

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
November 22, 2016
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Mae. Good morning, good afternoon good evening. This is a 2017 NCPH Intersessional Planning call on Tuesday 22 November 2016. On the call today we have Chris Wilson, Ed Morris, Greg Shatan, Klaus Stoll, Poncelet Illeleji, Rafik Dammak, Tapani Tarvainen, Tony Holmes. And from staff we have Benedetta Rossi, Robert Hoggarth, Chantelle Doerksen and myself Maryam Bakoshi. I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Maryam. Welcome everybody. Thanks everyone for joining us in our post Hyderabad timeframe. I trust that everybody has appropriately recovered from the week in India and a long ICANN meeting and that we're continuing to make progress on a number of fronts. The purpose for today's call was to gather for the second time to talk about planning for the potential 2017 NCPH intersessional. And I wanted to have everybody have a chance to comment on the proposed agenda that Benedetta and I put together for the purposes of this call.

We've identified as our action items today talking about the timing and location of the meeting with the hope and expectation that we will be able to if not completely finalize get right to that - the very edge so that we can nail down certainly the timing as to when you all would like to get together for the meeting. Assuming that we've reach that benchmark we'll talk a little bit about the potential topics for the meeting, how you guys would like to move forward in terms of doing prep work, talk also about the roles and responsibilities for you and your team as well as for us on the staff side not only in terms of logistics but in terms of programming and preparation. So that's going to be how we wanted to focus today.

So if anyone would like to add anything to that, take anything away please raise your hand or indicate a potential change. Great, hearing and seeing nothing we'll proceed with that. And of course we have the AOB at the end just in case anything comes up during the call. Before we get too far into it and Tony I'm delighted that you've joined us I had an opportunity to review what you all talked about when you got together for the GNSO Futures meeting when you were all together in India. And it seemed at least one of the potential topics that came up in terms of some of the back and forth there was the potential for this intersessional meeting. And although we've been proceeding with the expectation that you were all interested in going ahead to pursue this there seemed to be some substantial discussion about whether to continue to have this meeting or not.

And so I wanted to make sure that we cleared the air or clarified that aspect of things first and foremost just to confirm whether we're still on, you all are still looking forward to getting together and doing some sort of planning for a meeting next year. You all had the opportunity to talk with your individual communities, get feedback about not only about timing and location but

whether to have the meeting at all. So I wanted to address that first. And if you have a good mic Tony if you wanted to perhaps summarize that discussion where you thought things came out from that that would be very helpful.

I see that your microphone is activated Tony but I'm not hearing anything. Maryam I don't know if Tony is connected but while we're trying to do that does anyone else have any comments which are – because I know a number of you participated in that discussion just in terms of where you think things stand with respect to that. I see Tony thanks for your comment that you're trying to get your mic to work there but I welcome anybody else in terms of comments or perspective on that.

It always changes the dynamics a bit face to face to give you all an opportunity to talk through things so I just wanted to make sure we were all on the same page. Chris your hand has gone up. Let me give you the floor and then Tapani you'll be after Chris.

Chris Wilson: Sure thanks Rob this is Chris Wilson for the record. I just - again Tony could fill in more details but I think we left it at we go ahead and go ahead with the intersessional with obviously the caveat with that we would like to, you know, have a fulsome agenda and make sure we're not just sort of spinning our wheels but we actually have some good things to talk about. But I think ultimately that they – we finally came around to a notion I believe that we all thought we should have it so I think that - I don't think we have further discussion on whether we should have it but we obviously have further discussion about what we should be talking about and what we can be talking about. And obviously location and timing continues to be something we need to talk about. But I think the threshold question has been answered but if

others have difference of opinion let me know but I think that's how we left it in India.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Chris. Tapani, you have the floor.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Rob. I can pretty much echo what Chris said that we basically agree that we should go on with the meeting for next year. But one of the agenda items should be how to continue in the future that whether we'll have this kind of meeting so other kinds of meetings in 2018 and for this something was left open. But for this next year we should go forth with the meeting and just then we have certain at least a few of the agenda items besides the future of the meeting itself to have so let's move on and try to get the time and date decided as soon as possible.

Robert Hoggarth: Sure thank you very much, appreciate that and Tony has also noted that some comments in the chat there noting I believe there's always been support from the CSG. Only question mark was from the NCSG and you seem to have cleared that up for us so thanks very much Tapani.

