ICANN

Moderator: Terri Agnew
January 12, 2017
9:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Non Contracted Party's House Intercessional Planning call held on the 12th of January, 2017. On the call today we have Chris Wilson, Edward Morris, Greg Shatan, Joan Kerr, Kathy Kleiman, Klaus Stoll, Poncelet Ileleji, Tapani Tarvainen, Tatiana Tropina, Tony Holmes.

On the phone bridge we have Renata Aquino. And as ICANN staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Benedetta Rossi, Maryam Bakoshi, and myself, Ozan Sahin. We have received apologies from Barbara Wanner, Matthew Shears, Farzaneh Badii and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and Lori Schulman will be joining late. And we have also received apologies from Chantelle Doerksen.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Ozan. And thank you, Greg Shatan, for noting that you have joined us as well and it's perfect timing. I think we now do have

representation from the various groups. And thanks for noting the apologies as well. I did communicate both briefly with Wolf-Ulrich letting him know that I'd like him to say something about his proposal so I'll try to arrange the agenda so we don't get to that until he joins us.

Fairly straightforward approach as we've done with our past calls, just give you a quick logistics update. There have been a couple of developments there that I wanted to run by you all, and I may ask your help on that, Tapani. And then wanted to focus on the programming discussion list.

We did a good job, I think, on our last call of narrowing the list and in intervening week we've gotten some additional supporting information about one of the sessions and two additional suggestions for sessions, one of which would fit into one of the slots that we already have set up. So I'll look forward to hearing everybody's input not only where we are with the formerly suggested sessions but also with respect to the new sessions that have been asked about.

Is there anything else that anyone would like to add to the agenda in terms of particular items or topics? Great, hearing nothing we'll proceed with this and then, you know, time permitting, hop onto any other business.

On the logistics front there are just a couple of things that I wanted to flag for you all. One was the participation of our CEO, Göran Marby. I should know, as I indicated in the version 3.0 of the framework document, that we should know by the end of this week whether Göran will be able to join us. We're still looking at the possibility of him being able to participate at the meeting in person. But I'll have a better idea at the end of this week. I hope tomorrow, and no later than early next week, certainly by our next call we'll be able to know or confirm that. So that's in process.

I did ask you all to share with me any particular follow up or interest you had in Jamie Hedlund participating. I think I'd indicated to you all last week that I had reached out to him. He is interested if anyone would like him to participate in the meeting, to participate remotely. I don't know if that ends up being an overall session. I was detecting some waning interest in that on our last call but if that is renewed or if just during one of your breakout sessions or multiple breakout sessions a number of you wanted him to share a few remarks with you then we would certainly work to arrange that.

His initial feedback to me was what I had suspected when we talked about this before, he's very interested in hearing what you want him to be focused on and talking about so he views is as potentially a really good opportunity to hear from you as members of the community to talk about that a bit.

Greg, you put your hand up perhaps to make a comment about Jamie, so let me turn the floor over to you for a moment.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I, for one, would be interested in having Jamie participate. I think we need to firm up the schedule a little more to make sure that we have an appropriate time slot. To my mind, the primary point of the meeting is, you know, to interact with the other members of the house. At the same time, though, it – I think interacting over the topics that Jamie is taking over and with Jamie and with each other, could be a fruitful, both for Jamie and for ourselves. So I would be in favor of that.

And just while I have the mic, a completely random question but it does fall under logistics, is there going to be remote participation for members of the NCPH who are not at the table, so to speak?

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Greg, for the comments. I'll look to get further support for interest in Jamie to see whether you all want to move that to a general session or not, but I'll certainly express the interest that the IPC has in a conversation with him.

In general, in terms of remote participation by senior staff, I think we're going to be looking at, from a scheduling standpoint, afternoon sessions simply because of the time zone difference between Iceland and Los Angeles, and in particular Jamie is spending a lot of time out there these days now just, you know, getting up to speed with his team and the rest so that's likely where he will be during that time period.

In terms of other remote participation, we are setting this up as we have for you on – at past meetings to be live transmitting this information on an Adobe Connect room so that people will be able to observe remotely. We aren't going to be able to have the cameras set up, it's now becoming standard practice at the ICANN public meetings, where the camera is slaved to the microphones. So we're literally – everybody who's talking, you know, gets a nice headshot.

But we will have some cameras in the room that can show the overall perspective, somewhat like we did in past meetings, so that people feel a little connection with what's going on and they don't feel completely empty with just voices – disembodied voices on a phone. So we will have that capability.

In the past, the way you've all liked to operate is to have the focus be on the conversations in the room with observers having the opportunity to comment with you through instant messaging or making comments in the chat. But we aren't anticipating live interventions from folks who are just observing. Just having those live interventions remotely from people who are on the agenda

for a particular meeting or who are making a presentation. I hope that answered the – your questions on that, Greg.

