ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
July 25, 2017
10:00 am CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is the NPOC Charter Review call on the 25th July 2017. On the call today we have Gangadhar Panday, Olevie Kouami, Poncelet Ileleji, Raoul Plommer, Remmy Nweke, and from staff you have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. We also have Joan Kerr in the meeting. Thank you very much. Over to you Joan.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you. Can everybody hear me okay?

Man: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Great. Great. Welcome everyone. I'm excited for a second meeting and everyone has been able to join us. Can everyone see the screen because obviously, can we see the Charter? Does everyone see the Charter on the screen?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes we can Joan.

Joan Kerr: Oh okay, great. So last time, Raoul has sort of taken the lead on this. So last time we looked at Point 1 to Point 50. And I think it was left at (unintelligilbe0 and he did respond. He did take a look at it and he was in agreement.

And I see some comments from Raoul, if we want to start with those. And then we can go from there. So over to you Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Should we carry on with 5.0, from then onwards? Or (unintelligible) first?

Joan Kerr: I think that we should, excuse me, see if there's any comments from up to 5.0 and deal with those and then move on.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Sounds good to me.

Joan Kerr: So I'll go up to the top.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Hang on.

Joan Kerr: On my screen I see 1, 1.2

Raoul Plommer: Okay. I think there were a few suggestions by Gangadhar about bold font. I think that's okay. It's nice to look at everything in conformity. And I think the first, next comment is at 3.1.1 where (Swan) has made a comment about a writing problem.

Joan Kerr: Okay, 3.1.2, you're accepting?

Raoul Plommer: 3.1.1

Joan Kerr: There we go. Sorry. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: So 3.1.1?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: It's not refreshing on the Adobe screen for some reason.

Joan Kerr: That's the composition, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, 3.0, the Executive Committee and (unintelligible) conversation and then Juan has made a comment about the committees. I think we all agreed on having just one committee which is the Policy Committee.

Joan Kerr: And the Executive Committee, yes.

Raoul Plommer: Should we add the word committee after the policy development?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So it would be Policy Development Committee Chair?

Joan Kerr: Yes. Yes, that's a good point.

Raoul Plommer: Does everyone agree with that?

Joan Kerr: We can resolve it. Any comments anyone? Disagreements? So we're all agreeing on 3.1 suggestion of having inserted the Committee Chair. Okay, so

we've resolved that one. You'll let me know if anyone has their hand up, right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, Joan, I have my hand up.

Joan Kerr: Okay, I can't see it, so.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, I just raised my hand now.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Go ahead.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, so just a quick one. I was looking at this and thinking about what Juan is saying. So what if you have, instead of Policy Development Committee Chair, what if you have the Policy Development Committee Coordinator as well so that there's just one committee?

Joan Kerr: That makes sense because it must may get very confusing. Yes, because it looks like only they have a committee. So I think everyone is a coordinator of the Executive Committee. That's what we were trying to do.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, and then within the future, to all for formation of groups or committees, it's just the coordinator coordinating groups of people from the committee. I don't know (the progression really).

Joan Kerr: Do you understand, there we go. Yes, that makes sense actually because we're talking about the composition of the Executive Committee under, but that's what we're talking about. But do you understand Raoul and everyone?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think it has to be taken into account here as well.

Joan Kerr: No. What the suggestion is, that we're under 3.0. And we're talking about the composition of the Executive Committee and what it's going to be so everyone is a coordinator off the Executive Committee is what is being said/

Because later we create a policy team on its own. But we're talking about the Executive Committee here so everyone is actually a coordinator.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. I thought the policy development (is with the committee). Or do you think, all right.

Joan Kerr: Do you understand?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Hi. Go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: (Unintelligible) speaking. I was wondering, is it the format of …

Raoul Plommer: We lost you (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) we've lost you.

Poncelet Ileleji: That's the formats we agreed on initially where we had two coordinators for communication and one for PDP committee. Was that not the format of NCUC, when we agreed on that at the last meeting? I just wanted to know.

Joan Kerr: Yes, so I just want to point out a couple of things. We're talking about two separate things. Later we actually talk about the Policy Committee. This one is – keep going. The internet keeps going in and out. Is everyone hearing me okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Oh, okay. So Raoul, I just want to point out this is, we're talking about what the composition is of the Executive Committee itself. We're not talking about the, so who are members of the Executive Committee. Why does that keep happening?

So everyone is a coordinator or whatever we come up with, for them to coordinate the activities of. That's what it is saying.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, so we change these to Policy Development Coordinator?

Joan Kerr: That's right. (Unintelligible) and the Vice Chair. We also coordinate the (unintelligible) because we're trying to streamline it, right. Does that make sense?

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Well …

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry.

Raoul Plommer: Go ahead Maryam.

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry. So it would be Policy Development Committee Coordinator because you have the ...

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible).

Maryam Bakoshi: It is a committee, isn't it?

Joan Kerr: Yes, (unintelligible).

Maryam Bakoshi: Would be a committee. \

Joan Kerr: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: So it would be Policy Development Committee Coordinator.

Joan Kerr: Correct.

Maryam Bakoshi: But it's still a coordinator.

Joan Kerr: But between development and coordinator we need the word committee because we are doing a committee later. So Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. It's just I think because the Policy Development is going to be the only committee, then that might be reflected here as well in the wording of the composition.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: So it would be Policy Development Committee Chair like it used to be because that would be unchanged.

Joan Kerr: To make it easier.

Raoul Plommer: Sort of.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I think it would sort of reflect the change. That's the only, that's the most important sort of area that we are going to do. I think it would emphasize that.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: We could even change the C instead of being D.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Swap members and post (unintelligible). But that's just nitpicking.

Joan Kerr: No, no, I like that because that's where most of our work is going to be, right, so.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: Right. Okay. Is everyone okay with that? So go ahead and change it and let everyone see it? Yes, that's a good point. So we're actually saying the Policy Committee is part of our Executive Committee, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, okay. Because we discussed that as well.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan, sorry. The Policy Committee cannot be part of the Executive Committee. The Policy Committee Chair …

Joan Kerr: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: … is part of the Executive Committee.

Joan Kerr: That's right. Right. And, that's right. I was just going to …

Maryam Bakoshi: So what, yes, so the point I'm trying to make is that for each, okay. So D will be membership coordinator rather than members' coordinator. Wouldn't that be?