All right well let's talk location and timing. I know there was a lot of back and forth. I talked with several of you one to one when we were in India, more hallway conversations than anything else to note that there was some ebb and flow throughout the week. Would anyone like to take the first crack in terms of sharing the perspective of their community with respect to location and timing? I do have some information, unfortunately nothing of any detail to share in terms of the meetings team research. That's still ongoing but we definitely like to get the perspective from all of you to see if we can reach a consensus certainly for timing and then talking about location as well. Tapani I don't know if that's a fresh hand. If so I'll give you the floor to start us off.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Rob. Yes it was a fresh hand. Our NCSG feeling is mostly as I - as before that we would like the location to be somewhere outside other than US and that for timing the February timeframe is definitely preferred. One particular point is that we have a couple of people who would be coming who have a always issue with Visas. I was told that in particular Amr and Poncelet who is here as well need long time to get their Visas so is something like Amr has told me that six to eight weeks is what Visa processing takes and that starts from the date when they get their itinerary from the constituency travel.

So if we're going to have the meeting in February we should basically fix the location within early December like because Christmas time will add up to that time. And if we could try to go to the April, May timeframe which nobody from our side seems to want anyway that's actually doesn't make things any easier because then the time between Copenhagen and that would be too short. It makes also difficulty for these issues. So let's try to make a decision on both date and location as soon as possible and preferably April 2 or the week of February or thereabouts. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Tapani. Rafik I see that your hand went up. Please sir I'll give you the mic next.

Tapani Tarvainen: Hello. Can you hear me?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes sir.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thanks. Okay in term of location I don't think we have agreement yet about that part. I guess maybe having better idea about what is possible as a location can help to just steer the discussion. Regarding the date I don't think we have kind of agreement about that should be in February. Personally it's not the best time. And I can highlight again also the issue that raised by Amr

regarding the Visa. And I think it will be the same case for many from developing countries and particularly if we are going even to Europe.

And the issue is that in particularly February it will be really too close to Copenhagen meeting which means the difficulty will be to get Visa for the intersessional and also getting Visa for the Copenhagen meeting. So it's adding a lot of burden for those who have to apply mostly for Visa for any location that we may select. So I don't think really February is the best time and I guess we may have to think more about that.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Rafik. When you say think more about that what is your alternative thought there?

Rafik Dammak: I think as I expressed it before it sounds that we are thinking about January or February because we organized the first intersessional, the first edition in I think in January. But we may really may try to choose other period then that those two months because I definitively is - it's really too close in term of planning.

I mean like I think his folks are going to be on holiday this week. We have end of year holidays. So I'm not sure when we are going to work in term even for logistics for people to get Visa and get their support and in term of planning for the session.

So I think we are putting our self from every time under pressure to organize within this timeframe while thinking about maybe after Copenhagen. I understand there people they have to wait the problem (unintelligible). The problem intersessional will be - have some issues but at least I think organizing letter would provide some time more for in term of planning at

least at the substantive level. And it would also give more room in term of logistics.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Rafik. I have in the queue Chris, then Klaus, then Ed. So let's go in that order. Chris you have the mic.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Rob. I'm sort of reiterating I guess an email I sent to everybody after our - soon after our last call sort of outlining where the business constituency was on timing and location. I think, you know, we were I guess okay with the notion of a February meeting. I guess Reykjavik was suggested as a location.

I think that said I think we I guess to some extent echo or some of the concerns that Rafik just expressed and try to sort of think of a way to sort of find a middle ground. And that was obviously the notion of perhaps tacking on the intersessional to meeting B in this case this year it would be, you know, the meeting B as occurring in Johannesburg which is a shorter meeting obviously. It's the policy forum meeting recognizing of course that I understand some people may not be going to that meeting because it is the policy forum and not sort of the more traditional ICANN meeting but the thinking that obviously you just get one Visa because you're just traveling to one location. And it would cut down on travel costs for many people although you're already flying there in the first place and wouldn't need to have another plane ticket to another location in some other time of the year.

And I think also to Rafik's point I think part of it is that we are a little bit – we seem to be a little rational when we have to plan this meeting for the beginning of the next calendar year. In some cases we have, I know the BC will have one new executive committee member that starts in January. She'll be starting in January as our new CSG liaison. And, you know, she will have sort of no on ramp if you will to this discussion and world and sort of just

jumping right into it. I think there's a benefit to perhaps have it a little bit later in the year to allow new members of our various executive committees have some time to sort of get acclimated to the work.

