

**NCPH INTERSESSIONAL MEETING PLENARY #5
15 FEBRUARY 2017**

AC Chat:

Ozan Sahin: (2/15/2017 14:02) Hello, welcome to NCPH Intersessional Meeting on Wednesday, 15 February 2017.

Ozan Sahin: (14:03) My name is Ozan Sahin and I will be monitoring this chat room.

Ozan Sahin: (14:06) Discussions will continue with NCPH Plenary 5 - Maintaining the GNSO's traditional policy-making leadership position at ICANN

Ozan Sahin: (14:38) Tony Holmes speaking

Ozan Sahin: (14:42) Stephanie, I noted your hand up and let the co-chairs know, thank you.

Stephanie Perrin: (14:42) thanks

Tony Holmes: (14:44) Stephanie - noted you're in the queue

Ozan Sahin: (14:48) Tony Holmes on the mic

Ozan Sahin: (14:48) *Holmes

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: (14:52) Thanks Steph for referring to the points about newcomers/outside perception and the GAC

Stephanie Perrin: (14:55) You are most welcome. I think it is very puzzling.

Ozan Sahin: (14:55) Erika Mann speaking

Marilyn Cade: (14:57) Just a further comment: government reps often require not just notice, but also invitations, in order for them to get authorization within their own govt for travel and permission to engage.

Ozan Sahin: (15:00) Ed is speaking now

Stephanie Perrin: (15:05) Wait for it Susan, it will come later

Ozan Sahin: (15:15) Stephanie, your hand is noted, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: (15:16) Re early GAC engagement see the proposed implementation plan just to be finalized:

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/attachments/20170122/5e7bfe72/ProposedImplementationPlanGAC-GNSOCGRecs22January2017-0001.docx>

Marilyn Cade: (15:16) Has there been any discussion here in this meeting about how to create more awareness and understanding about the different approaches taken and why the GNSO Policy processes really need Government participation. You might think: Government participation - is that what we are seeking? Have we recently done a briefing about what the priorities of gTLD policy work will be for next year? Just a gentle idea of maybe we focus on governmental participation.

Ozan Sahin: (15:19) Avri Doria on the mic

Kathy: (15:19) All, here is the link to Minds + Machines Limited's Registry Agreement on .VIP with ICANN -- https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_sites_default_files_tlds_vip_vip-2Dagmt-2Dpdf-2Dredline-2D22jan15-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=SJoAZJPf4sll7c5HM-90jeUSDBNV8i1H6DgoihUn1_U&m=XzQfGZh7XeJzEIAEsirFnO7gFTaObdRBYN638GjNOqc&s=IOgCS6vTyG HzCPbQm8ONKWs0_EXgvCEffWSv9LicYFA&e=

Tony Holmes: (15:20) Marilyn - the proposal to flag where the policy development process is flagged should help with the valid point you raise

Ozan Sahin: (15:24) Steve is on the mic

Ozan Sahin: (15:25) Ed is speaking now

Stephanie Perrin: (15:25) Does the chat appear in the room?

Room Tech: (15:25) @Stephanie - No, it is full screen on the presentation.

Tony Holmes: (15:26) only for those on line individually

Stephanie Perrin: (15:26) I see. So if the folks in the room are not logged on, they don't see anything.

Stephanie Perrin: (15:26) I was about to type out my comments in case I get cut off again.

Marilyn Cade: (15:28) Tony, it would be helpful for the attendees to know that there are comments online.

Ozan Sahin: (15:28) Phil Corwin speaking

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: (15:29) Cooperation with GAC has already been discussed over some years in a common consultation group. The outcome is the aforementioned plan

Stephanie Perrin: (15:29) Now that you are here Marilyn, I want you to know that I have been nagging for two days to state their names for the record, it was only when I mentioned your name that someone perked up and paid attention and reminded folks....

Tony Holmes: (15:30) Stephanie - we will get to you

Stephanie Perrin: (15:30) Thanks Tony, Phil is covering some of what I wanted to point out.....needs to be in the primer that we need.

Marilyn Cade: (15:32) I was a little dismayed about many things, including that the private sessions were so early that many of the members could not join unless it was at 3 am. or 4 am. but also not announcing themselves is quite bad... bad for everyone, including as a role model for the remote participants. Those attending are supposed to be responsive to their members, not acting as an empowered new community that makes decisions on the spot, but understands they are doing a strategy session and reporting back... to all of their groups members

Marilyn Cade: (15:32) I believe you mean the GNSO Policy Council?

Stephanie Perrin: (15:39) +1 Markus

Benedetta Rossi: (15:40) A quick reminder that remote participation is mainly for observation, to ensure balance of numbers is maintained in each delegation in the room. A specific exception was granted for two delegates who were unable to attend in person last minute due to extenuating circumstances.

Benedetta Rossi: (15:40) If remote observers have comments they may use the chat function, and/or ask their delegates in room to share their comments or questions on their behalf, thank you!

Tony Holmes: (15:42) Marilyn - it appears you may not have access?

Tony Holmes: (15:43) can you post your comment?

Marilyn Cade: (15:44) hmm why would I not have access?

Stephanie Perrin: (15:44) You have to have a dialout Marilyn, adobe does not connect

Stephanie Perrin: (15:44) connect

Marilyn Cade: (15:45) I guess you have limited those who are participating remotely to having to dial in?

Marilyn Cade: (15:45) that is disappointing to learn at this point.

Marilyn Cade: (15:47) Perhaps this is part of my comment: those attending this session are asked by their members to have a high level, non decisional discussion and to bring back options and ideas for discussion among their members. I have heard mostly complaints and examples of disappointment and very few ideas for improvements. The GNSO Policy Council is not being replaced but this seemed to focus on some view that anyone else -- GAC or ALAC are threatening the GNSO Policy Council's role in gTLD policy. The GNSO itself has a broader role also to engage in ICANN governance more broadly and I seem to have missed that discussion perhaps taken in other sessions.

Marilyn Cade: (15:48) I hope to hear options being brought back to the BC, for instance. So that all the BC members consider what options, and any decisions that we might support for our collaborative work together.

Ozan Sahin: (15:48) This is the end of Plenary 5 session. Thanks for attending. We will reconvene at the top of the hour 16:00 (UTC)

Marilyn Cade: (15:48) Thanks, Stephanie, for the heads up. It never occurred to me that this meeting would not have openness to speakers just by enaging in the Adobe. Lessons learned.