Joan Kerr: Yes. I think membership was there before. So Raoul, what …

Raoul Plommer: Should we change membership?

Joan Kerr: Yes, to membership, yes. Yes, but the C, that it is the (unintelligible) that we're looking at, not the committee so it's just the Chair.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that's what it says, Committee Chair.

Joan Kerr: Okay. We could also just say Chair because it's just the person but that's fine. All right. Any other discussions? Like I can't see then hands raised. Oh hi Tapani. I see you've joined us.

Maryam Bakoshi: No, he's just in (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, so I have a question here from Remmy. And he says, please, is there any specific reason that we're reducing the committee to one?

Joan Kerr: Okay. I can answer that but anyone else can answer it? Remmy when we were in, before we went to Johannesburg there were discussions around (MPOC) and how to heavy all of the committees were. And we spent so much time organizing the committees, we weren't doing a lot of work.

And our scope of what we have to do in terms of operational concern was very specific so we started to talk about how to streamline all of the work so that we can get our policy work done. But everyone had agreed on that.

Maryam Bakoshi: Remmy, does that answer your question? Remmy typing. Hold on. Thank you. Another question for Remmy before we go to Poncelet is, I notice Poncelet has his hand up.

He says, the Membership Coordinator, does it mean that this is a membership drive based on education and based on outreach? I don't know if you understand that question or do you want them to clarify?

Joan Kerr: Yes, clarity it. I don't understand it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, while Remmy typing to clarify his question, Poncelet, please go on. Poncelet, you have your hand up. Please speak. Oh, Poncelet's hand is down.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes, this is Poncelet speaking.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead Poncelet.

Poncelet Illeleji: Hello.

Joan Kerr: Hi Poncelet. Go ahead.

Poncelet Illeleji: Can you hear me?

Joan Kerr: Yes, we can hear you. We can't hear you. Poncelet, there's a …

Poncelet Illeleji: Let me, there's a (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: I can't hear, so.

Raoul Plommer: No.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi everyone. If you mute your mike please Joan. If you mute your mike while
                    Poncelet's trying to speak, so I think that would help. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Is my mike not muted?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, your hand held mike. Your phone, I mean.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: Poncelet, unmute your mike now. (Unintelligible). Type your question then
                    please.

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you. So Remmy saying that it's a single person kind of. And is there
                    no plans to engage larger internet committee for outreach because it may not
                    be a one man affair.

So I think what he's trying to say is that shouldn't the membership coordinator be a committee rather than just one person? So he's saying that the Membership Coordinator needs extra help.

Rather than having it as just a single person, then it's a group of people.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I think I heard that. I was trying to unmute. So if I understand it, the question is about the work of the Membership Coordinator, correct, being one person. Am I correct?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's correct.

Joan Kerr: Okay, so we talked about that. And anyone by the way, if you have your hand up just please let me know because I can't see if your hand's up. What we talked about was the Executive Committee, we're going to meet and talk about what the actions are going to be for each coordinator.

And we're, it's not just one person. We're all going to be working at it as a team. So the Membership Committee will be working closely with, the Membership Coordinator will be working closely with the Communications Coordinator.

The Policy Development will be working closely with the communication. And then we track all of those every month. That's sort of the idea at least for the next little while. It's just to get onboard for our policy work. So we thought this was the easiest way of doing it and we agreed on that.

So it's not any one that is responsible. They're responsible to coordinate the activities of the Executive Committee. That's really the best way of putting it.

Maryam Bakoshi. Thank you Joan. Gangadhar your hand is up please. You can go ahead.

Gangadhar Panday: Yes, this is Gangadhar (unintelligible). I guess there is a function to form subcommittees. Can we have small committees for different things if that one person cannot handle it? Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you Gangadhar. Joan, we've got Remmy on the AC Chat. (We've got both members). So I think he means yes, you can recruit members to work on (outreach). I think yes, that's what he's saying basically.

Joan Kerr: Absolutely. Of course we're going to be out for that.

Maryam Bakoshi: And then Poncelet says, the Membership Coordinator will work with the membership base on a program in terms of outreach based on region. That's what I'm trying to explain to Remmy. Okay, Gangadhar.

If you look at Poncelet's explanation as to why there is just a coordinator rather than a committee, I hope that helps. Thank you. Okay, Joan please go ahead. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Yes, thanks. Are we good for the composition then? Have we answered all the questions regarding 3.1 including (Juan's) question? I think we resolved it. Yes? Last call. We're good for 3.1 which reads, composition of the Executive Committee? Is everyone hearing me okay?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, Joan we can hear you but you are not (your screen).

Joan Kerr: Voting officers.

Maryam Bakoshi: We can't see your screen.

Joan Kerr: You can't?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, we can't.

Joan Kerr: Can you now? Is it there now?

Maryam Bakoshi: No.

Joan Kerr: Hmmm. (Unintelligible) could not connect to Adobe. Okay, that's not good. I have no, it's saying it's the – refresh your browser. Okay, I will do that. It looks like there's connection problems with Adobe. But I'm refreshing, so.

So while it's doing that, the composition is Chair, Vice Chair, Policy Development Committee Chair, Membership Coordinator and Communications Coordinator. That's the makeup of the Executive Committee, the two votes. One, two, three, four, five members.

Can you see it now? It's still scrolling. Maryam, can you see the screen at all because I can see it?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, I don't, no not yet.

Joan Kerr: I have no idea.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hmmm, don't know.

Joan Kerr: It just says Adobe Room cannot connect to the Adobe connect server. Please relaunch your meeting room. Okay, well, great. All right. So maybe you'll have to, yes, it can't find the server.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, where are we? Are we good now?

Joan Kerr: No, it's not connecting to Adobe. I'm going to relaunch it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Poncelet, do you have your hand up?

Poncelet Ilelelji: Yes, I have my hand up. Poncelet speaking.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay Poncelet, thank you.

Poncelet Ilelelji: No, I was just trying to say okay, not it's loading. But that was (one piece) of information. When I opened what I had, something was not (dated). What I should (unintelligible) just shared this on the Skype. So that we can open it on our own machines, you know, if the system if going on and off. Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you.

 ((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry Joan. I have just shared the URL in the Adobe Chat and I'm sharing the link right now. Joan, let me know when your thing comes up and then I can stop mine.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, Remmy, that's a good idea. If everyone can just open the (Guru) Doc that would be a lot better. Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes. I have a separate link in the Adobe room.