So, you know, it's not something we're necessarily pushing extremely hard for this time around. If there's consensus that they want to - we want to do it in February in another location we can live with that. But I do think ideally we'd like to do it this year, if not this year then we need to really sort of for future years I think trying to tack on the intersessional assuming people want to continue to do it to another ICANN meeting which would allow I think (unintelligible) things for people and make it a little bit easier for all involved. That's sort of where we're coming from. But, you know, obviously others have differences of opinion. So I'll welcome other thoughts as well.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Chris. Klaus you're next in line and then after you I have, Ed, Poncelet and Tapani. So Klaus you're next. And after Klaus is done I'll see if there's anything's in the chat that I can read if anyone's contributing there. Please proceed Klaus. You have the mic.

Klaus Stoll: Hello. This is Klaus for the record. I understand very well the argumentation from Rafik. And I think to the first point do we have enough time to plan? I think we still got a good three working weeks in November, December and four or five working weeks in January or February if we go for the mid-February slot.

And the second thing about the Visa which is a very valid point the question there would be can that problem be solved by finding a place which makes it easier for Visas outside what the US but I don't know if that's actually possible. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Klaus. Some folks are typing. I'll check that shortly. I'd note farther back Tony typed February also good for ISPs except the week beginning the 6th. And then Tapani responded the week beginning Feb 13 would work best for most I know of. Farzaneh has typed hi. Please consider our day jobs as well. We can't take so much time off and travel so many times. And Tapani has said plus 1 Klaus there will never be any really enough time unlikely to be more at any other time. Ed?

Ed Morris: Yes hi Rob, thanks. The Visa problem as I understand it would not be solved by a April, May meeting because those folks who were going to need the eight weeks would actually have to apply for that Visa before Copenhagen. So in some ways it would make it worse because they come back from Copenhagen last week of March. If you're going to take two weeks that's gets you through April and we're at the end of May so that creates a problem. And then they still may need Visas for South Africa.

So putting it between the two meetings would actually make it more difficult for folks who need Visas to get Visas for two meetings potentially. I would like to make that point. In terms of tacking it onto another meeting well I understand the attractiveness I spoke at length in India with Donna Austin who is more or less the council meeting guru. She was adamantly opposed to this stating quite frankly that – and I just think she's going to talk to (Nico) about it that the minute they allow us to do this ALAC is going to want to do it, others will want to do it and our short policy meeting will be extended to seven to eight days.

And to add on to what (Fazi) said about respect from the fact that we are volunteers we have other jobs if we throw it in April, May that means we're going to be required with the travel to be away from our families and employment for a week to ten days in March, then again in April, then again

in June. February, you know, we've had a little bit of a break from India. So I would I would side with those wanting it in February while understanding and respecting Rafik's position. I just don't see how the Visa situation is going to be easier by putting it between two meetings. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Ed. In the meantime there have been some types in the chat and we'll go to you in a moment Poncelet. Let me read the chat types for those of you who may not be in the room. Chris says, "Can I ask for all why such strong preference for doing the intersessional early in the year?" Klaus says, "Please consider also that there are a number of other IG meetings in May, June like (Withis). Farzaneh, "I agree Chris what's the rush?"

Tapani indicates, "Early in the year would be useful for newly elected BCs to meet physically for the first time before Meeting A." Chris thanked them for the feedback and Tapani says for Visa concerns the longer time between May meetings before and after the better. Poncelet you're next in the queue followed by Tapani, Greg and Rafik. Poncelet you have the mic.

Poncelet Ileleji: Okay Poncelet speaking for the record. I know yes I supported a February meeting when I wrote. And this is based on precedent that happened before the intersessional. But listening to what has been said in to make it look doable within a timeframe especially with new EC members and all their meetings and for Visas too it – are there possibilities that exist that we can have them two days before the Copenhagen meeting and then we just – so it's just like one travel, yes.

