

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
November 29, 2016
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings are now starting. You may now begin.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Andrew. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the 2017 NCPH Intercessional Planning call on the 29th of November, 2016 at 1400 UTC.

On the call today we have Poncelet Ileleji, Rafik Dammak, Tapani Tarvainen, Ed Morris, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Vicky Sheckler, Chris Wilson, Tony Holmes. From staff we have Benedetta Rossi, Robert Hoggarth and myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Maryam. This is Rob Hoggarth. Welcome, everybody, to our call today. Maryam, just for attendance purposes, I note that Chantelle is also in the AC room. And I'll note too, Maryam, that you have the benefit of seeing who's on the line and not in the AC room so if you could keep track of that a little bit as well to the extent that we take queues and things like that. If you're

in the AC room, it'd be great to raise your hand; if you're not, I'll pause and make sure that folks have an opportunity to give me an audio, some sort of verbal cue that they'd like to speak.

Let me do a quick summary from where we were last week. And thank you all for being able to quickly join and do two calls right two weeks in a row here. We had a very good discussion last week examining a number of different options for holding the meeting. The major conversation centered around timing with some hope and expectation that our crack Meetings team will be able to deliver whenever you guys want to be able to participate.

I think with a number of holidays and other priorities they had in terms of getting a couple of last minute gatherings together, they still have not been able to get back to me with a confirmation on Reykjavik, but I have them focused on the week of the 13th of February as an option. That was one of our big options from last week. And so I've asked them to continue to pursue that on the chance that if you go that route that we'll have something available. So I will follow up immediately with all of you on email as soon as I hear back anything from the Meetings team with respect to location options.

The agreement on the last call was basically to give you all another week to chat among your communities, talk a bit about what you're willing to be able to do for this next 2017 meeting with the recognition that as we move into the 2017 meeting, you are all last least planning sort of a two-year window here where one of the major agenda items for this next meeting will be to choose where you're going to go and what the timing and the appropriate scope of the potential next meeting might be.

So I think the best thing that came out of the last call was a follow up email from you, Tony, in which you shared some suggested sort of thoughts and

options for folks to take. So what I'd like to do very briefly is to turn the mic over to you just to have you share sort of what you're thinking and background was on that, where the ISPs were coming out in terms of the various options that you laid out, Tony.

And then I'll note, Tapani, you were the one group that did and were able to respond in writing so I'd like to give you the mic after that. And then I'll take a queue and we'll see where folks want to be in terms of their comments. But, Tony, if I can turn the mic over to you to sort of share the ISP thought process, some of the recommendations you had to drive a decision here, that would be fantastic. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks, Rob. Just to say I'm struggling to get on the Adobe link at the moment so I'm just on the phone line. But basically I sent that note really having thought about the last call. And it was really prompted by a remark from Klaus, which is we seem to have a number of options on the table. And we started to go around in circles where people were just putting in views from their community without us honing it down.

And they were just questions that I thought would help us move it forward. So we ended up with three possible options on the table. And out of those it was – I was concerned because this was a 30-minute call, it's certainly a 30-minute call for me today. And we need to make some progress. And I think you've said, Rob, that the focus should be at least trying to get a date and a venue.

And one of the things I was hoping to get out of it was to understand what the other problems were from different groups' perspectives. So for any of those three option that were on the table, if there were reasons that their community had particular problems or certainly with the latter two where we hadn't pegged a firm date, if we could look at conflicts that could arise through

various commitments that those community may have, it could be the Internet governance stuff, it could be various trade meetings. If we can find the window for those other couple of options then at least we can start talking about dates and venues. So it was really just an attempt to move that forward.

And I didn't want to get back into the stage on this call where we didn't have the information to hand so that we couldn't peg in a lot more finite degree the various options that we have. I think that's all I really need to say on this.

Thanks, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Tony. Sort of throwing it back to you just briefly because you had noted out, you know, the various options and potential ranking of those, what from the ISP perspective would be your preferred ranking in terms of the options. Is it how you laid it out in your note to folks or would it be potentially different?