Joan Kerr: Yes, actually that would be better, if everyone could do that so then I could see who wants to talk. Relaunching. Okay, I'm relaunching it. Seems like its working.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan do you want to go on?

Joan Kerr: Yes. I have no idea what's happening. It's not, it says it's a private meeting and it's been sent to the host. Because I relaunched it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thanks Joan. Raoul you might want to take over the meeting while Joan is trying to do that. Thanks.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, is everyone okay with the 3.1.1 as it is now? Can everyone see that through their Google Talk?

Joan Kerr: Yes, I'm on Google.

Raoul Plommer: So the composition of the Executive Committee is five people. The Chair, Vice Chair, the Chair of the Policy Development Committee, the Membership Coordinator and Communications Coordinator. Those are all like established roles that have certain responsibilities.

And I think that they deserve their own area in the Executive Committee. So there's only five there. We cut it smaller and we really are trying to get the

active people together to work on the Executive Committee for the coming year because we got a lot to do.

But now does everyone agree with the composition?

Joan Kerr: Yes, I do.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I do. This is Joan for the record.

Juan Manuel: Hello. This is Juan. I am already connected?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, we can hear you.

Juan Manuel: Okay, I'm going to put in with (unintelligible). Okay?

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Since there weren't any objections, we move onto 3.1.2.

Joan Kerr: So I'm back in if we want to try the share screen again but if we're good, I'm good too.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan, I would want you to take over sharing the screen, if that's okay.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Share. Okay. Are we shared?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Oh.

Maryam Bakoshi: Juan, if you want to, you let me know on Skype so we don't have interference when someone else is speaking. Please let me know on Skype if you would want to soak and I would let Joan know. Thank you.

Juan Manuel: Okay, I'm not speaking. I'm not available to the reconnect but yes, I need the link for Skype please.

Joan Kerr: Okay. While Maryam's going that, so sorry Raoul. Sorry about that guys. I have no idea what happened. So are we agreeing to, we can pass 3.1 then and move on?

                We're all agreeing to it? And we're resolving the comments in the sidebar? Yes? Calling once. Twice. Three times. So we're passing 31 then. Accepting 3.1 the Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: And then moving onto 3.1.2. Okay, so who is this IT (unintelligible) DSA by the way? Like I don't …

Joan Kerr: That's Remmy.

Poncelet Ilelelji: Hello Raoul, I wanted to ask who is speaking?

Remmy Nweke: Poncelet, it's Remmy.

Raoul Plommer: It's Remmy, okay. And thanks.

Joan Kerr: Okay, 3.1.2. And can we remove the comments as we accept them so that we know that we resolved them. Please.

Man: Okay. So I guess with the new organization, we're only to have, oh, there might be a Vice Chair for the Policy Committee.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Man: But I guess that would really be the only once since we'd only have one committee and executive, on top of the Executive Committee.

Joan Kerr: That's right. So maybe what we should do is have two representatives on the Policy Committee then, the Chair and maybe …

Man: Joan. Technically we already have someone in the Policy Committee in the sense that Joan sits with me within the NCSGPC. So automatically, we can just say, okay, ideally the Coordination Coordinator walks with the Policy Chair within NCSG and then policy affairs.

            Because if we are going to rephrase it that the policy has to have Vice Chair, let it just be standardized. Because within the current structure, there's somebody that, in the NCSGPC, not only one, not only the Chair sits there in that NCSGPC.

            So that would be my suggestion. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Yes. But that's going to change after our meeting this week. The representations will change so we're just dealing with what we have to do. And we'll talk about representation in NCSG separately so.

Man: No, Joan, listen to what I'm saying please. I am talking of the NCSG. Since we already have somebody sitting on the NCSGPC there's already a

procedure whereby it's not only the Chair sitting on the NCSGPC, it's not only the Chair of the policy development process sitting on the NCSG policy committee.

There someone from (MPOC) already sitting there. So we can use that format for 3.1.2 instead of saying the Policy Committee should have another Vice Chair. That's what I'm saying.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan, I have my hand up. Can I?

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead please.

Maryam Bakoshi: Poncelet I don't know if we are mixing both of the NCSG and the NPOC. Now the NCSG is that is by appointment, right. But while the NPOC, then NPOC has a Policy Committee and within that old Policy Committee the old Charter was saying how a Vice Chair and I think eight other people to deem it a committee. So that's what, so three points, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 are not the same thing. Does that help?

Poncelet Ilelelji: Yes, that's very true. It helps. Sorry I was not looking at 3.1.3. I was just looking at it on top. I'm sorry.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, that's okay.

Poncelet Ilelelji: Its okay then. Something is not my statement. Sorry Joan.

Joan Kerr: Okay great. Thanks. We're looking at 3.1.2. Go ahead Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: So okay. I guess the point of this. We don't have any other Vice Chairs at the moment unless there's a Vice Chair in the new Policy Committee. We haven't, I don't think we've decided on that yet.

Joan Kerr: Right. That's, but it would be a good idea to have a Vice Chair representing NPOC and CSG as well, right, so.

Maryam Bakoshi: But we're mixing stuff again. Yes, so let us stick with 3.1.2 which is what Raoul is trying to address, yes.

Man: So basically this is about can other Vice Chairs within NPOC represent NPOC in the capacity of the Chair. That's how I read it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's how I read it as well.

Joan Kerr: Yes, that's correct. So what it's saying is that yes, they're not members of the EC but if for instance something happens to the Chair, for instance, God forbid the Policy Committee Chair, then in the absence of that they can now step in that role.

Maryam Bakoshi: Right. Yes, that's right.

Joan Kerr: So did we not have, Raoul, did you not have the election as a Vice Chair?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So but you're not deemed an officer, that's what we're saying. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: No, I am. I am but none of the others wouldn't be.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: For example, the Policy Committee Vice Chair wouldn't be an officer of (MPOC).

Joan Kerr: Right absolutely.

Maryam Bakoshi: It would be anyone. Okay. Well I agree with that.]

Raoul Plommer: So I guess we'll just leave it there as it is. I think it really doesn't have to even be mentioned but I guess, I mean I think we should just take it out. It's quite obvious that you don't have the same sort of responsibilities as a Policy Committee Vice Chair, as the Vice Chair of the whole MPOC, right?

Maryam Bakoshi: Can I speak Joan, please.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead.

