have to say something about who it consists of, just because it is that section.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: Because we're saying this - it consists of three distinct parts, so we can't just say policy selection process is in section below because we set it out before.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think we over-struck a bit too many things now. Like I think we should still have the two and three and...

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible) I just lost control.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: I didn't strike all that out. I can't un-strike it. I'm trying.

Joan Kerr: Yes because just, you know, we need to say these are the distinct parts, right?  
So.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Juan?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Just one observation. I think that we should say the same that we have in 5.2 because the members of the PC it's is the - named in 5.2. So I think it would say the same and not to get in trouble to say it in another way. That's my suggestion.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Joan. Please let me know when I can speak.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead please.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, Joan. So I'm looking at the 2.1.3, number three and four, is there any active NPOC members who volunteer for the NPOC Policy Committee and then active NPOC members in the Policy Development Process Working Group. Does that not cover active NPOC members? So an active member, you know, can be in the, you know, kind of covers those who are also in the PDP working groups?

Raoul Plommer: Yes but - this is - I think it's basically trying to underline that in the NPOC Policy Committee there can be only members of NPOC. I think that's what it's really trying to say.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes. But I don't know, just maybe look at three and four again. That's just my thinking that it's...

Joan Kerr: So what are you suggesting, Maryam? I'm wondering do we have to say the word active for three and four.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, I think the word active is correct because they have to be active members to be able to participate in this thing. But I think the question is an active member is also - may also be a PDP member. So I'm just wondering if those two, you know, if three and four can't be merged or three left because it also covers every other - it covers everyone really who is active, whether you're in the PDP or not. That's just - I think that's just all I'm saying right now. I don't know.

Joan Kerr: Well I don't know. I think it - three and four should stay because it actually just is very clear about what we're trying to say. I don't think we have to take our one or the other.

Raoul Plommer: Yes it lays out like who can actually be part of the NPOC Policy Committee. Now I'm just wondering what about the end of this? You know, like at one point do we say after review? I guess we can just take that out, and. So we need to word that a bit differently, the end of it.

Joan Kerr: Maybe final review by the NPOC EC?

Juan Manuel Rojas: I think the number is not working there because we are talking about the members of PC Committee, right, Policy Committee? And we need to add something at the end. So it is not very useful to have numbers and have a paragraph alone over there. So I think that we need to do that in a paragraph, like a numbered list.

Raoul Plommer: I didn't actually understand that. But if we add the sentence new members will be reviewed by the NPOC EC, period, and then we just say the Policy Committee selection process and duties are set out in section 5-point-something below. I don't think we need to say that we within the limits set out in section 5.2 because basically that just lists the same entities as we just did in this two and three. 5.2 is really - it was a carbon copy of this two and three so far, almost.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: I agree.

Raoul Plommer: So if we just put period there and then now we check the like where are the selection process and duties set out in 5-point-something.

Joan Kerr: I would - I don't like the word - it says - I know that we're talking about the Policy Committee but can we not say new members but members of the Policy Committee or something like that? Just, you know, how some people just read something and they don't - yes.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Well highlight the bit that you disagree with and make a comment and I'll change it to that. I'm just having a look at 5.5.

Joan Kerr: Okay. All right. Maryam, you wanted to speak? No? Okay. No, Juan, I haven't heard you. Were you trying to speak? Juan, are you trying to speak?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay go ahead.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes I'm trying - I'm saying that we can avoid the numbers in the paragraph we are discussing because we don't need the numbers there. I think we could adjust paragraph four to be clearer to the reader. I think that the number isn't important there.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, Juan, can you point where the Policy Committee selection process and duties are now? Because I can't find it right now. The Executive Committee has such a list of duties for example but I can't find an equivalent one to the Policy Committee. I'm not sure if we have one. It might be one that we're missing completely.

Juan Manuel Rojas: I think the duties are 5.6.

Raoul Plommer: No that's just the chair.

Joan Kerr: 5.7, you mean that?

Raoul Plommer: Yes 5.6 in this new document of ours, but I don't think it is that because that's only the duties of the chair, not the whole committee. Yes, right. In the old document there is 4.2.3, which is the responsibilities and it's the responsibilities of the Policy Development Committee. So I think we need something similar in our new document.

