

**NCPH INTERSESSIONAL MEETING PLENARY #6
15 FEBRUARY 2017**

AC Chat:

Ozan Sahin: (2/15/2017 15:51) Hello, welcome to NCPH Intersessional Meeting on Wednesday, 15 February 2017.

Ozan Sahin: (15:52) My name is Ozan Sahin and I will be monitoring this chat room.

Ozan Sahin: (15:53) We will start next session - NCPH Plenary 6 by 16:00 UTC

Ozan Sahin: (15:54) Chat history is cleared at the end of each session and please feel free to participate in AC chat with this new thread, thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: (15:57) To clarify, all chats are kept as records of the sessions, but cleared from the Adobe Connect chat and the end of each session

Stephanie Perrin: (16:03) no sound yet??? or do I need to redial

Stephanie Perrin: (16:04) ok now

Ozan Sahin: (16:04) @Stephanie we are starting now

Ozan Sahin: (16:04) Thank you

Benedetta Rossi: (16:10) @Stephanie you don't need to redial your line was transferred so you're all set

Stephanie Perrin: (16:12) great thanks

Marilyn Cade: (16:12) Bene, an you dial out to me? +12022516787? thanks.

Marilyn Cade: (16:15) Just fyi for Greg : we set up a framework long ago. Deciding to update it to take into account evolution is different than suggesting that we are somehow disenfranchised.-)

Benedetta Rossi: (16:17) @Marilyn we can set up a dial out for you to listen in on the meeting from your phone as an observer. Would you like us to proceed?

Marilyn Cade: (16:20) I am able to listen in, so perhaps not needed. I am however recognizing that I should have insisted on improvements by Barbara who is a new CSG . Gracious. scheduling the BC and CST meetings so early meant that non one would be on the calls. That was my fault for not trying to help her more. sigh.

Ozan Sahin: (16:21) Tony Holmes speaking

Marilyn Cade: (16:24) The NCPH was not agreed to or supported by the three constituencies BC, ISPCP, IPC. In fact it was a negotiation by two board members and a former member of one of the commercial stakeholders. It has never been welcomed by the rest of the community. I fully support Tony's comments.

steve metalitz: (16:29) @Avri's comments overlook that the transition changes the role of the GNSO but (for the most part) not of the GNSO council, which is confined (for the most part) to management of the policy development process.

Marilyn Cade: (16:32) Agreeing with Steve Metalitz. The gNSO Policy Council still needs to be focused on gTLD policy. There are other roles for the GNSO and that is not limited to gTLD policy but more about ICANN governance.

Marilyn Cade: (16:33) Why are we accepting that the NCPH is a fact of life? why not start over and have a separation as we used to have?

matthew shears: (16:36) not knowing the history what were the advantages of that separation

Marilyn Cade: (16:38) BETTER QUESTION, MATTHEW,

Marilyn Cade: (16:38) why were we pushed into a house that we did not agree with? what was the advantage of that, from different perspectives of the community

Joan Kerr: (16:42) IHi Mariln, will be reading your question shortly

Marilyn Cade: (16:43) I think that part of this discussion has overlooked that the GNSO is concerned about ICANN governance, and also has a gTLD policy council responsible for gTLD policy management/coordination. Perhaps both statements can be read together.

Tony Holmes: (16:44) Marilyn 0 we were pushed into that house as it was a (slightly) better option than the alternative being pushed on us BUT we were promised it would be reviewed after 2 years. That never happened.

Ozan Sahin: (16:46) Ed is on the mic

Ozan Sahin: (16:51) Hi Stephanie, I noted your hand and informed the co-chairs, thank you.

Stephanie Perrin: (16:51) thanks Ozan

Steve Metalitz: (16:52) Recall the statement unanimously adopted at the 2015 intersessional. Here is the key paragraph -- I would be glad to forward the full text: What is required is a thorough review of the current GNSO structure that takes full account of the evolution of the DNS and the interaction that is required between those players who have a major role to play in GNSO policy development. Without recognition of the need to undertake this exercise and commit to a program that is developed with the full cooperation of all impacted parties, an important part of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model will continue to be viewed as dysfunctional by many of those who remain committed to try and deliver coherent and progressive policy within the current structural architecture of the GNSO.

Marilyn Cade: (16:53) Actually, I said: the gNSO policy council has a limited mandate. I suggested that the GNSO has a broader remit.

Steve Metalitz: (16:53) @Steve, incorrect, the Board Governance Committee decided on an even worse structure and we were told we had 30 days to come up with something else.

Steve Metalitz: (16:53) *even*

Steve DelBianco: (16:54) @Steve Metalitz -- good point. I will read that NCPH statement into the record.

Marilyn Cade: (16:54) Support Steve Metalitz. and we did have a participant from within the community that agreed to the board governance committee while many of us wanted to refuse and put the Board on notice that we would not accept. we were preempted.

Marilyn Cade: (16:55) NO NCPH existed when we were opposing this structure.

Steve DelBianco: (17:00) @Steve -- please do circulate the full NCPH 2015 statement

Steve Metalitz: (17:00) @Steve I e-mailed it to you but is there a staff person I should send to?