I note that your hand is still up and if you have another question, I will entertain it or if you just want to lower that, that would be great. Thanks. The – and I see in the chat, Chris, you're agreeing regarding the meeting with Jamie. I'll scroll back up and see what that dialogue was.

The other thing that I wanted to raise, and this is something that Tapani and I have had a couple of correspondence strings back and forth on, is that apparently, and I don't know whether it's the location, the fact that we're now in a new era of ICANN after the transition, but there has been a significant amount of interest from Board members about this meeting.

And I understand that some of them have reached out to individual community leaders indicating their interest in attending or otherwise observing the meeting itself. The way things have been set up in the past is we generally, you know, put out the information about this meeting broadly from a transparency perspective. And we've had many different types of people actually observing the conversations from afar in the AC room, not participating.

But what I wanted to flush out and give you all an opportunity to explore was in addition to Markus, if you have – who you have specifically invited – but if there are other members of the Board who are traveling through that region of the world during that time who want to drop by, observe, sit in, learn more about your community, would you all be open to that? And would you either like me to extend an invitation or otherwise not dissuade someone who says, hey, I'm going to be in the neighborhood, can I drop by?

I'm very interested in that perspective because as I'm famous for telling you all on a regular basis, this is your meeting. We as staff are not here to make the decisions but to facilitate it. Nevertheless, we are trying to facilitate it within the parameters of the planning process. And we might be able to squeeze a couple of Board observers in as specially acknowledged guests.

I note to a number of you I have pushed back when you've said well, we'll pay, you know, or someone is going to pay their own way to show up and join our delegation. And we've been very strict about that. But I'm interested in any reactions from any of you in terms of potential Board participation in the meeting.

And, Tapani, I'll turn the microphone over to you if you wanted to over some context or where some of these requests or expressions of interest have come from.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Rob. Can you hear me?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, sir.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I was indeed contacted by two Board members, George Sadowsky and Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and basically asking if I would object if they attend the meeting. I'm not sure if they have contacted anybody else. And I have no – not much detail why they would want to interest other than just to observe what's going on. But I do not see any problem with them attending. So nor any reason to say that, no, we don't want you in.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you…

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: I actually assumed that they had been in touch with other – with CSG as well but I'm not sure if that is the case. So anyway, I don't really know much more than that.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I don't know if your – I saw some positive responses from Tony, Chris and Vicky in terms of, you know, the welcome of having that observation and maybe contributing to a conversation or a session. Farzaneh asked the question, why do they want to attend? I think she was typing that as you were saying, Tapani, you're not quite sure the motivations other than, you know, what I pick up from time to time with members of the Board, and actually I chatted briefly with Markus about this yesterday.

I think there's just a general desire on the part of many Board members to understand the community better. And they see that as an opportunity to stick their head in or to sit in for a length period of time, they like to try to do that. And I'm just conscious of dynamics and what you all want to accomplish. To the extent of the feedback I'm getting right now is that you all are comfortable about that, then I'm not going to, you know, necessarily reach out and invite somebody but if someone expresses an interest we will certainly entertain that and help facilitate their attendance.

Kathy, I see that you had raised a hand, I hope to comment on this in general so I'll turn the floor and microphone over to you.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thanks, Rob. Can you hear me?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I can. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, terrific. Good morning, good afternoon everybody. Yes, I join Farzi in asking, you know, I love these Board members, but this isn't the community, this is kind of some select representatives of the community who have been brought together to build bridges, explore issues. I think the dynamic will change. You know, having been a veteran of other intercessionals, I've always really valued kind of, you know, the candor of two days. Yes, we've invited people into the room to talk to us like Fadi, but we've also had the conversations with the room closed.

And but this isn't really the community. If the Board members want to see our communities that's, you know, Constituency Day, that's, you know, the PDPs where we're actively involved in the policy development. I'm not sure what they're observing here because this isn't, you know, we have many key people who won't be here. And so I'm not – this isn't the full community. So I feel a little odd. I think it will change the dynamic a lot. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Kathy. I have a comment but let me reserve it for Vicky because she raised her hand, and, Vicky you're next in the queue, you have the floor.

Vicky Scheckler: Thank you. I appreciate what Kathy is saying. My initial reaction to it, though, is that if the Board members want to have more interaction, you know, with different members of the community to better understand their different viewpoints, that's something that I think we ought to consider welcoming.