Yes it could be more dates been spent in Copenhagen but is that possibilities? So I – that's what I just wanted to ask can we consider that? And we are all in just one location so we just filter and into the ICANN meeting coming up. I don't know whether that is possible but I think by a compromised and solution

April and May (unintelligible) and good dates you have the -which is another and things happen. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Poncelet. We'll leave that question out there for those that follow you to respond to. I have Tapani, Greg, Rafik in the queue. Tapani you're next. Please proceed.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes thank you Rob. First about the possibility of tacking your intersessional next to other AOB meeting. It would kind of defeat at least half of the point. First that making their already long meetings even longer, people are tired. There's always too much else in the agenda it would be not very easy to focus on the different issues at (unintelligible). At least my experience with intersessionals is that they - it's been useful just because it's apart from the usual hassle rush and everything that goes on in a normal ICANN meetings.

And actually in effect that would mean just get - abandoning the intersessional and instant lengthening their regular meeting. And I'm not sure that would be well received for a number of points.

Another Visa concern there's (unintelligible) trivial detail that it might be possible to get Visa from Iceland and Denmark at the same time. In many places the Danish Embassy handles Icelandic Visas at the same time so at least applying for them at the same time should be possible in many places. So that's just a plus point for Reykjavik.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Tapani. I've got Greg and Rafik. And Ed your hand is still up. I don't know if you want to get back in the queue and so I honor that after Rafik. It would be great to hear from you. Prior to doing that let me just indicate Tony Holmes typed - Farzaneh typed in the chat. Actually Tapani new EC members need to get familiar with their tasks a bit and then attend

intersessional, will be a better meeting as well if they know what they are doing on EC.

Tony says either side of Copenhagen would be impossible for ISPs and Ed just notes your previous comment Tapani is a good - very good point, good point. Greg I'll turn over the mic to you. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. First it's clear listening to this so far that there is no perfect solution at least for this year. And so everything is going to be a trade-off. So we just need to decide which trade-offs are worse. So, you know, with that I would say that ideally in terms of the substance of the meeting I felt that a shortcoming of the last meeting was that there wasn't a lot of dialogue beforehand and when we got there the dialogue all felt very preliminary and that I had suggested in one of the previous planning meetings for the intersessional that it would be better if the meeting, the intersessional meeting was a culmination of some prior discussion. So we might actually be able to take some decisions ultimately that would have to come back to our constituents but that we could kind of feel like we could accomplish something about which we could, you know, look back and say that we have, you know, come to some understanding because getting together to have preliminary discussions that don't get us anywhere and then have any kind of follow-up kind of falls short as well, you know, in direct respect, you know, made us feel like not the most the best use of our time.

So I think what's most important is to make the best use of the time whatever it is. You know, overall I think that, you know, in terms of trade-offs my trade-off is based on what I just said would be for a meeting later in the year and not in February so that when we get there we have people who are more ready just both based on their own positions and also on groundwork for a later meeting recognizing that there are challenges with the governance

calendar, IG calendar and other calendars that will make it difficult to find the date. But again we're talking about trade-offs. And if we were able to lay some groundwork for a February meeting we certainly could make good use of the time. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Greg. I may come back to you and ask you sort of what you would look at and - for potentially additional tradeoffs there so you can just be thinking about that. I note only other one person in the queue at the moment. That's Rafik. So Rafik I'll turn that over to you.

I note in the chat that Klaus is concerned that we may be going around in circles. I don't think so yet. I think it's been helpful to get everybody's viewpoints and input on - and actually the spinning has been more of a spiral whereas as we advance through this a little bit. So Rafik let me turn over the mic to you to either respond to any of the previous points that you - that have been made or for some fresh perspective. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Rob. So I don't want really to spend that much time talking about the Visa but as a person that I have to apply for each, almost each or every ICANN meeting for Visa I really know what kind of trouble I have - we have - many of us have to go through every time. And they don't want that can be dismissed that easily.

The issue is that many of us don't have the chance to have two passports. When you apply for a Visa it means that the embassy will keep your passport. And so you cannot also apply for another Visa. So that you - we - I face personally such some issue like that and I have to figure out what the best time is to apply and so on and sometimes to forgo to go to someplace because I - you - I cannot apply for Visa in two different countries.

So the fact that we have Copenhagen depending even when for example for those supported by ICANN when they get constituency travel to initiate the process and also depending where you are applying I may be lucky if I apply in Japan. There are many Embassy. They may be kind of quite (expensive). But if for other countries the period of time to process these can really count in weeks.