Tony Holmes: Yes, I mean, from the ISPs I think at the moment we could consider any of the three options. But the easiest one really to make firm progress on is the February meeting that we talked about before where we actually had a date and potentially we were exploring Reykjavik.

So there's nobody – when we had this discussion basically around Hyderabad, there was no one that was expressing concern that we couldn't sort of make that timeframe. So for that it's an easier choice for us but at the same time if others have problems we wouldn't rule out the other options at this stage either pending getting a firm date for what they are. So, yes, I think it goes in ranking at the moment of 1, 2 and 3 straight down with the very last option making it the other side of Johannesburg. And the only reason for that is it's further out. So very few barriers, I think, from our side. We need to understand where others sit.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Tony. Let me turn the mic over to you, Tapani, after one brief comment and that is the one additional bit of information that we were able to divine, and I thank Chantelle for doing this follow up, is that when we were talking the April May timeframe, someone noted the value of potentially linking any event to potentially the GDD Summit that's being held and that pulled the Contracted Parties together.

For everyone's information, that is scheduled without a location yet but identified for that window of 9-12 May, 2017. So that gets plugged into anyone's thought process, that might be helpful. And the other observation I would make is, yes, I mean, basically we've been able to be a little bit flexible in terms of coming up with a timeframe and you all are being very magnanimous about your willingness to devote prep time to something that make take place the second week of February.

The challenge is, from a logistical standpoint, I think that we definitely have to – if we're going to go the February 13 route – we have to confirm that, you know, today. Otherwise we just won't be able to pull all the various strings together to make that happen logistically. Let alone you guys putting together a coherent productive agenda for that timeframe. So if we're going to go that route we have to decide today.

If you all choose to say, oh, no, we're willing to push it off to May or sometime after the Johannesburg meeting, taking a different approach to this, that we have a little bit more comfort on. But simply logistically, it's sink or swim I think given what hoops the Meetings team and others have to jump through to make that early February date happen.

Tapani, you were able to chat with your group and actually get a written response together. I know there were challenges for others to be able to do that. Could you share for folks who may not have had a chance to look at that just the perspective that you all had based on the outline and recommended approach that Tony shared?

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Tony – Rob, and Tony as well. Yes, I did try to get discussion and also created a little poll to see how many of our potential participants would be able to come or would not like certain timeframes. And the conclusion was that basically that for any possible timeframe we will have one or two people who probably won't make it. And general, there was a slight preference, or about slight or strong at least, but clear preference for February whereas the April, May and August September were more a washout. They had slight preference to August September but very – not a strong one.

One concern was indeed that there is no fixed date for the latter two so for April May timeframe, just about all – almost all possible times are a problem for someone but they were that they might not be able join but they would need a fixed date. So this is a bit of a problem in that sense. But even without knowing the date there were a couple who could not make it so it would seem that for us at least for now it seems that February would be the easiest timeframe.

I sent a few possible conflict events, a few more have risen up but nothing really (unintelligible) for August there is a – in mid-August there is ICANN (unintelligible) August 25, 26, that's the only one that I so far have conflict with that one. But for April May timeframe I already sent the full list and there are some in June as well. We had – that beginning of March that doesn't really matter.

So basically and otherwise none of the times are impossible for us either. There's no insurmountable obstacle against any other timeframes that I know at this point. But I'd at least rather not postpone it much later, that it seems that for most purposes it would be more useful to have it now and be in the August September timeframe is just before elections and beginning of academic year and everything so that messes up that one.

April May is really crowded and calendar-wise it would seem that some people said there is one week that I would have a hole in that things so it's a bit problematic. But we could accommodate – deal with any of them if need be if it turns out that February doesn't work.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you very much. I'm not seeing any other hands in the Adobe Connect room. Let me pause for a second to see if anyone who's not been able to make it into the room wants to get into the queue verbally. I note that Chris included the chat the BC order of preference with – and thanks for making note of that Maryam, with the February date being Number 1, April May, Number 2 and the August date – August September distant third.

Let me – in a facilitative role here note that there seems to be growing consensus, if not a general consensus here, for the February date either as a preference or a strong or quote unquote, clear preference for that February timeframe.