But, I fully appreciate what Kathy is saying in terms of perhaps not for the entire meeting and only to observer certain parts of it or to have them come in the way we're hoping that Göran will come in, to speak to us for a little bit. So maybe there's a way to structure it so that if they want to come we can have some discussions with them. But perhaps not every session, as Kathy is suggesting.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks for those comments. The one comment I wanted to share and offer was you've always had a Board member in the room, obviously that's in the case been the Board member selected by the community. And so Markus has been at the last several – or last couple meetings. So we've had that dynamic. But, yes, you're right that additional members would participate. And you have specifically invited Markus as well as Erika and Julf as the NCAs to participate in your conversation.

I'm interested in additional comments and feedback because I'm likely to be the one that somebody calls. But any one of you could also be called in terms of saying, hi, when is the meeting and what's going on? What I had done with Göran and I will do that for anyone else who expresses an interest from the Board in participating, is – and I think a number of you have seen it – I basically have an initial summary of what the meeting is, what the history of it is, we have information posted on the wiki about the meeting. I generally direct interested parties to that to give them some background.

So I just wanted to make that observation. I'm double checking the chat here. For those not in the room, Ed says, "Frankly, I'd rather invite the GNSO Council Chair, community members than extra Board members." "Considering the meeting is available for all to observe." Chris Wilson says, "Remotely I see nothing wrong with Board members observing in person."

Farzaneh would like Markus there but not sure about others. Lori, "As of October 1, the community is part of the corporation."

Well, if you all could, I mean, I'm interested in other comments and observations. I note that Greg has put his hand up on that. And as usual, the logistics section of our conversation takes over half the call, which is fine with me. Just making that observation, because I think this is an important point.

I want to be in the position to with some clarity if asked, say no, you're not welcome, or yes, you're welcome for this period of time. So I do want to see if we can drive to a conclusion or a consensus on this. Greg, you've raised your hand and I'll turn the floor over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan. I almost feel like I should apologize for talking rather than typing, but in any case since it's a phone call I thought I would talk. I think my view is probably closer to Vicky's but also maybe, you know, somewhere between Vicky and Lori. And I think that there may be a – some sessions where we may feel like there's sort of a Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle or a Shrodinger's Cat issue of whether having the Board members in the room changes the discussion in a way that are counter to the goals of the session.

I don't think that's true for most of the sessions. It may not be true for any of the sessions. I think we need to be able to speak freely and I think we've, you know, mentioned Chatham House Rules in the past potentially as well for some sessions.

So I think generally I'm in favor of having them there. Obviously not enforce. I think if there's as many Board members as there are members of a house then we have a problem, of course that would be the entire Board. But I think

that – I think we should err on the side of inclusiveness, but think about areas where perhaps it would take the conversation away to some extent.

So I think it's, you know, fair to – and I think interacting with the Board and, you know, creating this kind of, you know, the us and them thing I think is – it's not imaginary but on the other hand there is an element of lore to it that I think we need to get away from as an organization, if we're – and I think it's healthy to look at it in that regard as well. Who knows, maybe one day even a member of the Non Contracted Party House groups will become a Board member. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Greg. Appreciate that. I don't see other hands up. I'm noting that the chat is continuing. I don't know about Tatiana's last comment but I think it's important for you all to chat about that a little bit. It's once we allow Board members, and this is an open meeting, then we have to allow others. I'm not sure, Tatiana, what you mean about others. At this point I think we've got, at least from what I've heard, at least three Board members in addition who've expressed an interest in participating. They've done it with at least one community leader. And, you know, I think scoped it out with Markus a little bit.

He had reached out to me to ask for some guidance. And I said, well let me talk to the group first. I don't understand Kathy's comment about – talk about topics first. But I do agree that it might be useful to have you all ruminate and perhaps talk about this a little bit more in the chat while we talk about some of the programming issues. And then let me sort of reserve the last five minutes to see if anyone is persuasive in certain way shape or form in the chat with respect to a particular point of view.

What I'm interested in doing in terms of all of you and the way I've approached this from a consensus perspective, is basically to note if, you know, there's general agreement on something, the only time that I'm sort of backing off or having more conversations is when there are serious objections or whether someone is, you know, basically saying that can't happen or we should not do that.

Generally you're all very good about your conversations or your consensus. And so that's how I generally want to approach it. So I'm very interested, particularly as we have this discussion, and we go through it, for folks to express, you know, your level of comfort or discomfort and how strongly you feel about some of these points.

Greg, your hand is still up. I don't know if you need to lower it. But, Farzaneh, you would be next in the queue. And let me turn the microphone over to you, save some of your typing fingers and let you express your point of view verbally to folks. So you have the floor. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. Farzaneh Badii speaking for the record. I'm just going to be blunt here and say what I think. It's good for us to do at the intercessional. In terms of a couple of things that happened that the Board approved, which was in the – so when the GNSO was not consulted with and I think in – I sent an email to the mailing list and I pointed out to that instance. I think in order to prevent GNSO's process to a convention we need to, in the future, we need to talk to the Board member that we have as the GNSO.