Joan Kerr: Yes. 4.3 is communication. Where did you...?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, 4.2.3 in the old document, in the NPOC charter 3.0, you know the old one that we're comparing the new one to. Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So...

Joan Kerr: So my 4.3 is the Communications Committee.

Raoul Plommer: 4.2.3.

Joan Kerr: 4.2.3, sorry.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, yes.

Joan Kerr: 4.2.3. Sorry. Come on. I have a new computer.

Raoul Plommer: It's not all joy, is it?

Joan Kerr: No. It's supposed to make my life better. 4.2.3. Okay, there we go. All right. Responsibilities. Yes, we need to put that in then. Perfect. Yes, nothing more than the committee not understanding what they have to do. It causes confusion. Okay. Everybody's agreeing to that then? I think we need to put it in.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So you want to copy that and put that in then, and then I'll go back to 0.9?

Raoul Plommer: Okay, yes. I'll just copy it there and you see if it's accurate.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Hang on.

Joan Kerr: And that would make it 5.8 or something or - yes, we can worry about that after. I don't see anybody's hand so I hope that nobody's hands are up.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, even that doesn't give us a selection process that we're also supposed to find there.

Joan Kerr: So just assigning the duties, I think the limitations would be under the EC's duties.

Raoul Plommer: Hang on. What point, 2.1.3? Hello, Joan. Which duties are you talking about?

Joan Kerr: I'm saying that any limitations. So your question - I thought your question was relating to the duties of the Policy Development Committee, and I'm saying if we are - if there's any limitations that the EC has, it would be in the duty of EC, which I think we already - oh we did not write it down.

Raoul Plommer: Right, because here it says - okay, I'll change the new members to policy members.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Should I say prospective PC members would be reviewed by the NPOC EC?



Joan Kerr: Yes, prospective - I was trying to think of a nice word. Our list of prospective members.

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, I didn't catch that.

Joan Kerr: And then we could - yes, I was saying even say a list of prospective members. The list might be more than ten.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: And I would take out the period after NPOC EC and just says as set out in section 5.0 below. Just make that one sentence.

Raoul Plommer: Right. But, oh, you see actually the - we already took a bit out in the - because previously there was by the NPOC EC and then it referred to a section of the NPOC EC, but now the last sentence is about the Policy Committee selection process and duties.

Joan Kerr: Right. Yes, right. So.

Raoul Plommer: So we got the duties or responsibilities. I think we should call them duties. I think we've called all of such things duties in this document. I mean it's the same thing, isn't it? Responsibilities and duties. So we - I guess we still need a selection process then, like - or do we? Do we actually need a selection process in the charter? I'll look at the old one. Hang on. Well I can't really see - I can't see a selection process for any other committees either apart from the Exec Committee which is decided by vote.

Joan Kerr: Yes. So I think it's just a call for volunteers, right? And then we can set it out in the call for volunteers.

Juan Manuel Rojas: (Unintelligible). Now we are just saying who are the elected members but we have no selection process for the Policy Committee.

Sam Lanfranco: The chair is selected there. It's put together ad hoc.

Joan Kerr: That's right. So typically it would be a call - the EC would or the PC would, whichever one, calls for volunteers and then set out whatever the criteria and selection process is at that time, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I see it as the Policy Committee - I mean the - yes, the current members of the Policy Committee would sort of hash out what kind of people they need and I guess they could accept that call with the EC as well before sending it out. And then once we get the actual members or the volunteers then...

Joan Kerr: Yes. So I think we should leave it. I would feel comfortable leaving it for as needed, right? You know, here's what we need, here are the requirements, and the call for volunteers.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. So.

Joan Kerr: Is everybody good with that?

Raoul Plommer: So basically we'd end this with a list of prospective PC members will be reviewed by the NPOC EC. The Policy Committee's duties are set out in section - the new section that we just put in there.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: How's that? We just take out the selection process. Can somebody check what was the number for the new section, 5-point-something, where we pasted the responsibilities in?

Joan Kerr: I think it was 5.8 but just let me check. 5.8 was the duties.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, yes that's the one. Yes, so that's correct now.

