ICANN

Moderator: Terri Agnew
December 22, 2016
9:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings are now connected. You may proceed.

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Non Contracted Party House Intercessional Planning call held on the 22nd of December, 2016. On the call today we have Poncelet Ileleji, Farzaneh Badii, Chris Wilson, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Anna Loup. We have received apologies from Tapani Tarvainen and Adam Peake. From ICANN staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Benedetta Rossi, Chantelle Doerksen and myself, Ozan Sahin.

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

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Ozan. Welcome, everyone. Happy holidays. Thank you all for sticking to our schedule and your commitment to getting our planning work forged ahead with respect to the February meeting. I know from Ozan's roll call that we have somebody from each of the five constituencies so thanks very much for that.

The agenda that I've proposed that we got up on the slide today is for us to focus on giving you an update on the logistics and then really the bulk of the discussion on the programming, getting reactions to the brainstorm session list that you all developed on our call last week and then talking about pulling that all together in terms of the actual meeting preparations going forward.

So first let's do the logistics update for you. Thank you, number one, for all of you working very hard to finalize your delegate lists and getting all that information in. It's been a very tight schedule, as you all know, we have worked over the course of the last several annual meetings to work as effectively as possible with our Meetings team so that we're not, you know, having people booked for the last minute. That helps in terms of people's planning, it helps in terms of the budget and expenses for the meeting. So thank you all very much for that work.

Benedetta, can you give us an update in terms of the travel planning, where we are in working with the Meetings team and what some of the various chairs or planning representatives may be hearing from their delegates in terms of, gee, I need to get my ICANN email or not. If you can give us the status of that timing and where things stand that would be really great.

Benedetta Rossi: Sure. This is Benedetta speaking for the transcript. As far as the travel logistics go, I believe that the bulk of the attendees should have received or should be receiving shortly an email from ICANN's Constituency Travel team. The first step for the Travel team to book the travel portion is always to run security clearances from the US and that takes a few days so I'm not sure what the status is for the bulk of the travelers who were submitted last week.

But I believe that if you haven't – I see that Lori is noting that she hasn't received any messages which means that you should be receiving them

shortly. Whereas, the attendees who were submitted later on we finalized some of the – I think we had five pending delegates who were submitted this week. We were told that the security clearance won't be done before the 25th of December, which means that the welcome email submitted by ICANN's Travel team will be delayed because of that. But in any case you should be – everybody should be contacted soon.

If you haven't been contacted once the ICANN offices opens again so when we're all back the week of the 3rd of January, please let us know. But you should all have received your welcome email by then.

In terms of the travel update I think that that's all that we have. Rob, was there anything else you wanted me to touch on in terms of – did you want to talk about the hotel or are you going to do that?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I'll chat about the hotel and you can clarify anything that I don't have right on that, Benedetta. We're in the final throws of the actual documentation for the hotel. The Meetings team has been coordinating internally, as some of you know from past meetings, all the ICANN contracts have to go through a legal review and a procurement review. And all that was expedited by the Meetings team for us. So I think we're just at the point where Is are being dotted, Ts are being crossed, actually sign the contracts. Hence all the various communications going out about travel. Don't want people traveling to a place where we don't have a venue. So all that seems to be lined up.

So again, just reinforcing Benedetta's point, if, you know, you all get back on the New Year and find that there is a delegate or someone who reaches out to you and says I don't have my note yet, then that'll be a problem that we'll want to jump right on. We want everybody comfortably aware of schedules and time tables and all that at least a month before the meeting. And that – if

we accomplish that this year it'll be a major accomplishment and improvement over past years. And so it looks like we're well on track for that. So, again, please on any of these exceptions or where someone is having some particular difficulties, or hasn't heard, please reach out to us right away.

One other logistics item came up, I mean, I got a question from Ed Morris who flagged this for members of your delegations who are on the GNSO Council. There is a GNSO Council call on February 16 that is scheduled for I think 12 – I don't know the exact time but it works out to like noontime in Iceland.

And so we wanted to make sure for those of you who are planning to actually have some additional community get together or meeting on Thursday morning that you assure your councilors that they'll, you know, be able to participate in the Council meeting. We're talking with the Meetings team just about getting a small conference room with a PolyCom – maybe we'll just use one of the rooms that you guys have already used so that the councilors can gather face to face if they choose.