So if we want to say that the Board member at – a GNSO appointed Board member is our representative on the Board, and if we want to join the – divide between the community and ICANN as a corporation, then we need to talk to

that Board member and tell him our concerns, or her in the future hopefully one day. And then – and then try to do that.

And I think where the intercessional – it's a very, very good chance to talk about our problems and then see what we can do in consultation with the Board member. But maybe what I'm suggesting is totally out of the governance structure as ICANN, I don't know. But this is why I'm suggesting that instead of like showing the whole world and the other Board member what our problems are, we should first go through the channel of the Board member we have.

And also I agree that because remote participation is available, it's public, a lot of people just forget about the meeting or they don't attend it, GAC attends it when they are actually attend in person, conversely when they attend in person. I'm sorry, I talk too much. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Farzaneh. You have taken down your hand. Greg's is still up so I'm going to assume that's a new request. Greg, you have the floor.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I actually took my hand down and put it up again after I heard what Farzi said, because it led me to an interesting thought, not necessarily a conclusion. That there is a difference between our meeting and the GDD meeting, which has noted that, you know, Board members have been attending.

And, you know, the difference that I'm thinking about is that our session is or may become more like group therapy and the GDD is more like a trade association meeting. And those are very different things. And it's quite natural for the Board of an organization, you know, to attend the trade association meeting of its representative – of its kind of populace. We're not having that kind of a meeting.

And I realize there's a difference between the GDD and an actual trade association, which is really more like the DNA. But in any case, you know, the point is it's an industry event, if you will.

And this is, you know, again more like group therapy where I think for us to be successful on everything but the most mundane topics, we need to be able to open ourselves up. I was going to say bare ourselves, but I think that the new standards of anti-harassment would prevent that. But in any case, the point is that I can see Farzi's point that if we're going to be – if we're really going to let it all hang out, to use a very 70s expression, we may want to do it in a more limited circle.

And I do hope that's what we do. I think that one of the – at the prior session we had in LA suffered from a lack of kind of candor or, you know, putting it out there. And again, I'm not sure what "it" it is but it is not in any way a reference intended to invoke the anti-harassment policy.

But I think we do have a tension between the type of meeting we want to have and the type of people we want to have in the room. And so we kind of, in a sense this I think maybe why Kathy said we should do the topics, the second half of the agenda first, because then we might have a sense of whether having Board members in the room is going to be useful, neutral or counterproductive. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you all very much. I mean, I think what I'm inclined to do at this point, given the feedback so far, if someone were to call me, you know, 10 minutes after we hang up the phone is to sort of highlight that difference. And that – the very good way I think, or helpful way of thinking about it, Greg in terms of the different intent and purpose of the meeting.

And being able to share that directly with someone who expresses the interest I think will help them make the decision that, yes, maybe I don't need to be on a plane for five hours and I should just, you know, watch and observe noting that the transcript gets published, there's live streaming and you can just about see and hear everything anyway. So I mean, I think that's what I would be inclined to say at the moment to make that explanation.

If someone pushes back through that and says, yes, but boy, I would really like to attend, I think what I would then do is, you know, pending the further conversations about the topics and your session, is I would say, well great, thanks. Let me talk with the group about your particular interest rather than just very globally saying, sure, the more the merrier.

So that's the tact I'll take initially. I'll look forward to further guidance here in the chat and later in the call if we have the time for that and would appreciate, you know, any other insights that any of you want to share in that regard. This was very helpful feedback. Frankly, I just didn't know what to do with it when I heard about this interest being expressed.

I don't know if the rest of you are comfortable expressing that point of view if you're reached out to and talked to by interested Board members. I'm happy to either have you forward them to me or otherwise for you to share that same perspective. Does anyone have an objection to that approach? Greg, I'll assume that that's a hand that hasn't been lowered yet.

Great, we'll move then onto the next just very quickly noting as I did last, it's now T-33 days to the extent that we need any other stress in our lives, there's that knowledge so please be aware of it.

On the slide right now, I've listed where we were within terms of existing session ideas from the last call, a total of eight sessions. Just briefly running through them, an initial session where you all talk about your various group priorities for the calendar year. I was actually thinking about, and we'll put together a draft template so that you all have sort of the highlights that you discussed in talking about this session before so that everybody can be pretty consistent comparing apples to apples.