Maryam Bakoshi: Raoul, I think it's quite important to have it. I think things quickly will get blurred when people don't see things in writing, know you're not part of this. Because if I'm Vice Chair it would automatically know if you are part of the Executive Committee. So I think it's safer to have it there.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, let's just leave it then.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I think it makes it very clear about.

Raoul Plommer: Sure. There's a fine balance between trying to make it short and having the essential things. But we'll leave that one.

Joan Kerr: Now are you taking off any other comments that we've resolved because those are the ones that I'd like to look at first always, so. Okay, so we're agreeing to 3.1.2? Everyone is okay with 3.1.2?

Raoul Plommer: Is Remmy okay with it?

Poncelet Ilelelji: Yes, move on Joan. I'm okay. This is Poncelet.

Joan Kerr: Okay, thanks Poncelet. All right, so we're accepting 3.1.2. Okay, 3.1.3 then. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: I think there were no issues about that. So 3.2.1 would be next.

Joan Kerr: All right, so 3.2.1.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think Remmy suggestion is good.

Joan Kerr: Which is?

Raoul Plommer: To rephrase 3.2.1.

Joan Kerr: I didn't see his suggestion. What was it?

Raoul Plommer: It's the, he's using the handle IT (realms) DSA.

Joan Kerr: Oh, I see, okay.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, if you click on the yellow bit, it shows his comment, yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, okay. To manage elections and voting in accordance with the provisions. Oh yes, that's good. I like that wording. You're going to, Raoul, you're going to change it?

Raoul Plommer: I did.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Oh, not quite all of it. Almost.

Joan;   I was just looking for it. I was like okay.

Raoul Plommer: That's it. The next one, 3.2.2.

Joan;   Are you just going to take that off? Is it resolved?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I resolved it.

Joan Kerr: I'll bring up 3.2. Okay, to manage funding, expenditures and provides financial oversight.

Raoul Plommer: Looks good to me.

Joan Kerr: Mm-hmm. So you're changing that as well?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay. And I don't see you editing at all.

Raoul Plommer: No?

Joan Kerr: That's okay as long as it's edited.

Raoul Plommer: You see it?

Joan Kerr: I saw the changes from before, so. Yes, I like that regrouping.

Man: Hello Joan. Please, where are we now? Are we still at 3.2.2?

Joan Kerr: That's correct.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Joan Kerr: We're looking at …

Man: Because I just …

Joan Kerr: We're looking at …

Man: Yes, yes, I'm seeing Raoul deleting stuff.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: No worries.

Raoul Plommer: So 3.2.5, that's where the next comment is. Again, it's like to have the verb to.

Joan Kerr: Saw it. Resolved, yes. Tell me when to move on.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, 3.2.6. In soft copy from hard copy. No.

Joan Kerr: Oh, I don't know if I'd like to keep a hard copy. We archive everything, do we not Maryam? Hello? Maryam?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, the archiving process. Joanne, the archiving process there is correct.

Joan Kerr: Yes, and we take care of, I think we take care of this in that right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, so what is in 3.2.6 is correct except we want to change the lifespan. But this is the usual standard. Yes, I don't think we need to add anything there.

Joan Kerr: No. Okay. Where to next? I don't think there are any hands up so we can move. Where to next Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: Okay, so 3.2.7. Okay. Changing a semi-colon.

Joan Kerr: Yes, great.

Raoul Plommer: Policy development, 3.2.8. Semi-colon.

Joan Kerr: Capitalize or lower case. Different things just to make it look good but we'll work on that later.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: 3.2.9 then.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think we should split it. It does look a bit massive like a ball of text.

Joan Kerr: Yes. A lot of read. So it frees up. Whoa. We're on 3.2.9 everyone. Yes. Maybe a quorum or something.

Raoul Plommer: I don't know if we need to change the numbering or add A's and B's.

Joan Kerr: No, I think that just maybe one hard return.

Man: It's okay like this. We should just paragraph it.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I think we can do a hard return at a quorum of. Okay?

Man: Like a quorum of an semi-colon? Second paragraph?

Joan Kerr: Yes, and just a new paragraph there. I think that would help it as a first one just to give it a breather like Remmy said. Do you see that Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, do you see under the paragraphs? And like (one enter)?

Man: I've done it.

Joan Kerr: Okay. And maybe the next one is all members of the EC, is another hard return. And that will I think help it.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I already …

Joan Kerr: Okay. It's not showing on mine so I'm sorry. I think those three will make it – I don't want to refresh in case it knocks it out, okay?

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Right. Where to next?

Raoul Plommer: I even put one last one starting from the EC officers have the right to …

Joan Kerr: Okay. Great.

Raoul Plommer: … to make it through. Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes. It's just better on the eyes, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that's right.

Joan Kerr: Okay, to 3.2.10.

Raoul Plommer.   Yes, other. I agree with Maryam.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Guess little spaces wouldn't hurt her either.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: On the 3.2.10.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Do we need more? Well in the second draft we can maybe look at that.

Raoul Plommer: Maybe I just put it on 1 and 2 because they're like the biggest chunks.

Man: We just have to rearrange.

Raoul Plommer: Let's concentrate on the wordings now. I guess that's much more important.

Man: Yes, 3.2.10, right?

Joan Kerr: That's correct.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: It really, I think it's pretty clear.

Raoul Plommer: And 3.3.

Joan Kerr: Remmy and Gangadhar, leave your hands up in the AC room. Okay. Sorry. Go ahead Gangadhar. And tell me where to go if you're referring to a section. Hello. I can't hear him. Can you? Hello. Okay, Remmy do you want to go ahead while we wait for Ganga please

Remmy Nweke: (Unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Sorry. 3.2.1?

Raoul Plommer: He wants to say something about the last 3.2.9. Any decision of the EC officers. Go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Gangadhar Panday: Any addition of the officers can be approved to the members or by the members.

Raoul Plommer: Can you write your suggestion in the Google box Gangadhar?

Joan Kerr: Can you write it please Gangadhar?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think Gangadhar is right. It is by. I remember reading that before and feeling weird about it.

Joan Kerr: So I can go to my Skype. What is the suggestion?

Raoul Plommer: That was the suggestion. Any decision of the EC officers can be appealed by the members. It used to be to the members but that didn't make sense.

Joan Kerr: Right. Yes. Yes, very good.

Gangadhar Panday: The word by, yes, that is okay now.

Joan Kerr: Yes, okay. Yes, it's an excellent word. Great. Thank you. All right. Can I go to Remmy now?