We'll leave that up to each individual councilor in terms of how they want to satisfy their Council meeting attendance obligations. The intercessional meeting ends officially on the evening of the 15th. Some people, based on airline reservations I understand may actually be looking to get out that evening. Others who will be sticking around for their individual constituency meeting the next day as we already discussed on our past call, will have the flexibility to stay an extra night. And obviously if a councilor participating in some of those meetings and then sticks around for the Council call obligation they can do that as well.

Plenty of the councilors do calls on mobile phones or in airports or whatever so we don't want to limit someone's travel options. But since Ed raised that we are talking to make sure that we do have a place and particularly if someone has already checked out or, you know, has some other complications we want to give folks a small option there.

We'll finalize that all when we're there in person but obviously from an airline perspective, we want to make sure that your councilors are aware of that and are prepared to meet those obligations. Looks like that won't be a major problem and we'll have capabilities there to handle that for folks.

I think those were the – all the logistical update items we had. Let me pause and see if anyone – Kathy Kleiman, welcome on the phone bridge – see if anyone else has any questions about logistics before we move onto the more substantive programming discussion. I'll pause for a few moments for folks to come off mute or raise their hand.

Farzaneh, you have raised your hand. Let me turn the mic over to you. Please.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, Rob. It's a personal question. I'm just wondering if the travel – well let me just send you an email later on. It's a very personal question.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: All right, very good. Thanks. Your question prompted for me one other thought, and thanks for the jabber, Benedetta. So far we have three expressed declarations for community meetings on that Thursday morning. If your community is still deliberating whether you want to meet that day, we can't

know like two weeks before the meeting. So please, as soon as possible, let us know if that's something that your community is planning and wants to do.

This may be an incomplete list, but I think so far I noted, Benedetta, that we have the IPC, the NCUC have declared their interest in having meetings that morning. Tapani also indicated that he would like to have an NCSG meeting. That may be something that you all want to work out as part of the NCSG. So, you know, Klaus and Farzaneh, you may want to collaborate with Tapani to see how that would work for that morning. But those are the communities that I have jotted down based upon individual emails that I have received.

If the rest of you want to do that, please let us know. I think somebody expressed previously in a chat or on the call that, my goodness, two days, you know, is enough but for those of you who are interested in that extra time on Thursday morning, please confirm with us. That does have some impacts in terms of what we're paying the hotel, what the room availability is. As Ed indicated on the past call, things are getting tight at the hotel because of cultural events taking place in Reykjavik that coming weekend so we really want to make sure that we have that stuff nailed down.

But if we don't know by early January we're going to return that space. And I don't want any of you in the position where you have to meet in the lobby. I only say that half-jokingly. Just want to be able to nail that down and give you guys the opportunity to plan for that stuff if you would like.

Anyone else? I see no other hands in the room. And I see, Kathy, you have joined us in the AC room so all of us are in the AC room so no more hands we'll turn to the next agenda item, which is programming.

We have a couple of new faces and names and voices on the call today. Thanks, Farzaneh, for asking a couple other people to participate. By way of background, for those of you who haven't been on some of the previous calls, or attended previous intercessional meetings, this is your meeting. And so we turn to you all – as staff we facilitate the discussions but it's up to you all to decide what you want to talk about, what you're focused on, what you want to accomplish at the meeting.

And each year we give you all the opportunity to name a number of different topics or sessions. If we can go to the next slide, Chantelle, and Ozan, you'll see the list that the group provided either by email or on the phone call last week during the planning session. You'll note very quickly that we have 10 session ideas at the moment. You may also note in looking at the version 2.0, the framework agenda planning document that I circulated, that we have a total of seven plenary sessions, at least based on past scheduling of the sessions.

There's five plenary sessions and two luncheons. And then there is the block of time that we reserved for interactions with senior staff where each of the SGs participates individually. You don't participate as an overall group. So if you look at this list of 10 you essentially, you know, would have eight covered and you're basically looking to cut two.