And we'll set a fairly firm timeframe so that folks have a good opportunity to make that presentation at the beginning of the meeting. We'll still have to decide whether you want to do that before the initial breakout. Right now the way we've had it set up is we all come together and you have your initial welcome at either 8:00 or 8:30. I'm inclined to make that 8:30. And then you go and break out into your sessions where presumably you might even have the time to fine tune the presentation that you each want to make at the next session. We'll leave that to be decided as we further develop the agenda timing.

The NCPH procedural in-house issues, that was focused on the selection of the Board member for the NCPH. There was also an opening, and a couple of folks make comments, that that might also include selection for other roles on the part of the GNSO, review teams and the like. And this may also be an opportunity for you to talk about the next meeting. You know, where is it going to be, what the appropriate timing, what are the goals and expectations you have for that.

I told you about our efforting to get Göran involved, so we're still anticipating having some exchange with ICANN senior leadership. That feels like a fairly strong session that you definitely all want to have.

I'd flagged the issue about the compliance function. This could come off the list and you could have some individual conversations with Jamie. Or it could be a general session and we just have it for 15 or 20 minutes so it doesn't have to be a long session.

On the policy issue placeholder, Wolf-Ulrich has made a pitch for that. We'll talk about that on the next slide but the ISPs have presented a potential topic for that placeholder area, so that's something that we'll talk about here in a moment.

Maintaining the GNSO's traditional policy making leadership position at ICANN was the recommendation, Farzaneh, that you and Kathy made. Farzaneh has since shared with the group some additional information that she committed to on the last call so I hope you all had a chance to look at that on the list. We can touch on that.

We haven't really explored this ICANN budget discussion session. I added a question mark here whether you wanted Xavier Calvez to be involved in that. I did note Ed's point from the last call that his view was the potential goal of this was coming out of the conversation with a small budget working group. Certainly if NCPH members that you may then want to posit to the Contracted Parties House to see if the GNSO wants to establish that sort of mechanism going forward.

And then I left on, simply because I didn't know what to do with it based on the conversation last week, this broad topic session with the GNSO councilors. That still seems to be an area where we don't really have a consensus as to what you might want to do there.

So that – those were the existing sessions and concepts. And then since that time, we got two more contributions over the course of the last week. There was Tapani's proposal that I dubbed Work Stream 3 restructuring ICANN, impacts on GNSO that Lori then called, I thought very cleverly, the futuring discussion.

So, Tapani, I'd like you to spend a couple minutes talking about that. I noted that so far we've got yes or no objections from three other groups and a no by representatives from the NCUC. And so I'd be interested in your conversation on that.

And then the new gTLDs recommendation that Wolf-Ulrich made on behalf of the ISPs. There was a positive response from the NCUC, I think that was you, Ed. But no nos yet, no other reactions to that prior to me joining this call that I saw.

So I invite and open the floor to anyone who would like to make a comment on the existing sessions or the new ones. But I'd like to reserve that first to have Tapani, you make a quick pitch for the futuring conversation and then Wolf-Ulrich, I'm delighted to see you've been able to join us to just give a quick synopsis of the new gTLD recommendations. Tapani, you have the floor.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Rob. I must confess at this point that I have not really done much more than just relayed Wolfgang's proposal. And you know about it almost as much as I do, the text I sent. I note that he's actually (unintelligible) working on this idea with Klaus though who is present here, I believe. And Klaus might be able to elucidate a bit more. So actually I don't think I want to say anymore, but I don't even have a strong opinion here whether we should

include this or not, I just relay the proposal as one possible idea. So and I really don't know much more about when Wolfgang wrote it, I related all this.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: So I'm hoping…

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

Klaus Stoll: Are you waiting for me? Oh yes. Okay this is Klaus for the record. Basically we had a ongoing discussion since many ICANN meetings and IGFs, between Wolfgang and me and other people, that basically we are looking forward to the restructuring of ICANN in the Work Stream 3. And also the work of the – then called Structural Improvement Committee inside ICANN.

And we just thought it is – would be a good idea if we start this discussion actually now because this is a very complicated topic. The Non Contracted Party House will be under particular scrutiny in the restructuring of ICANN. And to get it started and to get it started between ourselves and to talk inside the Non Contracted Party House actually what our expectations, positions are and so on I think would make very much sense to start that now instead of waiting until Work Stream 3. And that was our thinking in very short words. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Klaus. I don't know, but I suspect that Poncelet, Greg, and Ed are in the queue for this particular proposal. Before I turn the mic over to you guys, I wanted to make sure, because I don't know how long the conversations will go, that, Wolf-Ulrich, you have an opportunity to give a quick synopsis or

at least verbal sharing about the proposal that you shared with the list on new gTLDs. Could you do that briefly for us?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi, Rob. Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Just briefly, you know, it – well it came out from an internal discussion within the ISPCP we had. And there was the – well the feeling, you know, that there is ongoing discussion or in several circles within the ICANN community with regards how to deal with a potential future round for the – for new gTLDs.