Joan Kerr: Yes. And so just to go back quickly, Juan made a point earlier regarding 2.1.3 that instead of having the numbers of the Policy Committee shall consist of and then one, two, three, four, that it would be a sentence. So that was what he suggested and that was what was there before.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, right. I think it's much more clearer now. You have the actual four cases of people who can be active in the Policy Committee.

Joan Kerr: Right. I just thought I'd go back to it because he mentioned it.

Raoul Plommer: Sure, sure. No, I think this is way more clearer than that. I mean you had to read that a few times to actually get what was going on. Now it has the four cases really clearly.

Joan Kerr: Juan, are you okay with that? Yes. Juan, are you okay with that then? Juan and (Ganga)?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes I'm okay with that.

Joan Kerr: Great. Well we addressed it. (Ganga), you're good? Sam? Yes. Consensus? Yes. Okay. Great. Thank you. Next.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you. Next, 3. - membership.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes. Okay. Okay I'm just resolving that last comment from there because we moved that...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...suggestion, right. Okay. And the next one – right. So 3.1.1 – there's the...

Sam Lanfranco: Oh I was meaning to talk with...

Joan Kerr: Somebody's speaking and I can't hear. No? Okay sorry. Go ahead Raoul.

Gangadhar Panday: I have a small point to make. This is Gangadhar. Audible...

Joan Kerr: Okay go ahead Ganga.

Gangadhar Panday: Can everybody listen – hear me?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes. We are saying that we are reviewing the list - about preparing the list. Well (Michael) - he discussed something but instead we can try to make a – prepare the list and finalize it.

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, what list are you talking about?

Joan Kerr: Someone said that. Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: Prepare and review – instead of that we can prepare and review.

Raoul Plommer: On which point is that? Which section?

Gangadhar Panday: Two point one point three.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. And now there's a – right but the – see the EC...

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: Does somebody have that to prepare the list, right?

Raoul Plommer: No. The EC will not prepare the list. The PC will do it. The EC will only approve it or disapprove it.

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: So basically the Policy Committee does the work of vetting the candidates and making the call for them. The EC only says yea or nay. We don't want to make it too burdensome but we want to have a little control over what the committees of NPOC do. Okay?

Joan Kerr: Okay Ganga? Ganga? Did we lose him?

Raoul Plommer: Maybe.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Okay I agree with that explanation. Let's go to...

Raoul Plommer: Okay so 3.1.1 – I like Sam’s version. It will consider unregistered entities on a case-by-case basis. I think that’s perfectly good. That really gives it some emphasized...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Perfect. I like that.

Raoul Plommer: ...that we could really – yes that we can make...

Joan Kerr: Yes. Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...the exception if there’s a – really a good case for it.

Joan Kerr: Right. Yes I like that too. Juan are you good? Juan?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Good. I’m good on...yes...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Juan Manuel Rojas: ...I’m good.

Joan Kerr: Okay great. Thanks.

Raoul Plommer: Okay then the – then there’s some more sections to check. Like in 3.2 it’s about, “An entity which does not fall within the non-exhaustive criteria set forth above may nonetheless be ineligible to be a member based upon a review and determination by the Executive Committee in accordance with the provisions contained in Section...”

Well it won't be 5.9 so we need to check what that is. Did anybody find something equivalent about the eligibility?

Sam Lanfranco: I have not. I'm looking in the files.

Raoul Plommer: So what is it exactly referring to? "An entity which does not fall within..."  
So this is about the Executive Committee's determination.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. What if we just leave it at that?

Raoul Plommer: Yes good idea. I agree with that. How does that feel to everyone? So basically we...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: So you're taking out in accordance.

Raoul Plommer: Yes that's right.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Yes perfect. Great. Great. So like oh gosh that makes it much easier.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Let's move on.

Joan Kerr: Hey Sam, it's good to have you on.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Okay great.

Raoul Plommer: Okay so the next one is 3.3.3 and so we will have the organizational representatives and their alternative representatives, ORs and ARs. Just remember that folks. None of that ADR stuff.

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: One thing about eligibility.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead. Yes that's basically what I think – oh.

Gangadhar Panday: I have a good point to make about eligibility.

Joan Kerr: Okay go ahead.