So we have to be mindful about this kind of issues. So this is important in term of really about timing but also the location. Again I think we need to give us some time really to prepare. There was some issues even why - people are questioning why we have the intersessional. And it was kind of I think related to the program part is why we are spending time I think it will be like around almost five or four days of traveling and meeting.

We have a need to think carefully why we are spending time and about the content. And for that we have to give ourselves the time to do so. If we do in February it's really just I think in practice is around less than two months to prepare in term of logistic and the content. And since we are - we have many groups to coordinate between it's not that easy. And also as for some groups we will have new executive committees and so on. So we have really to be mindful about all these concerns. I still don't understand why we are trying to have an intersessional in February and what we can achieve.

If we are going to push for that and you - we may just only enforce the point that many are questioning why you are having the intercessional because we're putting our self in a lot of difficulties just to organize it. We need to achieve something. If you want to achieve something it cannot be an intersessional and we have to give ourselves enough time and also to give those who are - who will be elected soon to participate fully in the process.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Rafik. Let me see if I can sort of flag where we have our two strings here. We've got timing and location issues that we said we would discuss today. And all the conversation has pretty much focused on timing with location seeming to me at least from what I'm hearing be a matter of ease of Visas in terms of not only the country that you'd all be traveling to but then the space, expense and time to be able to trade out various documents so the people can also participate in other industry activities, ICANN activities or just their day jobs.

And so location seems to me to be a less important thing in terms of the timing here because it seems to me that we may be able to reach an agreement on a location once you can nail down the timing. There seems even to be in some of the comments here in the chat some suggestions about middle grounds or extended Visas for a number of other things.

Now when I look at timing I see four suggested timeframes that everybody's thought about at present. Now I'm looking at the 2017 year looking at essentially the week of February 13 sometimes between – just before or just after Copenhagen which has been noted as impossible from at least one group. The mid-April may timeframe which many people have indicated concerns about getting the Visas and having the available documentation to be able to go to Johannesburg. And then the before or after Johannesburg timeframe where I've noted the objections about extending that meeting, you know, beyond the timeframe for that.

No one has considered and I recognize this is somewhat out of the box but what about after Johannesburg? It's still in the calendar year, maybe in the next fiscal year? I know that I can work in partner with David Olive to ensure that if the meeting doesn't take place in this fiscal year that maybe you all could look to next time. But I don't know and that's just punts the consensus

conversation down the pike because there's always going to be periods between ICANN meetings. So it seems to me like we had these four options. A number of you have acknowledged that no one is going to be happy with each one.

Klaus asked the \$64,000 question okay, how do we sort of bring this home or bring this together? I've shown you the great value I bring to these conversations which is to be Captain obvious. So yes I appreciate that Rafik. Rob make everyone unhappy.

The – I see two options here. One is that we narrow it down to two different options. That is to say okay let's pick out at least four potential opportunity. You know, let's do a I don't know if a show of hands is the best way or some sort of quick poll that Benedetta and I can pull together although I like the hands methodology to try the decision today but to just look at the two options that seem to offer the most opportunities for folks with the Copenhagen seeming to be off the table for you Tony with ISP. I wanted to see if you had any other comments or if your mic is still in a difficult mode there?

Tony Holmes: Thanks Rob. I think for both or for all the others other than Copenhagen then we could consider our preference would still be February the 13th by a long way. The concern with the April, May timeframe would be the precise timing because of the overlap with other meetings. And I don't think we'd be in the position today to be able to go through everything and say those dates are clear. And their final suggestion beyond (Joe Berg) well certainly hadn't thought about that so I wouldn't take that off the table at the moment. The only one that we're really strong on is Copenhagen and that just is really difficult for ISPs to do at either end of that.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Tony. I would note that the ICANN 60 Meeting takes place the end of October. So that - that's the date is indicated right now as October 28 through November 3. For those celebrating Halloween you miss it again. But basically that leaves about a four month window between Johannesburg and Abu Dhabi. Now granted that's, you know, summer vacation season but, you know, no time of the year is going to be perfect.

So we have on the table at least at this point the 13th February meeting. And I'm sorry I was looking at calendars so let me take a quick look at the chat to see if there's anything that I may have missed. Greg indicating the INTA meeting at the end of May which wouldn't preclude the end of April Greg presumably. Interesting the Barcelona location. Ed indicates February 13 is his support.