Raoul Plommer: Sure.

Joan Kerr: Remmy tell us what you want to address please. Go ahead Remmy. Remmy you may be on mute. I think he's trying to unmute. Okay, until he comes on. The net thing, let us know when you're on. We were at 3.3.

Remmy can you, no, we can't hear him. Can anyone hear him? Maybe if you could write it as well, Remmy, that would maybe help us. Okay, while he's doing that, can we, 3.3 Raoul please?

Raoul Plommer: Okay. So 3.3.4. There was a, it said keep the EC and affiliates informed as to the NCSG actions and decisions. And we think that might be members instead because this is about the treasurer and I don't think he would be informing NCSG and NCUC before, you know, NPOC was informed.

So I think that is really, the treasurer keeps the EC and the members informed, not other affiliates.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Hope that answers Remmy concern.

Joan Kerr: So we've changed all of this and we'll go through the whole document later to make sure we do a find and replace for affiliates.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, Remmy is commenting on the Adobe.

Joan Kerr: Could you read it? I can't see it.

Raoul Plommer: Actually, we've gone through most of it now I think. Yes. So…

Joan Kerr: What was his comments?

Raoul Plommer: It was about that means different things appeal to members than by members. It was to the earlier point.

Joan Kerr: Okay, great. Thanks. Thanks, Remmy.

Raoul Plommer: So then it would be 4.0. Brand new number. Here -- okay, so I remember now doing this where I'm putting not appropriate, I basically use that where it says some committee that is now abolished in the new version. So I'm basically less than blank. I don't know if we need to keep the list of those but I guess that was part of the reason why we get rid of the committee so that basically we can take all these rules out apart from the policy development committee.

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) have defined the duties of each coordinating body.

Raoul Plommer: I don't think that's the job for the charter, at least for a committee that doesn't actually exist.

Joan Kerr: We can define it. Coordinating is pretty easy to do. You're coordinating what the action is, right? So…

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So what was Remmy's concerns, where are the committees or have it be abolished. If this assumption is correct then 4.0 should be rephrased. Okay, operating committee. Oh, I see. The following are formal operating committees with permanent duties -- oh I see. So we have to change that is what he's saying, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Well, actually, instead of having not appropriate at 4.1 we should move the policy development committee here because it's going to be the only operating committee.

Joan Kerr: Right. So we have to say with the exception of the policy committee, right?

Raoul Plommer: Something like that, yes.

Joan Kerr: Or the only operating committee is the policy committee is really what it is.
                    So we can work on that wording too. Why don't we highlight that and you
                    and I can work on the wording of that for the next meeting, Raoul.

Raoul Plommer: Of the policy development?

Joan Kerr: 4.0 because it's a number of things that we have to discuss there. There's an
                    assumption that there's only one committee but we have to word it that there
                    are no other committees.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, yes, I'll make a comment here. And then I think I will just copy/paste
                    the policy development committee stuff.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Here, change the numbers.

Joan Kerr: Are you going to do that now?

Raoul Plommer: I'll just do it now, yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay, go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: Oh, actually, we -- if you now have a look at the 4.12, I think we need to think
                    about C or then we need more members to our policy committee.

Joan Kerr: That's what I was saying that you and I probably could work on 4.0 and then bring it back for the next -- so it can go through each of those.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: Because that's going to take a bit of work. Is that okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So I'm just going to put it down as something to do for you and I and then we can bring it back to the committee next time, okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, so we can go onwards. Hang on.

Joan Kerr: So that's a to do for you and I. All right, tell me where to go on the document.

Poncelet Ileleji: Excuse me, it's Poncelet speaking. You moved back too far. Now, we are back to where we stopped at 10.

Raoul Plommer: We're now at 4.4.2.

Joan Kerr: Poncelet?

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes, I'm hearing you. Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay, great. What we've decided that 4.0 needs…

Poncelet Ileleji: No, I got that. I just got -- I got that.

Joan Kerr: So we're at 4.2 now just because of our comments.

Raoul Plommer: 4.4.2 and it's just a semicolon. And now, we're back to 5 again. Okay.

Joan Kerr: Replace 3 with 2. Okay. Do you see 4.4?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, no, 5.1.1. And I have to admit, I didn't check what NCUC and NTSG has on that. Did somebody else?

Joan Kerr: I didn't check it but we'll leave it and check it for next week then.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Right. So then we are at D, 5.1.1 D. That's the last thing we pasted there.

Joan Kerr: Be it local, regional, or international; is that the one?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that's the one.

Joan Kerr: And then the word or.

Raoul Plommer: All right, yes, this had to do with -- right, because this is policies and procedures governing members. So this is about members' eligibility and now, we need to think if we want those individuals who are experts but don't represent an organization to be able to join MPOC as a member.

Joan Kerr: Right. And that was a wording that we were trying to - it was a wording that was used I think to distinguish them, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, demonstrable expertise. I think that was something that was…

Joan Kerr: Yes, or individuals with demonstrable expertise, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Man 1:   Excuse me, this is (unintelligible) speaking.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead.

Man 1:   Do we need to separate not for profit and non-commercial in this issue, in this paragraph or you can just put only non-commercial organizations?

Joan Kerr: So eliminate the not for profit, you mean?

Man 1:   Yes, because we are separating not for profit and non-commercial and for me, it's the same but maybe I'm wrong, right?

Joan Kerr: And we're trying to be a non-commercial.

((Crosstalk))

Man 1:   Non-commercial.

Raoul Plommer: I can go with that.

Joan Kerr: And we haven't changed the name as well. That was something that we had to address.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, should we leave it until then?

Joan Kerr: Yes, and I'm just going to make a note that we need to go back -- that's a good point, one, we go back and change it once we have the name. I think we

should leave it until we do that just so that we don't look silly in terms of having it in the names. So that's 5.1.1 D, name. I wrote it down so that we don't forget. Okay. All right, did you add the individual, Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: I did a comment there.

Joan Kerr: Okay. All right, where to next?

Raoul Plommer: It's individuals with demonstrable expertise on the area. The wording on the end there, like on the 00 needs to be something to reflect that it's demonstrable expertise in the area that MPOC works with.

Joan Kerr: Or the MPOC's priority areas.

Raoul Plommer: Sounds good.