Sam Lanfranco: Go ahead. I think there's a time delay with him.

Joan Kerr: Yes I think so too. How about this? Unregistered entities will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Adopt...

Sam Lanfranco: He did? Is this what he said?

Joan Kerr: Yes. Ganga we said that before and agreed on it. Thank you.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear us? Yes we did...

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: There's some – okay. Okay thank you.



Joan Kerr: Yes thanks. Sorry. Sorry. Go ahead Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: So basically I'm still looking for...

Gangadhar Panday: So it is not changed? No?

Sam Lanfranco: They both say the same thing. Joan is just suggesting reiterating the beginning of the sentence but they both say the same thing.

Joan Kerr: So Ganga I think that we have addressed it in terms of what you're trying to say. Do you see it?

Gangadhar Panday: I know the last sentence - to make it more readable and the intents will clearly come out.

Joan Kerr: Okay can you – when you let us...

Gangadhar Panday: Yes. Unregistered entities will be considered.

Sam Lanfranco: Is there a big difference between will consider unregistered...?

Gangadhar Panday: With the last sentence...

Sam Lanfranco: Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: ...it's – or alleged.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. You want to switch two of the words around?

Raoul Plommer: I don't know what's going on anymore.

Joan Kerr: Ganga? Ganga can you hear me?

Gangadhar Panday: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay are you...

Gangadhar Panday: Go ahead.

Joan Kerr: ...addressing 3. – can you...?

Gangadhar Panday: I can hear...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Are you addressing – okay are you addressing 3.1.1...

Gangadhar Panday: Eligibility...

Joan Kerr: ...or 3.2?

Gangadhar Panday: Yes the last sentence just to make it readable more clearly because - 3.1.1.

Joan Kerr: Okay so you want us – what's unclear about it?

Gangadhar Panday: Last sentence...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: ...the standing of the wording, “Unregistered entities will be considered on a case-by-case basis.”

Raoul Plommer: That’s what it says.

Joan Kerr: Yes I – I’m not quite sure what your point is.

Sam Lanfranco: He just wants to move unregistered entities to the beginning of that phrase.

Gangadhar Panday: Is that okay?

Joan Kerr: Well we’re...

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: I think it’s probably fine as it is.

Joan Kerr: Yes it’s – it – our job is registered entities. We’re giving the allowance and saying, “Okay we understand in some countries, you know, people have an entity or a project or whatever - that we will consider them,” but that is not our main task.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Am I correct?

Sam Lanfranco: He’s just trying to move – he’s just suggesting the English is better if we move two words forward.

Joan Kerr: Okay which are the two words then?

Sam Lanfranco: Registered entities.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Registered...

Gangadhar Panday: Yes it is. You're right.

Sam Lanfranco: From registered entities will be considered on a case-by-case basis. It's just changing the English wording of it and sequence. Either way works.

Joan Kerr: So will be considered is all that we need to change?

Sam Lanfranco: You know...

Joan Kerr: In special circumstances unregistered entities will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Is that what we're saying?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay well sure. Okay yes that might be clearer. Okay.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Gangadhar Panday: I do.

Joan Kerr: Okay I see what you're saying. Okay.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Is that – does that look good? Is that what you – okay great.

Gangadhar Panday: That's good.

Joan Kerr: Thank you. Great. I just didn't know I'd identified. Okay next. Great.  
Thank you Ganga.

Gangadhar Panday: Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Okay. Sorry Raoul. Next?

Raoul Plommer: We're at 3.4.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: So...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: So we were looking for the section – okay.

Raoul Plommer: No I'm – I actually – yes. Yes 3.4 which is the next section which is about the...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...ARs so I solved that. But the next one...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...is 3.4. Oh it talks about the organizational representative. Okay well that's the previous one.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: So that's 3.3 then.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I was going to say I didn't think we'd dealt with that. Okay good. All right. So one of the questions I have to ask – we – we're not doing this as far as I know.

Somebody fills out an application and NCSG goes through the process of approving them based on, you know, the application that – there's a name, there's an organization and there's a Web site.

So – and then there's a contact and an – a name of a organizational representative as well as a – an alternative because we have two names and points of contacts.