Robert Hoggarth: (17:01) you all can find the 2015 communiqué and all the other documents associated with the 2015 NCPH Intersessional Meeting here -

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_display_ncph_NCPH-2BIntersessional-2B2015-2B-2D-2BDocuments&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=SJoAZJPf4sll7c5HM-90jeUSDBNV8i1H6DgoihUn1_U&m=HQm-L63uCZj7jBC87JuKSnRiQxUUfqLgGCyjLBrBHTA&s=CxYpl7mMkKF-mQ2WZexN7dh1DU7QoN8bWuysxE2AHz8&e=

Marilyn Cade: (17:06) I will say this again: all suggestions are only options that have to be brought back to the Constituencies. So, undoubtedly, what Steve, you are proposing is: this might be a suggestion to the Constituencies of the NCPH?

Marilyn Cade: (17:07) Changing the allocation of seats to be returning to more seats that are elected by the SOs, reducing the NomCom allocation, would move the majority of seats back to the SOs, and return the NomCom to its original purpose ; only five of the Board seats.

Marilyn Cade: (17:09) So, 3 for each of the SOs, and only five to the NomCom. We would need to factor in the selection of a seat from the ALAC, however. but this is a major reform and one that could take some collaboration with the other SOS.

Steve DelBianco: (17:09) ICANN will supply the criteria for conducting the GNSO Review; these criteria include but are not limited to the following areas, to be applied to GNSO Council, GNSO Working Groups, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies: • Achievement of mission, compliance with agreed upon rules and processes • Accountability and transparency to the public •

Membership processes and participation • Structural support toward achievement of mission • Governance and management: effectiveness of execution • Quality and evaluation/measurement of outcomes • Communication • Effectiveness of implementation of prior review recommendations

Steve DelBianco: (17:11) Also this from the last RFP: The work methods are expected to include: • Examination of documentation, records and reports • Outcomes from the 360 Assessment • Integration of Assessments of the 2nd ATRT • Limited interviews, if needed

Ozan Sahin: (17:13) Wolf-Ulrich speaking

Marilyn Cade: (17:14) If ICANN is limiting the process for public comments by limiting the funding, etc, then anyone bidding will not be able to really gather data. I have spoke to many of the interviewers and I think that the RFPs and ToRs are problematic. Rinadia has identified the independence issue but I strongly find from my engagements with any of the reviewers that even when they have suggested changes, there has not been openness on the part of ICANN staff overseeing the Reviews.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:15) This gets back to my questions regarding contract management

Marilyn Cade: (17:15) For instance, I suggested to one reviewer being discussed: why not hold interviews with different constituencies and even hold online engagement and they were not really encouraged to do that. There was a strong focus on costs, costs, costs.

Steve DelBianco: (17:16) Finally, the last RFP said this: ICANN will supply the criteria for conducting the GNSO Review; these criteria include but are not limited to the following areas, to be applied to GNSO Council, GNSO Working Groups, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies:

Marilyn Cade: (17:16) They were asked to do all interviews at the ICANN meetings and then many people that they tried to speak to were not available, as they were too busy with their constituencies work

Lori Schulman: (17:17) @Marilyn, I remember that. Very hard to schedule time.

Marilyn Cade: (17:17) So, what I told them was garbage in, garbage out. They did speak to the ICANN staff. So did I about this challenge.

Marilyn Cade: (17:24) Rather than having a NCPH Intercessional -- should the NCPH continue -- why not have a fuller summit of all of the members = as others do.

Marilyn Cade: (17:25) Holding meetings with a limited set of officers+ 1 or 2 is perhaps not the most effective engagement -- let's go for a real Summit.

Marilyn Cade: (17:25) parallel to an ICANN meeting in 2018.

matthew shears: (17:26) + 1 Greg

Ines Hfaiedh: (17:27) + 1 Greg

Ozan Sahin: (17:28) @Stephanie - your hand is noted

Marilyn Cade: (17:30) Ozan: and mine?

Marilyn Cade: (17:30) Bene: are you calling out to me? or you can read my comments?

Benedetta Rossi: (17:31) @Marilyn, kindly use the chat function for your comments. Stephanie is part of the delegation but was unable to join last minute hence her ability to participate remotely with her phone

Greg Shatan: (17:32) Biennial Intercessional has a nice ring to it.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:33) Can I get my question and comments in please

matthew shears: (17:36) + 1 Ed's idea about linking to GDD

Juan Manuel Rojas: (17:36) Im sorry. What means GDD?

Greg Shatan: (17:36) Hammer and tongs, hammer and nails, hammer and sickle, hammer and shears.....

Anna Loup: (17:36) global domains division

Stephanie Perrin: (17:37) Uh.....yes.

Juan Manuel Rojas: (17:37) @Anna Thanks

Stephanie Perrin: (17:38) \No means no

Greg Shatan: (17:38) But what about the kids?

Greg Shatan: (17:38) 50% of all marriages end in divorce....

Ozan Sahin: (17:38) This is the conclusion of last plenary session of NCPH Intersessional 2017. Thank you for attending.

Anna Loup: (17:39) Thank you Ozan!

Stephanie Perrin: (17:39) we don't really need to meet face to face if we have a decent teleconference process in place. Then perhaps we add an extra half day on one of the regular meetings.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:40) not that I want to kill the intersessional, but at the moment it seems pretty dysfunctional to me and I am a participant.

Robin Gross: (17:41) Less travel is better. We can do so much with Adobe Connect and such tools. Let's try to do more remotely.

Marilyn Cade: (17:44) Maybe we could do a Summit back to back with teh mid year meeting and open this to all attendees of all constituencies members -- at least for one full day -- more of a Summit of members. Not limited in numbers but open to all membes.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:44) That was more along the lines of what I was thinking

Ozan Sahin: (17:45) Thank you all for attending!