And it was, never, let me say, a little bit focused – more focused on that other than rumors and opinions. And it would be – that was our opinion, well, to start the discussion with regards to the – to more strategic questions putting some positions together with regards is it advisable and what does it mean on short term for example and under which conditions what could be safeguard, what is the feelings based on the experience with the existing – with the last round of implementing new gTLDs.

So that was the idea, well, to have this open discussion. And it would be a good point or – and good idea, well, to have this discussion within the NCPH in Reykjavik. So that's it about that so we have not more details on it at the time being, but that's a starting point. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Appreciate it. So I invite comments on any of those two proposals by anyone on the call. I've got Poncelet, Greg and Ed in the queue. Poncelet, you have the microphone.

Poncelet Ileleji: Thank you, Rob. Poncelet Ileleji speaking for the records. I just want to make a comment on the first new topic about the Work Stream 3 restructuring ICANN. I think it's a very broad topic. It's very broad. And based on the eight sessions that we have currently I have a slight personal opinion, I think

expanding that eight will make us reduce time on what we want to spend on them especially to the other and we have also tried to fit in side events within generally was the plan and to discuss during the NCPH meeting.

So one suggestion I would like to make, if at all this really a big based on the no objection and Work Stream 3 restructuring ICANN, if at all this is really big support base and we have to insert it, we should remove Session 7 which has to do with ICANN budget discussion and session. We should remove that and replace it. But also in second it and without removing anything I think it would be too much. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Poncelet. Greg, I've noted several attempts at typing and so I'm interested in offering you the microphone. You're next up, sir.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. It's Greg Shatan again. I agree with Poncelet that the topic suggested is very broad on the WS 3. But I think that it actually leads to perhaps the – a more focused topic in the same swim lane and actually this comes out of the exchange on the email list that we had just prior to this call on this topic. And I'm kind of reframing a comment that was made, I think by Ed Morris on the list, but I'll reframe it as a question or a topic, which is is the Non Contracted Party House merely a voting algorithm? And if not, what is it?

I think that leads to – it's a more present discussion than Work Stream 3. But on the other hand if we don't have a vision and understanding of what the Non Contracted Party House is, it's hard to decide how to fix it. So I think this is kind of a necessary predicate to a later discussion of Work Stream 3 in 2020 and all that as we get close to the next GNSO review.

And I think there are a number of other comments that were in the emails that could actually be turned into subtopics and, you know, such as, you know, if the current NCPH works for – does it work better for one side than the other? What are the goals? Does it meet the purposes of one group more than the other? If it's merely a voting algorithm, what's the role of the Non Contracted Party House NCA Board member? Vice Chair? Should these just be rotated?

So I think it's – it kind of focuses us more on the near term and frankly, I don't think we could discuss the changes or the scrutiny that it might be under, that we might be under as a house, whatever that is, in the future if we don't have the discussion I suggest first. So I'd like to put that forward as a variation on the topic that's suggested and the one that would be both more pertinent and more focused for what is still a relatively short meeting. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Greg. Ed, you've patiently had your hand up for quite a bit. I'll turn the floor over to you.

Ed Morris: Yes, thanks, Rob. Yes, it wouldn't be one of my topics but I think Greg has made a constructive suggestion provided we're all disciplined enough to stay within the parameters of the discussion that Greg proposes. So I'd have no problems with that. Certainly I don't think I'm a huge supporter but would not object to that inclusion in our agenda.

I do want to talk about a few others. I was actually the guy who was pushing Number 8. We have councilors dropping off of this meeting like fleas so I would withdraw, as I did in the chat, my suggestion for a separate councilor session or councilor-focused session because frankly we're not going to have enough councilors there to do it. Amr dropped off today. I know there were a few other NCSG councilors who are reconsidering their participation at this point. So I would suggest we do away with Topic Number 8.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben's suggestion, I'm absolutely supportive of it. It's unique, it's innovative. I don't really know where our respective groups stand going forward on the next round. And I'd like to find out. I think for the Non Commercials, in particular, I think we really need to think about that and come up with a position. And so I strongly support my friend Wolf-Ulrich Knoben's suggestion.

I also want to make sure we don't forget the idea we've had in the past, and Lori's mentioned it in chat, about having something dedicated to IP. The reason for that is twofold. One is we're going to have to – of the tri-chairs of the RPM group in attendance in Phil and Kathy. And second, it's a group that is full of dissent, acrimony despite the best effort of our chairs, there's a lot of negativity coming from there. And a lot of it's coming from people who are going to be in Reykjavik.