But we don't – so how do we know – do we need to know if they're actually authorized because it says that in 3.3.1? Or are we just assuming I guess?

Raoul Plommer: Were we talking about 3.4 now?

Joan Kerr: No 3.3.

Raoul Plommer: Oh. Sorry. And what was that?

Joan Kerr: I'm asking do – yes. No I'm asking do we need to know – the fact that they have an application and then we're saying it's okay that they're authorized to do so, right? Are we getting too specific?

Raoul Plommer: Well sorry, what point exactly? In 3.3 - in each application for...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...membership with the NPOC?

Joan Kerr: Yes. I'm asking is – are we assuming as NPOC that if somebody puts an application in to become a member of NPOC and NCSG but NPOC particularly, we're assuming that they're authorized to submit that application.

Raoul Plommer: All right, yes. Yes we do. I mean, we're not going to check them individually from the organization. I think if there is a person going under somebody's organization with false pretense I think that will be found out pretty quickly, and I don't think people come to ICANN to do that kind of stuff like...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: I sort of...

Joan Kerr: All right. So we have it in there anyway and...

Raoul Plommer: ...don't see that happening.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Yes. Okay well – and we’re saying anyway that they have to be authorized so we’re seeing it, and the assumption is that they’re following it, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes. Yes we can only assume that. I think in some cases...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...it could be really difficult and tedious process of actually checking out if that person is the designated representative. We just have to take their...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...word for it and wait for any amendments that the organization does.

Joan Kerr: Okay. I just thought I’d, you know, since we’re doing this so...

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes.

Joan Kerr: All right.

Raoul Plommer: I sorted out the section references in 3.4...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...so they’re correct now.

Joan Kerr: Wow. We’re even doing that. That’s fantastic.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Yes. It’s all happening.



Joan Kerr: You're going to do two – yes you're going to do two celebration dances. All right. Any – Juan are you still with us?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes I'm here.

Joan Kerr: Okay so you're agreeing I'm guessing with everything we're saying if we don't hear from you.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes I loved the – in the organizational and the – all that stuff but I like this.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Well sound a little bit more enthusiastic then. Okay next.

Raoul Plommer: So 3.6.2, election procedures. Now we have to find out where they are. Apparently Juan has identified them at Section 6. Let's have a look at that.

Joan Kerr: Do you want me to go to it or you're looking at it?

Raoul Plommer: I'm looking at it. So – okay...

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: ...there's – there are some procedures. For example, there is the announcement to the constituency regarding elections shall take place at least 30 days prior to their commencement, and that the chair shall submit the nomination containing an - election schedules as well as the ballot to be used in the election to the EC for review and approval so that's already procedures.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Okay so do we want to do – are we changing any of the sections or the formatting in 3.6?

Raoul Plommer: Yes I – there's...

Juan Manuel Rojas: I was wondering there Raoul...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes I was wondering there about election procedures because it is not – it was not clear for me what our election procedures (unintelligible). So I put my comment there to – okay we are the – this –I get the number list in the steps but I don't know if that can keep there or in Section 6 where we are talking about voting person.

I get my – I left my current in that page. I think that there are – right there so please clarify me if I am lost in that election procedures or we are – we let them – either we have it or we are going to put more specifically.

Raoul Plommer: Well I don't know if we really need to spell out all the procedures in the charter. Maybe. I don't know but, I mean, there are some here already so if we're basically just thinking about like where to refer to, I would refer to the whole section of 6, which is about voting because it does have quite a bit of procedures here from different angles.

And yes like basically all from 6 to 6.2.5 is – it's about procedures so I think we should just refer to Section 6 and they can read it for themselves. It's less than one page so, I mean, that's not that bad.

Joan Kerr: So Maryam has a suggestion that we have a procedural document separate than the charter which – because then we can change it easier than it going through this.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: So then...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: ...we would make a – sorry, go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. No. Carry on. Carry on.

Joan Kerr: Yes I was thinking that a - food for thought if we made a reference as outlined in the procedural document and let's say we are adopting that. And then you can change the procedural document at any time because you know how things come up. You know, election procedures we can call it sort of thing.

Raoul Plommer: Right. Yes I agree with that. I mean, it...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: We don't need to have it ironclad as we would in the charter.