Rafik says Abu Dhabi? Yes did I read correctly for ICANN 60? Yes I did. That's the next AGM Rafik. So in terms of that timing that's where - and location that's where that is. Yes I was waiting for someone to make the observation about Valentine's Day Greg. Thanks for doing that.

In terms of board meetings Chris there's a board meeting in Los Angeles the week of February 1. That's the getting together for a workshop. I don't know that they had their complete calendar yet for 2017. I haven't seen it. That's something that is - it's available I can ask (David) or (Melissa) for and we can circulate that if that would help people in terms of looking at things globally because they're, you know, they obviously have meetings almost once a month. But most of those are telephonic.

So it seems as if we're down to the week of February 13. You know, Ed you made a very strong statement about the concerns about the Johannesburg meeting. So I don't know what people feel about that. I'm not troubled by the

relabeling of intersessional to potentially connect with and ICANN meeting although that might be heresy from my fellow staff perspective.

But I don't want to just take that right off the table although Tony has done that for Copenhagen which leaves the other sort of window as the end of April which is about a month and a half after the Copenhagen meeting. I'm mindful of the concerns that Rafik and Poncelet have said about Visa requests for Johannesburg and how that might impact that. And Tony we'll work on the staff availability once we get a location. But that seems to me to be the minor thing at the moment.

I see that Ed you've raised your hand. Maybe there's a magic beam that you've identified that might help us narrow things further. I'll give you the mic.

Ed Morris:

Thanks Rob. No magic beam. I just know if we try to tack it onto meeting be there will be a loud response from certain members of the GNSO Council, not me. But there are folks that have particularly on the CPH side that are big fans of the policy forum. Now I am a big fan of the policy forum. I love the four day meeting. But there are folks that worked really hard and believe it's sort of sacrosanct they're upset that the CCWG has as an extra day. So I think if we do select that day we're going to have to expect a lot of blowback from folks and including the meeting staff. You guys are willing to accept that that's fine with me. It does make sense in some regard.

But I can also say from at least my perspective on the NCSG I'm really hoping we can start sending to the policy meeting our policy people and not the folks involved in constituency management and the more administrative stuff. And I think the target for traveling to these meetings is almost a different type of travel or within the constituencies and stakeholder groups. So

I would be hesitant to merge a policy meeting with or administrative general meetings because I think there's a different cast of characters involved.

Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Ed. Let me try to throw one other sort of radical out of the-box thought here. This is just more me picking up sort of the sensibilities that you're all sharing. You're indicating that the February timeframe would conceivably work. Where I think - and this is just from a personal sort of picking up the vibe level is that that creates a substantial stress and strain on the number of fronts. One it requires concession on your all part with respect to potentially what you want to accomplish at the meeting, how you pull it all together, how you get prepped accordingly for it.

And in an era where we have the new ICANN accountability something that you are all going to be focusing on from an SOAC perspective particularly within the GNSO, you know, I don't know if the timing for those discussions are right or if you want to risk, you know, trying to cobble together a meeting where everyone is still not happy and seeing what you can accomplish in that timeframe.

I know I threw out the post Johannesburg. Chantelle and I were jabbering and she indicated wow, you know, that September timeframe doesn't look too bad. Would you be all willing to consider saying look let's, you know, let's sit down, let's come up with a two-year plan here. Let's look at something for between Johannesburg and the Abu Dhabi meeting something where you can thoughtfully without feeling any stress or pressure sit down and think okay let's plan this out over the next two years, figure out where we want to go, what we want to do.

Let's look at 2017 and 2018, put together a plan. And we're talking about this and have some good conversations either in the January, February timeframe and it works out that the two are in the same fiscal year then I'll just work with David in terms of budget requests for FY '18 to ensure that we can support two meetings in that timeframe.

But what if folks can just sort of react or give me a sense whether taking that off the table, pushing it to like an August, September timeframe provides anybody with a little bit more time, air, space to think about going through this. I'm just thinking out loud here and trying to look for a potential compromise. Any thoughts or comments? Let me look. I haven't been staring at this screen.

Tony says six weeks is ample time for prep. Tapani says plus one. And there's more time people won't start preparing earlier anyway. Very good human observation.