Can I suggest that we proceed with that as the approach from a planning perspective with the understanding, and I know that on the previous calls there were some concerns about that date, whether those had been completely ameliorated or those are going to be able to be adjusted or at least something that folk can live with, with the understanding that when you do get together there will be a priority about talking about timing, expectations, projections

and just overall what you want to accomplish strategically for the next time that you get together.

Does anyone have a strong objection to moving forward with the February timeframe and just authorizing as staff to go ahead with all dispatch to identify as a first priority the Reykjavik location with an expectation that, you know, if we have major difficulties there, we'll come back to you all with an alternate location. But that we'd be focused on that. Let me stop and see if anyone has any strong objections to taking that approach and that route.

Tony has raised his hand for a comment, if not an objection, so Tony, I'll turn the microphone over to you.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks, Rob. Certainly no objection. I think that that would be a really helpful step. I'm also aware that on these calls where we represent our communities sometimes it's really difficult to make sure you're reflecting all those views. But I wonder if it would perhaps be possible to give ICANN staff maybe three or four days to have a look at the logistics around that and the rest of us three or four days to maybe go back to our communities and see if there are any red flags.

So if we could have a call in four or five days where we can catch up with what the possibilities are and anybody can come back if there are real concerns at the end of that we should really be in a position to move forward hopefully pretty quickly on this so perhaps that's something we could consider, Rob. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Tony. I was going to ask if anyone has any suggestions or comments on your suggestion. And Tapani has raised his hand with recognition that no

one else who hasn't spoken yet has raised their hand, Tapani, I'll turn the mic over to you. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Rob. As I said, I circulated this already amongst our members, NCSG members, entire membership actually or at least everybody on the list includes NCUC and NPOC. And no strong objections came about. But I'm happy with Tony's suggestion other than my schedule I'll be traveling the rest of the week, going to IGF in Mexico so I'm not sure if I'll be able to join a call but Friday might be possible.

Otherwise one little point if we go to February we have a slight preference to the beginning of the week on the 13th. There is one event at the end of the week that one person might be able to go to so February 13 to 15 would be the best dates, but not overriding problem if it turns out at the end of the week, is easy. Otherwise I'm happy to call it consensus now or wait for three or four days if need be.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I think the approach that I'll take from just a logistical standpoint, recognizing the challenge of being able to pull, now that you've added folks to the representative planning list here I think that's less of a problem. My major concern is always to have representatives from all of you on any call, any planning call that we do have. And I'm happy that we have that situation here.

I am more than prepared, and I think you all should be very comfortable noting that all of you through the three calls that we've had have been excellent sharers of the various concerns of your communities. And I recognize that when you're talking about delegations of potentially 7 attendees, which is what we'll be going with again this year from each of your groups, that, yes, there's always going to be one or two people who unfortunately won't be able to do it from a scheduling standpoint. But I don't

think in any scenario we're going to have 50 people who can all, you know, find the exact correct time.

What I will do is we're going to move forward with that February 13 week planning noting what you've said, Tapani, about earlier in the week rather than later. Unless we run into any difficulties we will proceed with that and we'll immediately alert you via email.

I think the right approach here, and you're very sensitive to this, Tony, and I appreciate that, is that if any of the groups, you know, collectively as a group, any of the communities comes back and says no, that is simply unacceptable, we can't do it, that would be the only condition under which that we'd stop from a staff planning perspective on that.

If otherwise reluctantly or semi-reluctantly you can all live with this from a consensus standpoint, I'm prepared to declare the consensus for this call with the understanding that by the end of the week if there is a major objection then we'll put a halt to that. But I don't want to try to drag you all back on a call particularly when a number of you are heading for the IGF meeting or something else, even for a brief call because I think that a major objection would open up for at least another full hour discussion. And I don't want to try to pull that all together.

I note, with a smile, Chris's comments about Valentine's Day, and I'm sure a number of us will have that as an issue that we'll have to deal with. Maybe make it up to our significant others with a long weekend some other time in February or maybe a nicer time of the year. But, yes, from a staff availability perspective, we will make it work.