So I do think it would be a good use of our time to talk about IP issues, where it divides us, where we could find some area of agreement and do it in the Chatham House way, as Greg has suggested in the past, try to get off our preconceived positions, the history which seems to restrict where some people go and see if we can find some solutions there.

And finally, on the budget, I wanted a deliverable out of this meeting. Part of the discussion on list of mention, there were a lot of folks in the NCSG who really don't want this meeting to take place, not a majority but a significant minority. I'm one of them. I don't see the value. The first intercession had value. But each intercession, in my mind, has had less and less value.

And so for this meeting to continue, for us to be able to go back to our community and say, hey, we did something here, I'd like to try to come out

with some semblance of group working on a project. I think the budget is a great idea. And frankly, I want to give the guy credit, I think Greg came up with this when I was speaking to him in India. He may not support it now but I want to give him credit for the idea. The budget is an area where I think we all have a common interest in ensuring that the GNSO is treated fairly.

We'll have some differences on compliance, but it's an area where I think we need as the GNSO to become more active. And I think, as Rob said, if we can start a small group here maybe even expand it to the Contracted Party House. ALAC and ccNSO, have dedicated groups that lobby Xavier. We don't have one. And I think we may want to start thinking about combining forces in that regard.

So in summary, I can support Greg's proposal for talking about an introspective look at what this thing called the Non Contracted Party House is as long as we stay within that parameter. I think the budget discussion could give us a deliverable that allows us to justify this meeting, do support Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and would ask that IP also be considered a policy issue to be discussed. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Ed. The next person in the queue, who has also been patient, thanks, Kathy. Kathy Kleiman, I turn the microphone over to you.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thanks, Rob. I'm just going to respond to the last two sessions that we were discussing. I actually love Wolf-Ulrich's topic. I hadn't thought about it before but the idea of talking about a Round 2 and our concerns, we all lived through it, we can talk about the successes, we can talk about the issues, we can talk about the concerns. I'm not sure any bullet points will come out of it but it's a great conversation to begin to have.

And I kind of laughed when Greg was resummarizing Ed's discussion because it goes perfectly with the group therapy session for us to wrap up with the session at the very end of who are we, where are we going, what are our goals, what's happening. I think that's a great ending session that may not get us into Work Stream 3 or may begin to, but I've got to tell you that at least for me and for the people I know who volunteered for this, we don't have expectations or positions on this issue. And we don't have the time to prepare them before this meeting.

So I like the narrow issue as construed by Greg and Ed because I can prepare for that and then if Klaus wants to start introducing us to broader issues I'm happy to listen to that either in what I propose as a closing session or in the hallways and then begin to take that back and work it through with NCSG and NCUC. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Kathy. I noted, Anna, that you had put your hand up and it came down once or twice. I wanted – I don't know if it's a connectivity issue or whatever, I wanted to give you an opportunity at the microphone if there's something that you wanted to add. If you are talking we can't hear you and otherwise I'll imagine that it is in fact a connectivity issue. You may want to troubleshoot for this call and for future connection. Thanks, Anna, appreciate that.

Great, Kathy, I think that's a hand that needs to be lowered. Let me summarize what I've heard then at this point and maybe also give you, Klaus, an opportunity – you or Tapani – an opportunity to provide some feedback back.

I've heard an interest in the concept of futuring but much more focused on the immediate future as opposed to the medium or long-term future that says gee,

could we jujitsu this a little bit and really look at it at where we are today as an NCPH, what's the role, what's the goal and how do you all collectively want to consider that going forward as things move forward through Work Stream 2 and into Work Stream 3. So that's how I interpreted that sort of refashioning or suggested modification to that suggestion.

I've heard only positive feedback on the new gTLD Round 2 or Phase 2 conversation so on that be careful, Wolf-Ulrich, you'll probably be nominated as one of the cochairs of that session. But that seems to be fairly straightforward.

Looking back at the consideration of those two, I think it then behooves us on the next call to look at that being the universe. These eight plus the modification suggested by the two with some changes here. One, I wasn't hearing resounding interest in an overall session on compliance. But I'm going to keep this open for anyone to give feedback as to whether it should be a short session or a session just devoted to the breakouts.

And Ed has withdrawn or pulled back substantially on the GNSO councilor session in view of some cancellations or changes there. And so we'll take that off. Wolf, your slot would go nicely into 5.

Which leaves the open question, and I'm interested also in folks reactions to Ed renewing his interest in an IP issues discussion which could be Part 2 of Session 5 or something related to that.