Joan Kerr: Right. That's right. Now we would have to have that document ready to submit with this so people can refer to it as well. So when...

Raoul Plommer: That's true.

Joan Kerr: ...we're asking – yes asking for public comment, right, they need to – I like, you know, I'm a detail person so – unfortunately.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Well I think Maryam knows the election procedures better than any of us so maybe she could prepare some of that for us.

Joan Kerr: The procedural – election procedure document. I agree.

Raoul Plommer: How do you feel about that Maryam? Okay she says sure in the chat so...

Joan Kerr: Okay great.

Raoul Plommer: ...I'll change the...

Joan Kerr: So...

Raoul Plommer: ...Section 6 to something like procedural document.

Joan Kerr: Yes as set out – yes as described in. Yes. And then that way that takes off a lot of the other stuff that – and we deal with its elections separately, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Let's save NPOC for election – yes procedure maybe should be a procedural – it should be probably a – caps. Yes. Yes and now we're starting to break things down.

That's – this is good. All right. Perfect. Now 3.6.3, the members have a right to access the email lists.

Raoul Plommer: Hang on. Sorry. Where are we at?

Joan Kerr: Three point six point three.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: It says they have responsibilities to receive information and have access to the NPOC website -- fine -- but the email list as well.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, basically they would be able to receive and send communications to our email list, yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Not the ExCom list but, I mean...

Joan Kerr: Okay. I have no problem with people communicating. I'm just wondering - thinking of the (unintelligible), that's all. That's what I'm thinking of. But I guess it's a public venue, so it's okay.

Raoul Plommer: I guess we could - public email lists.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because, you know, I'm not hesitating about the communication or access. I'm just making sure that we follow the rules.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, but according these, all our list are public, right?

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes. Well I still have to finish just to make sure we're in rights, right? So 3.6.3 says receive communications. They have a right to receive it. So the next part is almost a separate thing, is of access to. Right?

Raoul Plommer: Maryam, is our ExCom list public? Actually, I know the answer to that myself, because maintain it and it's not...

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, the ExCom list - yes, the ExCom list, every list should be public.

Joan Kerr: Should be, but is it, is what we're asking.

Raoul Plommer: No, actually it is, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Raoul Plommer: The ExCom list isn't public at the moment.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, it should be public, publicly archived.

Raoul Plommer: (Unintelligible) say that, because I haven't seen the, for example, the NCUC list, ExCom list. I don't think it's public, is it?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, it is public, yes. And even in the ICANN GNSO bylaws, it's there that the email list should be public. Yes, the NCUC list is public, as the NCSG as well, yes.

Raoul Plommer: So all the ExCom lists are public?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, so it should be publicly archived so they can go and look at it, but not post to it.

Man: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Only members can post to the those lists, so those are called closed lists. Only members can post to them. But anyone can go and look at the public archives and read from there.

Man: All right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Read was has been posted already, yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Maryam, did I give you the admin rights for the ExCom list?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, not yet.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, well let's make a note of that that I will, yes?

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, thank you.

Joan Kerr: And just a point of my - (John) - at my - when I sent things to the discuss list, I'm not quite sure if everybody gets it, because I don't get a copy of it at all. So I need to work with someone to make sure that I actually get the discuss list, because I don't have access to it, even though I sent it out.

Raoul Plommer: I guess, (John), you can check it from the archive, because they are archived as soon as they arrived on the public. I think Maryam can give you the address for the archive of the NCSG or the NPOC discuss list and you can just use that address to check for the latest mail and you can see your mail there.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I just to (unintelligible) to myself so that I know that it's sent. But yes, I will do that. So Gangadhar has a comment, 3.2.

Gangadhar Panday: Hello?

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead Gangadhar. Okay, participate, participate.

Raoul Plommer: Participation (unintelligible) good word.

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes I see what you're saying, but I think participate tells them what their rights and responsibilities are, because it's two different things they're saying there. Good suggestion, though. So if we could, for 3.6.1, it has vote twice. I know it's a sentence. If you could take out one of them and say vote in all. So they have the right to vote in all elections.

Man: Okay.