Joan Kerr: And just a note from our meeting in Johannesburg, we were looking at what was the meaning of fair and efficient, and I was to contact Kathy who contacted Marie-Laure, and I did that, and they said -- Marie-Laure says she doesn't remember but it's up to us to change it now. So I think -- so I just wanted you to know that I did follow-up with that.

Man 1: What did you see? Marie-laure says she doesn't remember.

Joan Kerr: She said that it was Allen that wrote most of it with Avri but -- so Allen was actually the main writer of the last charter.

Man 1: Yes, the last charter was Allen that most of the ideas.

Joan Kerr: Right, and what she suggested was that it's a different time now and that it's probably not even applicable but she doesn't even remember what that meant at the time. So that's what we know.

Raoul Plommer: Can you see the wording Joan, all individuals with demonstrable expertise in MPOC's priority areas and should we refer those priority areas to our was it scope where they list quite a few of these areas.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: But maybe we should restrict it to those because those might get old at some point.

Joan Kerr: Yes, such as those listed, right?

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Man 1: Can we use the word can include those listed just for future?

Joan Kerr: Yes, and maybe that's something we should put in the scope too is that as issues come up that we will address it somehow, right, operational concerns.

Raoul Plommer: It was 1.2.2. Hang on. I'm just going to…

Joan Kerr: I can't see it, but if I refresh, I will, but I might lose you and so if I refresh later, I'll see it and we'll have to go through them again anyway.

Man 1: Raoul, where did you put it?

Raoul Plommer: 5.1.1 D at the end.

Man 1:   Okay, I've seen it be a local, regional, or international not for profit, or in non-commercial organization, or individual with the most (unintelligible) expertise in…

Joan Kerr: MPOC's priority areas.

Man 1:   Yes, it makes sense.

Raoul Plommer: And that actually gives us something that is different to NCUC too because you need to be a registrant to a domain to be able to be part of NCUC. So this is something that we can have a member in ICANN who doesn't even own a domain.

Joan Kerr: Right, they could be -- yes, and they just want to help us. Okay.

Man 1:   But that's not going to be likely the case because within our operational concerns, we are looking at DMS. It made the wording and everything sound good but it's not going to be likely the case. But the expertise is important, the expertise in priority areas.

Joan Kerr: All right, where to next?

Raoul Plommer: So I guess we add the -- oh, we probably need to leave out E.

Man 1:   I think delete E.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan, we have Remmy and Gangadhar waiting to make a comment. Remmy and then Gangadhar.

Joan Kerr: Okay, great.

Raoul Plommer: Go ahead Remmy.

Joan Kerr: Remmy? I can't hear him.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, Gangadhar please and then I'll read Remmy's comment.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead Gangadhar.

Gangadhar Panday: (Unintelligible) 1.2.2 so I've seen that the web session can be mentioning GTLD and then we are really restricting this call. I somehow have a feeling that this is more wider, this is more open.

Joan Kerr: What number are you talking about?

Gangadhar Panday: The (unintelligible) that you are defined in 1.2.2 which you are mentioning (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: But we're at 5.1.1 now.

Joan Kerr: We've already defined those. 1.2.2 what is the concern, Gangadhar?

Gangadhar Panday: (Unintelligible) mentioning GTLD, we are restricting -- making the scope very narrow. I feel it has to be a bit more open or we should have something to add (unintelligible) also.

Joan Kerr: But our scope is narrow. So what are you suggesting to put in and replace?

Gangadhar Panday: Something to take care of any future contingent residual heading or some other things. We should have some scope there to expand it in case we need to.

Raoul Plommer: We can expand it in the future. The ones that are there are the kind of solid ones that we feel that we can really work on and something that won't be knocked down when the review of this charter happens.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay scope (unintelligible) expansion.

Raoul Plommer: I don't think we restricted ourselves to those. We can do other things as well.

Gangadhar Panday: Okay. So I have added there this words but not limited to.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Add a comment there. We'll return that next charter call but we need to work on the same point. We can't start jumping to one and the next. So we need to work on the 5.1.1. You can leave a comment there now and we'll come back to it next meeting, okay?

Joan Kerr: Yes, we're on 5.1.1 and…

Raoul Plommer: That's right, on E. So basically, we'll be -- we wouldn't have this expertise clause here again.

Joan Kerr: Right, because we're including it in D, correct?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that's right for individuals. Now, Maryam, did Remmy write something or did we get through to him? He was on -- he had a point to make earlier on 5.1.1?

Maryam Bakoshi: Just a second. I'm just trying to see if Remmy can come on now.

Remmy: Yes, I can hear you.

Joan Kerr: Okay, great. Go ahead. We're on 5.1.1. Is that what you're addressing?

Remmy: Yes beside the (unintelligible) from time to time (unintelligible).

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, Remmy. Joan, Remmy is saying to please (unintelligible) the chat from time to time because he has -- and other people are making comments there. Thanks Remmy. I think Joan is sharing her screen so she might not see it quickly but I will read out comments as they come in. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Any comments right now? Are there any comments Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, no, thank you, Joan.

Joan Kerr: Great. All right, so we're taking out E and adding the individual to D. Are we good with 5.1.1?

Raoul Plommer: No, there's still more. There's like F, G, H, I.

Joan Kerr: Hold on. I don't have that on mine.

Raoul Plommer: If you just scroll down.

Joan Kerr: No, mine goes right to 5.2.

Raoul Plommer: On the left side, Joan.

Joan Kerr: It's on the left side, yes. Okay, sorry. All right, so -- oh, I see what you're saying. I was going to say, all right. F. Own at least one domain name and maintain (unintelligible) web presence.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, so I think I have a suspicion that might be in the GNSO rules or in the ICANN member rules, something like that. But we need to check that out.

Joan Kerr: Actually, when we did approve membership that's an (unintelligible) for MPOC, they have to have at least own one.

Raoul Plommer: Right, but so that's something that we will continue to have as a requirement. Is that necessary?

Joan Kerr: Yes, it is.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: And that becomes E now, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Then the left side it's -- well, I added F, acknowledge the relevance and importance of ICANN related matters. Fair enough.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: What about the last two?

Joan Kerr: Okay, so H, it should be a given but it's already set out. Do we have to say it? This is H. I don't know if we have to say it business that's just me. What does anyone else think? What I would do is (unintelligible) and highlight…

Raoul Plommer: It's fine, Joan. It's fine.

Joan Kerr: It's fine. You want to put it into the new one?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay, all right, so we can have that one and for sure I we should have.