Ed agrees with Tony. Greg says it depends what we mean by prep because we're just setting agenda? Six is fine. Yes I mean where I was getting to is this sense that all talked about prior to the LA meeting earlier this year that said let's, you know, identify some agenda items. We've had working groups. We've had calls before those meetings when people are committed and the meeting is a culmination of the work not the beginning.

And I think the point you made Greg was you're just getting started when you get to that meeting. And as you point out Tapani human nature being what it is folks don't really focus on it until you're face to face. Okay so putting together a longer term plan may make some sense there.

Ed says one proposal would be to tack on a meeting on either side of the GDD to perhaps allow for interactions with the CPH for a day or so. That's a very interesting out of the box suggestion Ed as well. I don't have what the dates are for that summit. That might be another alternative. Although I don't know that, that community has some of the same scheduling challenges that you all have.

And yes Chris I don't know what that is at the moment. I'll chat with (Cyrus) after this call. Everyone is choosing to type rather than speak. So I'm fine with that. Oh thank you Tapani I'll turn the mic over to you. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. We've now had a few out of the box suggestions here which I don't think we are ready to decide on this point. So - and also we still don't know if we actually can have the meeting in Reykjavík in February for example. I understand you haven't had information on that. But in order to move this forward we will need another call soon like next week maybe.

Suggest we have a - try to move this forward fast - try to do - have something we can work with it within our communities and try to move it on. If we deliver too late it will be too late to do anything but it will be de facto default back to call August whatever, so just a thought...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

Tapani Tarvainen: ...we need two days.

Rob Hoggarth: I agree with that. Chantelle has indicated that the GDD Summit is 17 to 19 May. So that makes things a little tight for your interim meeting there Greg that you had talked about earlier. But that's where the GDD Summit schedule time is at the moment. I - you guys are not that far apart. I think the issue is,

you know, it's typical in terms of a consensus discussion how much or how strongly the objections are for the February 13 time frame?

We will continue to work on our meeting team colleagues. And in this case we're not able to focus on that February 13 time frame Tapani. So that's something we can certainly come back to on a quick chat next week maybe focus on a 30 minute conversation out of respect for just the challenge of getting you all together at the same time. But that might be something that we do. And we'll have a little bit more information there.

I think, you know, and you guys nailed down that timeframe. Then we just even if Reykjavik is not available then we look at another – I guess the only issue is how strongly the objections are. I note that the objections came from Rafik, from Poncelet, Farzaneh indicated that as well. Greg indicates all of - it's all tradeoffs. We can make February work. Poncelet has now said based on all of the assumptions I think I will go with the 13 February timeframe. So let me just throw that out to you Rafik who coincidentally have your hand raised to share with us your resistance or concern about that February timeframe. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Rob. Yes I am - it's not just to say I'm resisting or what. I mean I still don't agree with that. However what I was going to ask is really since I think you proposed it several timeframe is it possible to list them? I think to - we have to give to be fair and he's tried to all possible timeframe.

I think as we - I mean people are just focusing on one timeframe. We are trying just to fit within it. It's not I think the right way to do things. If we – you try to give different timeframe and from the discussion like some maybe some proposal that to link that to the (BAY) meeting or to maybe GDD Summit and so on. So trying to get a proposal with different timeframe and

then I think we can weight in for or against while discussing with our different group so...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes thank you. I mean essentially the - I'll say the three options that are on the table are we've got the week of February 13. That's I think everybody agrees on that one. Maryam said after the (Joe Berg) meeting that was, you know, and out of the box brainstorm on my part. The only one realistically in terms of this fiscal year I think is the late April timeframe. As a couple of folks I think indicated regardless of, you know, that general timeframe it's a matter of a lot of organizational meetings and other meetings going on in the community during that timeframe. So it would be like probably fitting a thread through the eye of the needle. But that probably could still be potential.

Obviously more difficulty in terms of finding locations from the meeting team perspective because there are meetings during that timeframe but that's something we could probably work out. So I think we're still talking about those three time frames Rafik, February 13, late April and after (Joe Berg) a meeting like in the summertime. But I think a number of you have given me sufficient push back there that says no, no we can, you know, we'll pull it off. And we'll accommodate certain trade-offs through the February 13 meeting. Yes Tapani August, September timeframe.