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: I think we can take the receive communications way as well.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: And participate. Those are bit of - I think they might have been like a headings of sort, but now we have to take them out.

Joan Kerr: And 3. - yes, the 3 - yes, right there, because it says a lot there.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Even the 3 6 2 participate in leadership elections, because then it says run for or nominate another member or yada, yada. So yes, okay.



Joan Kerr: So Gangadhar, are you good with that? Did that address your to participate, Gangadhar? Gangadhar, can you hear us?

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, just to avoid possible confusion, because...

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: ...participate, just to avoid confusion, one we can change it, 3.6.1.

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: ...something like that.

Joan Kerr: We've changed. We've taken them out completely. Can you see the document or no? We've taken out both and streamlined it. Okay, we've done that. Thank you. Great. Okay, anything else about 3.6 then? So Gangadhar, if you can't see it, we've removed both of them and made it more streamlined, okay?

All right, next. Everyone's good with 3.6 then? So far, so good? Okay, next.

Raoul Plommer: So, determination of eligibility and status, 3.7.1, 3,7,1.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Membership eligibility and voting status, consistent with Section 5.0. Is that where it is? I don't think so. I think that was already in three something.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, voting status, I think it's 3, 3.0 all section, because we are talking about eligibility angles and (unintelligible) in six.

Raoul Plommer: Oh, hang on.

Joan Kerr: So 6.2, I don't know if it'll end up being that but. Which one did you say it was, one?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, he's just made a comment there and I agree with that. The eligibility of members is 3.1. But then voting status is somewhere else, I think.

Joan Kerr: Yes, it's in 6.23 -- ineligible, that's ineligible. Yes, that's ineligible.

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: Six point two is voting members.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Voting should be - okay. So 6.3...

Raoul Plommer: 6.2.3, wasn't it?

Joan Kerr: Yes. So those are the ineligible voters. Okay, so we're saying who's ineligible in 6.23.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, because here it says voting status consistent with - at 3,7,1 -- the one where we're checking the references for. It says that it needs to be consistent with, so...

Joan Kerr: So it defined who can't vote.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's part of it.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So I'm going to put with sections 3.1 and 6.2.3, okay?

Joan Kerr: Great. It's interesting here, 6.24, it says the check in process is the chair, but I had it as a membership chair. That's interesting. Whoops.

Raoul Plommer: Where does it say that?

Joan Kerr: There was a lot of overlap.

Woman: Okay.

Gangadhar Panday: Six, two, four.

Joan Kerr: No, Gangadhar says which point are we at? We're actually at three - we're just double checking. We were at 3, 7, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yup. I'm moving on to 4.2.

Joan Kerr: We're now at 4.2 because we were just checking something, Gangadhar. Four point two, okay. (Unintelligible). So 4.2...

Raoul Plommer: Okay, yes so basically, one, we need to have, for the executive committees, create operating rules for existing members to maintain their membership eligibility. Now that means that, for example, if I started to work for an internet service provider and I'd be attending ICANN meetings with them, then my eligibility at NPOC would be gone, yes?

So basically we require NPOC members to update their status with NPOC and ICANN to us, or even to the membership coordinator. But it's really their responsibility to update their data. We can't be checking backgrounds of all the people all the time, yes?

Gangadhar Panday: Okay, yes, I get it. Okay, yes, yes, I get it. It's about to the people, key membership of NPOC continue our requirements, initially where it was a member for the first time.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Not just first time but, I mean, this is sort of ongoing, yes.

Woman: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: We require our members...

Gangadhar Panday: Ongoing, yes.

Woman: Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, I get it.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Okay, so good.

Raoul Plommer: And that section 3.1 is correct.

Joan Kerr: That's right.

Raoul Plommer: Moving onwards, so there's - oh, regional representatives. Okay, yes, that's a well spotted one. It shouldn't say that. Well, or should it? Basically...

Joan Kerr: Just say that the chair may delegate this task, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: To an NPOC member, to our - to an NPOC member. It could be anybody.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. So I just may delegate this task to another NPOC member.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because it doesn't have to be a regional representative, because we have to develop that program anyway.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: I'm going to put that down as a to-do.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, but the point talking about the chair of EC.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay.

Joan Kerr: I like that delegation component, though.