Raoul Plommer: Not for profit or non-commercial organizations.

Joan Kerr: Well, the most countries it's a not for profit but just put slash non-commercial. But the entity is actually incorporated as not for profit.

Raoul Plommer: I don't know. We've been using both terms and I think non-commercial includes not for profit but I guess that's again one point where we need to think which we're going to have or we need to have both.

Joan Kerr: Yes, just put both for now until we've decided.

Raoul Plommer: At least we got rid of one of them.

Maryam Bakoshi: Remmy raised in the Adobe Connect Room.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead, Remmy.

Remmy: I was thinking that I wanted to add to what you just said. The (unintelligible) for now for consensus (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Remmy: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes, Maryam, what did Remmy say? I can't hear him.

Remmy: Hi, Joan.

Joan Kerr: Hi, go ahead.

Maryam Bakoshi: Remmy please could you repeat so that Joan can hear what you say.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I didn't hear you, sorry.

Raoul Plommer: Nor did I.

Remmy: Can you hear me now?

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead.

Remmy: Yes, I was saying that the (unintelligible) for now for consistency.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, sorry, Remmy is saying to retain both so non-commercial and not for profit for now for consistency purposes.

Joan Kerr: He's agreeing?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, he's agreeing.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Great. Thank you Remmy. It's a good thing to have both.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. So 5.1.2 then. A long one.

Joan Kerr: So we can copy that but remember to use the word member at the end of the first (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: As a member, yes.

Joan Kerr: And A, commercial (unintelligible) a for profit motive include consultants. So we're defining what they are. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, in eligible organizations and the list is non-exhaustive so that's a good thing.

Joan Kerr: Right. Do we have to say all of that or just can we have a broad statement that says more for streamlining?

Raoul Plommer: I think it's better to have that.

Joan Kerr: It seems like they all should be there so that somebody can argue that they should.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. So this gives us a real short hand. If it's in the charter, it's easy to point out straight away and it won't be even a debate.

Joan Kerr: That's right. No, I agree. Okay. Just going to copy those over. And number E also has the word affiliates.

Raoul Plommer: Groups not chartered to support non-commercial interest users as described. There, right, got it.

Joan Kerr: I'm just going to put down one of the things we have to do is find and search for affiliate.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So we don't have to worry -- and replace. So easy to miss them. Okay, all right.

Raoul Plommer: So okay, an entity, which does not fall based upon a review and determination by the members committee. So there's a committee now there. So should we change it to coordinator?

Joan Kerr: Yes. Good spot.

Raoul Plommer: Members coordinator?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: I think we now need to check what's at 5.9 or if there's anything there.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I wrote it down.

Raoul Plommer: And there's not. And that's a big one. Oh, wow.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So just highlight that so we don't forget to do that one too, just to check.

Raoul Plommer: You made a note of that?

Joan Kerr: Yes, I did.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. 5.9 is a long one but I think we should carry on with this one first.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I wrote it down to double check.

Raoul Plommer: Cool.

Joan Kerr: Yes, and we'll just go through that later. Okay, 5.1.2. Again, non-voting members.

Raoul Plommer: That should be in its own box actually and 5.1.4 is out of its box as well. Hang on.

Joan Kerr: So we have about 15 minutes left, is that correct, Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's correct, Joan.

Joan Kerr: So we probably should just focus on the 5.1 and get that done and then we have some duties to do for all of those and everyone else can -- we can look at the rest of it. Are you creating the box for it now?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Regarding 5.1.3, other than the word affiliates, anyone has any comments on 5.1.3 which has also A and B associated with it. Any comments from anyone while Raoul is creating the table? No. Any hands up? We're good.

Maryam Bakoshi: No hands up in the room.

Joan Kerr: It's pretty clear.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. So that looks better again.

Joan Kerr: A comment for 5.1.3 other than the word affiliates has to be changed. 5.1.4, can we go to that one, which is just one sentence.

Raoul Plommer: I just changed affiliates because the thing is now I remember why we didn't do it last time because it would change it from the other side as well and we don't want that change. So 5.2.1 then or actually did we go through all these 5.1.3?

Joan Kerr: Yes, there are no comments. It had to be changed but I think it's pretty straightforward. We're saying what the eligible voting or non-voting members.

Raoul Plommer: Right. All right, sounds good.

Joan Kerr: 5.2.1. I think these are the (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Uh-huh.

Joan Kerr: And (unintelligible) categories as well and everyone was okay with the categories. We defined what they meant.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, this is something new that we changed.

Joan Kerr: That's right. Any concerns, objections, comments. 5.2.2. Move up. 5.2.3, colon, not full stops please. Oh, I see. Okay. Colon at voting, I guess, voting status and you are clicking off the resolve when we resolve them. Right, Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: What's that? Yes, I'm resolving them.

Joan Kerr: To take them off the comments, right, so we know that later we don't have to deal with them. Okay, great. I don't know why my screen is…

Maryam Bakoshi: Remmy's hand is up in the Adobe room.

Joan Kerr: Go ahead Remmy please.

Remmy: Thank you, Joan. I wanted to ask would it be (unintelligible). Hello?

Joan Kerr: Are you asking about 5.2.2?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, correct.

Joan Kerr: Sorry, go ahead.

Remmy: I was asking how do we actually (unintelligible) employment (unintelligible) depending on the number of (unintelligible) we cannot (unintelligible) quickly (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Maryam, I couldn't hear very well. Sorry.

Maryam Bakoshi: I think what Remmy was trying to ask if have organizations take one vote and members take one vote. Is that correct, Remmy?

Remmy: The organization take two votes…

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Say that again, Remmy.

Remmy: How do we decide the classification of organization? How do we decide (unintelligible)?

Maryam Bakoshi: If we can't (unintelligible) verified we usually go by their word. So when they're filling out the NCS application forms, it would ask if you're an organization with under 25 employees and any of those things. And so you would have to -- we'd have to just go by your word which organization, whether you're large or small.

Joan Kerr: It's asked at the application process.

Remmy: Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thanks. Okay, so we're at 5.2.3. There was a semicolon at MPOC. You changed that already, Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, which one?

Joan Kerr: 5.2.3, participation and voting status has a semicolon instead of a period.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I did change that.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: I was thinking actually on 5.2.2, where it says that organizations shall be classified as large organizations, if -- and the second one has membership organizations with more than 250 individual members. So basically, that's different than having an organization with 250 individual members, right?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's correct. Do you want me to answer that question?