And obviously as you guys move forward with the February 13 timeframe we would look at one of the major agenda items before leaving the meeting of picking when the next one will occur which based on these conversations will probably be a good hour and a half session. So I like - and understanding that a number of folks are still thinking through this, you know, I think that the best approach and that will still keep us if you end up going with the February timeframe very close to being able to pull off where we have this discussion next week. I mean I'll be right on the horn with the meetings team to say

please look, you know, don't let the whole month of February just look at the week of February 13, will it even work? And, you know, if it doesn't in Reykjavik we'll find some other potential location there that may work for folks.

No Maryam I'm not suggesting that our next meeting be for one and a half hours just 30 minutes. I'm hopeful that we can resolve things through some email conversations and then just bring that closure on whether we proceed with February 13 or, you know, move things later. I'm very conscious Ed of your earlier comment in the chat that we need dates, we have lives. And I think it is important for us to, you know, establish some certainty as you all plan in your calendars for next year.

Any other final thoughts which, you know, I apologize that we sort of punt this to next week? But I think based on the conversation that you've all had and some of the thoughts and some of you can consider, you know, the overall comfort and maybe indicate on email on the February 13 so we can get everybody on the record in terms of what they're going to deal with and what they can handle recognizing that you are looking at doing this longer term.

So I think what I picked up from the conversation was yes we're willing to compromise on February 13 that week with the understanding that we put much more emphasis on longer term planning, the overall strategy for this meeting, where this is going in the future, what we want to accomplish both in the existing and future sort of SO, AC accountability environment. So yes let's shoot for a 30 minute call. If everybody can still do this timeframe which was 14:00 UTC let's just target that for 30 minutes. And I'll commit that it'll be a definite decision that we'll say it is February 13 if it's not that it'll be a later date.

And ideally if, you know, anyone has an opinion about the April timeframe can look at calendars or have suggestions about that timeframe as an alternative and if not it does look like looking more toward that August September timeframe. We've gotten some feedback in the chat that, that 14:00 - Chris let me double check that. Yes that would be on the 29th if folks can swing that.

Great, thank you all for a very robust conversation about this. I note that Farzaneh has a hand up in the chat. I wanted to give her an opportunity to comment since we have not heard your voice yet of this call Farzaneh.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Rob. Farzaneh - are we recording this? Anyway it's Farzaneh Badii. Just a very brief comment I just noticed that all the attendees of the community here are male and I'm the only female person here. So I think on our agenda for intersessional we should discuss gender diversity. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you very much for that observation. And I will record that for your agenda conversations. And I think it will be helpful regardless of timing if folks have brainstorm or thoughts about agenda items. I think that'll be helpful because you're all invariably going to get comments and questions anyway from your community groups. I know some of you already have. Well why are we doing this meeting anyway? What's the value of it? What are we accomplishing? So as you think through timing as brainstorms hit you for agenda items as well that will be really great. Thank you all for those final comments.

I don't know if you're noting Greg that domain pulse is a complicating factor for February 13 or a helpful factor of that but I'll let folks make that determination prior to next week. Thanks for sharing that. We still have a couple of minutes left. Looking for any final comments from folks not that we

have to use the whole hour but Tapani your hand is up and I'll give you the floor.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. When you asked for the potential topics I just want for the record one that we should have on the agenda is that how to - how NCPH elects its board member. We managed to agree on how we select the vice chair for the council but the board member selection process was left open. And that's something we should have on the agenda here. That's definitely NCPH issue.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thanks. And I think based on some of the conversation back in LA in February you may be closer to that decision than you all think. So that might be helpful. And Greg I accept the comment about the domain pulse being a potential tag on or maybe folks can take advantage of that as well. So didn't have Vienna on the list but I'm happy to take - If we get that. And I'll tell the meetings team about that as well.

So we'll continue to press forward on the meetings team in terms of feedback for Reykjavík and Western Europe the week of February 13. Rafik thank you for the - I like the question mark happy Thanksgiving greetings. For those of you celebrate it have a good celebration later this week. We will reconvene at 14:00 UTC next Tuesday 29th November and bring this all home. Please thank you all for your future email comments, and talked about this and for any other dialogue that you've had with your communities. I think we're almost there and appreciate very much the dialogue. Thank you all very much. We'll adjourn and stop the recording. And we'll talk to all next week. Thanks very much. Bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Rob. Mae, you may stop the recording. Thank you for your time today. Goodbye everyone.

END