Raoul Plommer: Or maybe we should - instead of saying NPOC member, maybe we should say that it's for the - may delegate this task to communicators, communications coordinator, because that's really their sort of area of work, isn't it?

Joan Kerr: Managing communications -- well that's what I've been doing - I mean that's what Juan and I do. I consider communications his job, so I don't if it has to be specific manage - yes, because the coordinator is actually responsible, to me, as the person that's communicating our strategies and plans, right, so.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: And Juan has been great at following through. Good job.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, so 4 2 5 EC duties -- voting in the EC on the matters listed in section - oh yes, we need to find the EC duties first. Oh, it's 4 2 6. It's right below. So we just say section below, don't we?

Joan Kerr: I just say 4 2 6 so that it's specific. I always like specifics if it's possible.

Raoul Plommer: Right. Okay. It's 4 2 6, the executive committee shall have the following duties. Oh okay, so Juan wants to move it.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I think it should be - yes, I agree. I was going to say, I think we have to establish that beforehand.

Gangadhar Panday: I have a point to make about 4.255.

Joan Kerr: Okay, go ahead -- 4.425 -- yes, go ahead. Go ahead, Gangadhar.

Gangadhar Panday: It is about the only from their regions? Only from their regions? The membership partner that is not involved with (unintelligible) are only the region from where he or she is coming.

Raoul Plommer: Good catch.

Joan Kerr: Good catch.

Gangadhar Panday: Can you hear me?

Joan Kerr: Yes, good - yes, very good catch. Yes, you're right.

Gangadhar Panday: Can you hear me?

Joan Kerr: We can hear you. It's a good catch.

Raoul Plommer: We can hear you, Gangadhar.

Gangadhar Panday: We are mentioning their region. That means the region from where the membership committee he or she is coming.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I took that away...

Gangadhar Panday: Not about the other region.

Joan Kerr: Yes, no, we removed the region. Thank you. That's a good catch.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Now it says...

((Crosstalk))

Gangadhar Panday: The thing on their region, are we (unintelligible) to their region.

Raoul Plommer: No, we took it out. But it was a good catch. You fixed it, Gangadhar. Can you hear us?

Joan Kerr: I don't think he can.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I don't think he can.

Joan Kerr: No. Gangadhar, we removed it. Can you hear me? I typed it in as well.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I think we definitely need to read one more time all this before we can hand it over to anyone.

Joan Kerr: It's good. Thank you so much. Great. All right, so we're at 11:59. What does everybody want to do? We're on till 12. Do we want to reschedule another one?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, when was the next meeting supposed to be?

Joan Kerr: We didn't schedule another meeting for this, but we can.

Raoul Plommer: Right. I think we could just push it to January.

Joan Kerr: Yes. So we're at the 12th today, do you want to do it at the - just before maybe the sixth? Or let me just look at my calendar here.

Raoul Plommer: Second of January would be a Tuesday.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I don't know if I'd be happy with that. How about the ninth?

Raoul Plommer: All right, so the ninth is - yes, ninth is good.



Joan Kerr: Yes, because I know the next couple weeks I, like, from now till then I'm super busy, so, with parties I mean.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, all right. Well, I mean, it's good we get a proper break from this, so everybody will have a final look through and hopefully we get to finish this next time. I don't think there were too many comments towards the end of the document.

Joan Kerr: No. But what we have to do -- Maryam has to do -- is maybe take out some of the election procedural -- which will make it easier as well -- and we would like to review that. So I think it will make it easier the next time. So bye Sam. Thank you so much. Gangadhar, we took it out. So he's suggesting that we take it out from the region. Great, well we'll do that.

So the next meeting is set for this January 9th then. And in that time we'll have the procedural document draft ready and then review the document as well. Is that good?

Raoul Plommer: Sounds good.

Joan Kerr: Yes? Okay and 10 am is good, or 15? Wonderful. So we will see you guys tomorrow then, right? Great, thanks a lot, guys. Great job. This was really exciting, actually. Maryam, yes Maryam, if you could - we're wrapping up the meeting. Thank you.

Gangadhar Panday: Bye everyone. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Ira, you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you so much for your time today. Goodbye everyone.

END