Raoul Plommer: Go on.

Maryam Bakoshi: So basically, there are some organizations that have just employees and there are other organizations that have members who have employees, if that makes sense. So that's a difference in (unintelligible) organization.

Raoul Plommer: But see, where it says has membership organizations with more than -- should we say just has more than 250 individual members, like it's in the first one. It has more than 25 employees.

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry, Raoul, I don't understand either.

Joan Kerr: I don't either.

Maryam Bakoshi: (Unintelligible) organizations classified as large if one of the conditions is that it has more than 25 employees or has membership organizations with more than 250 individual members. So we can have (unintelligible) employees or it can have two organizations that have more than or one organization that has more than 250 individual members.

Raoul Plommer: So that's what I mean. So then that organization needs to have at least two membership organizations which have 250 individual members each at least.

Maryam Bakoshi: Not necessarily. So it can have just one that has 250 members.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, let's take an example of Open (unintelligible). It has 350 members or 400 by now. So does that fall into large organization because it doesn't have membership organizations within it. I think that's just a strange wording because in the first one, it's really clear. It has more than 25 employees so I think we should use the same here and it says has more than 250 individual members.

Joan Kerr: I see what you're saying because it says membership organization. So yes.

Raoul Plommer: So I think it would just make it a lot clearer if I just take it out.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So it would be like that.

Joan Kerr: But we could also say if -- no, you're right. Let's just do it because it just makes it interpretive, right?

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, so how do you (unintelligible) for organizational members as well?

Joan Kerr: How I read number two, so category A or category one, two, I read it that say, for example, the Red Cross, it's a membership organization that -- I don't know, I think how Raoul says it will be much, much simpler.

Maryam Bakoshi: I understand what you're saying, Joan, but for instance, number three says it is comprised of five or more organizational members. So if those organizational

members have one employee or one member each, it wouldn't make it a large organization.

Raoul Plommer: No, they would be organizational members so those members of our member organizations would have to have their own members. See what I mean? It's like organizations under an organization.

Poncelet Ileleji: Exactly, like, and for example, in YMCA -- hello?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, go ahead (unintelligible).

Poncelet Ileleji: Like for example in -- hello?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, we can hear you.

Raoul Plommer: We can hear you.

Poncelet Ileleji: Like for example in YMCA's (unintelligible) to be in another world alliance you have to have like 5,000 members. So it's within line of how our own is like the member organizations of MPOC have to have X amount of members, not like so you will have somebody like a one man NGO joining MPOC. Something like that. Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Poncelet, I don't think that's what that part is saying. You can have a one man NGO joining MPOC and he will be a small organization.

Poncelet Ileleji: Okay, Maryam, let me rebut. So what do you want to change it to? I didn't get what you want it to sound like.

Maryam Bakoshi: I'm not sure so I'm trying to tease out what Raoul is saying because I'm really not sure. So what we did was take this from the NCSG tracker and I think it's better we just go back there and understand what it's saying and then we can, rather than changing it here, and then again, like (Raul's) example is make it better. But take what we have from the NCSG and improve on it.

Joan Kerr: So Raoul what exactly what your concern with point two?

Raoul Plommer: The wording was -- it was like that you would need more than one organization sort of under that organization. That's what the one was like. Now, I think it's really clear. You're a large organization in our eyes if you have 25 employees or 250 individual members. I think that's really clear and now (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: I agree.

Raoul Plommer: And the third one is now -- it is comprised of five or more organizational members.

Joan Kerr: I agree.

Raoul Plommer: So for example, it would be like YMCA, like Poncelet was saying, that has -- or ALAC structures, that sort of thing. So then we would be talking about an organization that has organizations within them and I think you don't really get exceptions for those. They're always large.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I agree. I think it's clearer how you say it because then it would be like an association almost to have that kind of membership organizations under you, right.

Raoul Plommer: That's right, yes.

Joan Kerr: No, let's change it. I agree. I think it will be much clearer.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, Joan and Raoul and everyone, I have (unintelligible) what is there in the NCSG charter and yes, it can always be improved on, but that's what the NCSG charter says.

Joan Kerr: But we're saying an organization that has more than 250 individual members. That's all we're saying, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes and we don't want to be exactly like NCUC anyway.

Raoul Plommer: No.

Joan Kerr: So we'll change that one and then we can revisit it later.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: I think our time is almost up.

Raoul Plommer: That's right, yes.

Joan Kerr: So what's a task?

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan, my hand is up. Sorry, just a quick one. Raoul, if you look at the NCSG charter that (unintelligible) copied I think what the problem was that we didn't copy the whole thing properly because it says, B, organizations that are

composed of ten or more organizational members that qualify as large under criterion A above shall be classified as large organizations. So I think because we didn't copy the whole thing, it didn't make sense.

Joan Kerr: I'm going to put an accent to revisit and to really think about what it is that we're trying to say there. How's that? I put it on (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Because that one looks like it's going to be (unintelligible). So I have some actions for things that we have to look at, some of them included from last time. If everyone could also go through it again (unintelligible) anything that we resolved this time, new comments, and we should highlight as much as possible Raoul, all the things that we've already agreed on, so (unintelligible) and then the next time is to schedule another meeting for next meeting.

Raoul Plommer: Well, I mean, so far, we really agreed until 5.2.2.

Joan Kerr: No, it's great.

Poncelet Ileleji: 5.2.2. that's where I stopped, yes.

Joan Kerr: Great.

Raoul Plommer: So we get back on that next week, same time, same channel.

Joan Kerr: That sounds good to me. That's great. I think we're doing really great guys. So next week, Maryam, you'll send out the reminder again and continue on.

Maryam Bakoshi: Sure.

Raoul Plommer: We're learning a routine on this as well now.

Joan Kerr: Yes, it's getting better and it was better to phone in using the phones, right Maryam?

Raoul Plommer: Definitely. We'll do that next time each of us.

Joan Kerr: Yes, and I apologize. If I have the charter on the screen, I can't see the other activities.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan, I'll show you the next time how to do that. You should be able to see all the things that are happening in the chat room as well, but I will share my screen with you on our next one-to-one call and I'll show you how to do that.

Joan Kerr: That would be wonderful because I hesitate to go because I know, oh my God. Okay, great, that would be wonderful. Okay, great, guys. Thanks a lot.

Raoul Plommer: Thanks everyone.

Joan Kerr: Bye.

                              END