Klaus, thanks, you put up your hand and then I'll have Greg behind you. Go ahead, sir.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you. This is Klaus for the record. I just would like to say that as a compromise I support Greg's proposal under the one condition that we keep the title.

Rob Hoggarth: You want to – well, we'll still have to decide on what the title is simply because I – do you like the concept of futuring? Is that what you were suggesting? Or the more verbose Work Stream 3 restructuring impacts on GNSO?

Klaus Stoll: No, I was more thinking about because Greg wanted to put basically a step before. No I think that makes a lot of sense. And are we really more a voting algorithm I think is a very good title…

Rob Hoggarth: Oh.

Klaus Stoll: …to have. That would be – would be really making the whole thing – we should be – should very careful not to go beyond this topic at that point then.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Thanks for that flexibility of your suggestion, appreciate that. Greg, you have the floor, sir.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. My – maybe my interventions were too subtle. I'm not really in favor of Wolf-Ulrich's suggestion although I'm general in favor of Wolf-Ulrich and most of his suggestions. But I just feel like this – I don't know how this interacts with the new – the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. I feel like it's – that's where that discussion is taking place.

                 And is this a proposal that there should be something other than whatever the end product of the working group is or is this just kind of a caucus discussion

intended to kind of see what we all think about the work we're doing in there with the other members of that working group? If it's the latter, then I think a conference call of the representatives of each of the NCPH groups that actually participate actively in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group would be a more fruitful discussion and a better venue for that type of discussion.

And it's the discussion of somehow doing a round that is not the work of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group I think that's a – I'm just not in favor of that. And that's just not, I think, a good idea. I think that this discussion should take place in what working group or among the appropriate caucus of members of that working group. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Greg. Wolf-Ulrich, I'll give you two opportunities. One to provide an immediate bit of feedback to Greg's comment; two, I think what I'll do is, I mean, what I'm interpreting the suggestion is is there way for us to fine tune or refine that or be a little bit more specific about what the purpose or goal of the conversation would be. And if you'd be open to that, Greg, I think what I'll do is give Wolf-Ulrich the opportunity to flesh that out a little bit. Do you want to do that now, Wolf-Ulrich, or on email?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I'm open to that, but what is said. So I appreciate the support from the NCSG side here on this matter. And I also appreciate, well, your critics – criticism, Greg, about that. But I understand, and you've fleshed out very well, you know, these two parts of the discussion could be like, you know, the one is the content related part of the discussion; and the other one is, you know, the question of to find common ground or well not the question to find common ground but to look at, you know, how – whether there is common ground within our house here

on that and what could that be with regards to safeguards, with regards to the new gTLD introduction second round.

So that is a – what is behind, you know, our intention, well, to bring it to the floor here to the table. I really wonder whether it would be wise, well, just to have a conference call on that. I think it's valuable, you know, and it's useful to have it in a face to face meeting. Well, it shouldn't be, couldn't be a big round of that. But I think it would be helpful to sort out and to find if there's something on common ground or if there's nothing.

It shouldn't be done, the work, which is to be done by the working group itself. It's just, you know, why we – because we are sitting together as a house and I think this is such a big item on policy matters for the future that it is useful to discuss it face to face. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Wolf-Ulrich. I will endeavor to reflect the various comments on that particular item. And I'm also interested in seeing any further email conversations about Ed's suggestion because we still had these two potential issues for that Item 5 session agenda where they could be played with, modified to perhaps fit a more consensus view as to the value of both the topic and how much time you all spend on it and what you goal is for them. So I'll work on that from a next version 4 for you all to take a look at prior to our call next week.

Just two quick logistical items. I know some folks are having to jump off. But we will look to continue these conversations next week. Thank you all very much. I know sometimes it feels very challenging but you are narrowing this stuff down in a productive manner. Next when we get together there will be 26 days until the meeting.

Just one final thing, please, a couple of comments were made on this call about potentially people dropping out or changing or now not being able to do things. That creates some tremendous issues, stresses and pressure from a meeting travel perspective. And particularly from visas and things like that, we're pretty much past the event horizon there for some countries. So please be mindful of that.

If folks are dropping out this late we will do what we can to try to accommodate new people, but it does make it very difficult. And our past experience has been if folks get within the last month and they're canceling out it's really tough to replace them. So I just wanted to make sure that that was out there for the record. It happens, but we try to minimize it as much as possible.

Thank you all for participating in this call. I'm going to go back through the chat and see all the novel suggestions for the title of the futuring discussion. I saw a number of inventive suggestions there. We'll look forward to connecting with you all again next week. And I'm hopeful at that point we'll be pretty much to the finish line in terms of this session list.

Thanks all very much. Ozan, we'll adjourn the call now and talk to everybody next week. Bye-bye.

                              END