That also gives us a little bit of leeway, the major challenge that we'll have is from an AV perspective with a number of other ICANN events taking place just that week before with the Board getting together in Los Angeles. We'll have some challenges I think from an AV perspective but we'll get right on with our IT team to be able to make sure that we've got that together. A lot of that will dependent, of course, upon venue and location and what's available there.

But we will start immediately on that planning effort. We will immediately get back to you if we get any problems or anything like that that might come down the pike. If any of you are inclined to make calls within Iceland or otherwise, please hold off on that so that we don't create our own sort of competition. Let's let our Meetings team sort of have conversations. But if you have suggestions for potential venues that you might recommend our team reach out to we'll make that effort work.

Tony Holmes: Rob, it's Tony. Can I get in the queue please?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, sir. I didn't know if that was an old hand or a new hand so please, Tony, you have the mic.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks. I think that's an excellent way to proceed, Rob. I just wanted to confirm a couple of things. The first is that it would be really helpful I think for our understanding if you could provide an update, let's say, on Friday, bearing in mind IGF the following week, for all of us where ICANN currently feel that they are with the arrangements. In other words, if it's looking viable if you could make some progress on that by the end of the week and maybe just send a few lines as an update on Friday, that would be really helpful.

And the other thing I want to make absolutely sure in my own mind of the potential dates that we are now looking at so if you could just remind us of the dates as well I'll make sure I've got them recorded in the right way. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Tony. All excellent suggestions. And I also want to address Chris's other comment, I don't know from a budget standpoint that I'll address Greg's flower comment in the chat. But the date – the week that we are looking at, the window that we are looking at is February 13 to the 17. If that potentially involves a travel day on February 12, you know, we'll figure that out.

I am operating under the assumption, and I've got the draft story document together that we prepared for the previous meetings, noting that we're looking at this as being along the lines of our previous meetings where you have seven participants from each of the communities. We also include the NCAs and the Board members as invitees as well. That we're looking at a three-day affair potentially giving the option to any of you as individual communities to meet as a group either during that two days or as an add-on, you know, the day before or evening before or morning after, if you'd like to have some of that time.

There will, nevertheless, be time within the agenda as we've done on the last several meetings for you to have individual time. So with that understanding, we're looking at that week, Tony, with a preference being earlier in the week, as Tapani asked. We'll just see what the options are and the availability is there.

I don't know that we're going to be able to miss the 14th, which (unintelligible) as Greg's and Chris's other comments. So we're just going to

– we’re going to look at those blocks and that’s the timeframe that we’re looking at, Tony.

Is there anything else that I missed? Was I responsive to everything that you just asked?

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Okay we’ll definitely get back to you on Friday with the status check. I’m going to be on the phone here after we get off the call reaching out to Nick Tomasso to let him know that we have a firm window that we need to focus on and to give all efforts to that. Thank you, Tapani, for, you know, for looking at that. We’re going to see what we can do that whole week.

Any other comments or any other observations that folks want to make? I don’t know, Greg, if you want to comment on what you mean by maybe we should poll on Domain Pulse before finalizing? Is that – that’s the other event that’s taking place within the region close in time and there may be others who want to attend that. We’ll look that up and see that – if we can avoid that timing so that folks might be able to leverage the trip for that.

Chris, I see your hand went up. Let me turn the mic over to you, sir.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Rob. Chris Wilson. Just a quick – obviously we’re focusing on Reykjavik. If – do we want to also brainstorm alternative cities now if we – if for some reason we – that – we couldn’t get Reykjavik or, you know, logistically it wouldn’t work? I don’t know if you want to wait until later or not because we sort of settle on the February timeframe and since time is of the essence in that regard maybe – I don’t know if it’s worth us thinking about maybe not necessarily on this call because we’re wrapping up in five minutes,

but over the course of email or something at least one or two other cities in case Reykjavik is not doable, if that makes sense.

Rob Hoggarth: That's an excellent suggestion, Chris. What – Maryam, if you can leave the chat open and the AC room open for about 5-10 minutes afterwards, if anyone has an immediate brainstorm as a fall back that would be great. Please type that into the chat. No tongue in cheek suggestions, please, because we can't see or hear your tone when you're typing that in.

Or via email afterwards if, you know, throughout the course of the rest of today you get any of that feedback. It would be helpful, I don't want to just, you know, say to the Meetings team, pick anything in Western Europe. I don't think that's what we're looking at; we'd like to be a little bit more focused. Seems to me that, you know, given everybody's preference with now Iceland in February that regardless anyplace in that region you'll still be wearing some gloves, a hat, and a winter coat.

And thanks, Tony, for no limitation. It's just if anyone has a strong preference for something that might – that they think work out really well from a visa perspective or something like that, that would be helpful. It's always good to give an alternative to the Meetings team for a fallback so they can legitimately say that in their negotiations with the venue.

Greg, your hand went up so let me give you an opportunity here in the next last couple of minutes. I'll turn the mic over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan. Sorry, I was kind of not audio connected. But first with regard to Domain Pulse, I thought that maybe one of the reasons we ended up with the 13-15 is because at one point I noted that there is an event called Domain Pulse in Vienna that I think is pretty narrowly focused on kind of

contracted party types and on European ones in particular. So I'm not sure that we would have any actual conflict with that meeting.

And taking the meeting off Valentine's Day would have a salutary effect for some of us. As Tapani says, we could live with the 15-17 although if that means travel on the 14th that's actually probably worse than – that doesn't necessarily solve the problem. So I don't know if the planning of the 13-15 is because of that perceived conflict or not. But if it is, you know, we should look at whether that's an actual conflict.

And in terms of other suggested possibilities, would look in – consider Portugal or Spain, Lisbon, Madrid, possibly Barcelona, even, you know, further south. A relatively small meeting so we can, you know, look to a secondary city and that kind of takes us someplace that ICANN hasn't, you know, been lately but is also kind of as close to the Atlantic – as mid-Atlantic as possible and in a sense. And another suggestion is Bermuda.

Rob Hoggarth: All right, thanks, guys. Yes, yes and then someone can bring along their significant other to salve the fact that we all have to be in meetings. All right great, thank you all very much for these thoughts. The one other quick observation I'd like to make someone asked about staff and I realized later with the follow up comment that you didn't mean just us. I think, you know, we're going to have that challenge given the timeframe that we typically have. One of the reasons why, you know, California was always attractive that we could just drag somebody down the hall or across the street.

I can commit that we'll work our best to at least have people via remote capabilities so that don't let that affect your programming or the thought about, you know, who you would want to participate in the meeting. We can certainly achieve that. Once we let folks now when and where the meeting is

and we've got that nailed down we'll of course make our best pitch for folks to be able to participate or come through for that meeting. It might, given the initial Iceland location, be an ice stopover for folks who might otherwise be traveling.

Thank you, all very much, for your participation today and being able to do this so quickly. We will circulate information to you on Friday at the latest once we know more about the Reykjavik location and dates that look best for the venue. In the meantime please share any other suggestions or thoughts you may have via email.

I think what we'll plan to do, given IGF next week, if I've got my timing right, is we'll look to schedule the next call so that we don't have a conflict with that recognizing that a number of you will be participating in that. And we'll balance that with noting that you have reps on the call. But we'll move very quickly to the actual program planning phase because that'll be the next real priority I think you all need to have.

The other piece here, and I understand that we have to wait until we have a specific date, but please you each have, you know, a roster of seven, we will be following up with Chantelle and Maryam like tomorrow to start bugging you all for potential attendees. So if there are any folks that you know are nailed down and will definitely be coming, please let us know that asap.

If there's one or two slots of your seven that's not going to be able to – you're not going to know for a little bit, that's okay but I'd really like to have 80%, 90% of the travelers identified here in the next week or two so that we can begin working with the travel team. That's very important if we're going to be able to pull this off.

Thank you all very much. I only have to smile a little bit at the (Hobart) suggestion. Thank you all very much. Appreciate the joining us. And we'll talk to you all very soon. Thank you all for joining. Bye-bye now.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Maryam. We can end the recording.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much. Andrew, you may now stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you so much for your time today. Good-bye, everyone.

END