Now Lori introduced an interesting concept at the last meeting that I think a number of people reacted positively to, and that's that you're not limited to any particular length of the sessions. If there are a couple of topics here that are important to a particular community that you want to make sure that is discussed in a plenary type session, maybe you guys can negotiate a shorter session. If some of these sessions really require a lot more conversation, you can schedule a longer session.

Right now we've typically looked at, you know, 75-90 minutes for each session but you all can play with the agenda in any number of ways that you want. We have tried generally to keep the agenda focused on an 8 to 6 time block. We have added break sessions now based on feedback from past meetings.

So I think it really falls to all of you as the planners to talk a little bit more about what are the real priority sessions that you have, that you want to use real, you know, substantial blocks of time, big blocks if you will, and those that might be important maybe just to one or two groups that you want to instead devote to your breakout time.

That's another area that a number of you have taken advantage of in the past. You're got approximately three hours and 45 minutes, you can stretch that to about four hours of individual community time that has, in the past, been split between sort of SG interactions at the stakeholder group level and constituencies at the constituency level. But again, it's your meeting so you guys can be flexible in terms of what you and how you want to approach that.

Oh I see Renata's suggestion in the chat, how about 7:00 am? That, you know, that's up for you guys, you know, there would be some time zone issues that some of you will have. And I'm just very conscious and take a lot of stock out of a number of the leaders who have participated now in two, three or four of the meetings in terms of, you know, what are the limits of your productivity as a group. So that's something that I think you all can explore as well.

Let me pause again and give folks an opportunity to raise their hands to either reinforce some of the comments that you may have typed in the chat here while I have been going through the summary or to make observations about

particular titles or sessions. Vicky and Wolf-Ulrich have raised their hands. I think Vicky, you went – clicked your button first so I'll turn over the mic to you first. Please, proceed.

Vicky Sheckler: Before getting into the sessions themselves, I had one comment on the scheduling. And I think it would be preferable to have a section on meeting just with the SGs or the constituency early on rather than at, you know, starting at four o'clock on day one. So I would ask that we get an hour or an hour and a half after the introduction and welcome just to make sure we have all our ducks in a row and then go into the plenaries.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. I appreciate any reactions that anyone else has to those. The only observations I would make is that last week you all talked about, you know, doing this sort of introductory session where you all said these are what our priorities are. Between now and the February meeting you probably have a couple of community meetings where, you know, you're already doing your annual planning for 2017 so we may likely be having that.

Vicky, is your suggestion – well from your suggestion, what would the community groups be doing in that hour and a half time block?

Vicky Sheckler: Okay, I'm not sure if we need an hour and a half or an hour but it was mostly just making sure that we're all on the same page, that we understand our goals for the intercessional, you know, that type of thing, just to have a little bit of face to face time with your group as we move into the further discussions.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great.

((Crosstalk))

Vicky Sheckler: …to an hour or an hour and a half. I don't care if it's half an hour. I just think it would be helpful to schedule that in.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks for that. And I'm interested in what other people have to say about that. Let me throw out two ideas or options that you have. One, we don't have you gathering until like 8:30. It's a Hilton so they've got, you know, the breakfast rooms and all that. Consider, as groups, whether you want to get together informally, you know, in the morning – that morning before, either over breakfast or coffee, and if you wanted to do that and didn't want to start at 7:00 or 7:30 we could postpone the introduction and welcome to something like 9:30 or 10:00. So there's a couple of thoughts to throw out there.

The question I would have as you explore this idea potentially a little bit more on that, Vicky, would be if folks did want to do an initial get together session earlier, would you want to have all the bells and whistles of remote participation or could you just do it in a room without a phone bridge? In other words, if you're just doing it for your delegation, you don't need remote participation. So that would be an important AV/logistical issue that we would want to explore.

So you can just think about those as you further explore that idea. We can certainly adjust things to accommodate that if that's what you all want to try to accomplish. I want to make sure that you achieve the goals that you're interested in doing.

I'd also remind you that we talked last week about having the webinar that we would do for some of the newcomers to some of the new meetings and have that. You all might want to consider as well, for your delegation, some sort of pre-preparations, a week, two weeks ahead of time. Again, it's early in the year so probably pretty tight in terms of scheduling where you just all get your

delegations together and chat on the phone in terms of meeting preparations as well. Just an immediate thought and reactions to that cool idea.

Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. Please either comment on Vicky's idea or something that you were already interested in exploring. And I'll keep watching to see if other hands go up to add to the queue. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Rob. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I have some comment to the session ideas. But first, well, to understand correctly, you know, because you were talking about prioritization of those topics so I understand if that is correct, my question that we should come down in the end with up to eight items or so to be discussed, you know, in the whole group. And the other one may be (unintelligible) item, that's my question, well to understand how we are going to prioritize.

And if that is the case so also we didn't have the time, you know, internally within our group of participants from the ISPs, to discuss, you know, this list in detail. But, you know, I put an idea to the – to our list with regards to prioritization if that would be the case. So I would have a question mark with regards to Number 5, which is the separate session for the GNSO councilors. I didn't understand why this should be maybe because I wasn't at the last meeting and there was one, I'm not sure about that. But that would be of lower priority to me I would understand.

And with regards to Number 6, I think I saw also a comment from Chris Wilson, so which was now more clear because so he wouldn't like to discuss, you know, those contracts policy issues in detail. So I wonder what is here behind and this, for me, has also a lower priority. So far my comments. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thank you. Let me turn the mic over to Kathy Kleiman first since she just raised her hand. And then I'll answer your questions, Wolf-Ulrich, maybe some of Kathy's comments might collect that. Kathy, I'll turn the mic over to you please.

Kathy Kleiman: This is Rob, right? Sorry, it's hard to…

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, hi.

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: Why don't I let you address Wolf's question because I'm not sure I'm responding to those so I'll be happy to wait.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you. I think the first overall observation I wanted to make for you all, Wolf-Ulrich, was right now you suggested 10 sessions. Chris has clarified that some of those were examples that weren't necessarily proposals but just ideas of areas of community commonality.

                  What I was observing is that if you were to follow the framework of past meetings, you have about eight plenary – well you have specifically eight plenary sessions, when you take in the five plenary sessions plus the two lunch periods plus that one section where you have sort of the interactions with the senior staff. Ideally Göran if we can work that out. So it doesn't mean that you have to do a tremendous amount of reduction of this list of 10.

                  That being said, you can immediately see where there are some areas there or suggestions where you might be able to combine sessions. So I was just sort of setting that stage for you all to talk about priorities. You don't really have a

big prioritization discussion – you've got eight topics and eight sessions. So a lot of that is really sort of the interaction that you all have.

With respect to Item Number 5, that was a specific suggestion that Ed Morris provided noting that since there will be about half the GNSO Council attending the meeting that it might be useful to have the separate opportunity for the councilors to get together. As we observed on the last call, that could be dinner on, you know, one of the evenings, that could be some other session where that group just gets themselves together to network. That really wasn't fleshed out.

That's really the purpose of this call and maybe the next call to sort of fine tune some of the bulk topics that you all came up with so that we can get some common understanding not only about what the topic is, but what you all want to accomplish, you know, what's the goal of some of these topics, what do you want to achieve by the end of the meeting?

We'll talk a little bit more about that, you know, later in the call when we start talking about potential leaders of some of the conversations. But that might be a little bit premature until we actually flesh out some of the topics a little bit more. Perhaps what I should have done is put a name or two next to some of the people who suggested these topics so that if folks had questions we could tease it out a little bit more.

I think that answers all of Wolf-Ulrich's questions so, Kathy, I'll turn the mic back over to you and please, any one of you want further clarification or just want to start commenting on any of these topics please raise your hand to get in the queue. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Hi, Rob. Thanks. This is Kathy Kleiman. And first I apologize for coming in late, and it's a pleasure to join you in this planning underway. So the idea – I believe I'm supporting what Vicky said, which I think it's a good idea for the constituencies or stakeholder groups to meet first. And breakfast might not be the best time, people are coming in, they're going to be red eyes.

In the past, Rob, am I wrong that we've kind of had a quick kick off to the meeting at like nine o'clock and then split up into some planning time, some face to face planning time for the stakeholder groups and the constituencies? An hour should do it unless people want more time.

But, you know, if you guys have already beaten this to death then okay but I think it's a good idea to bring everybody together, maybe do an introduction, you know, have a welcome, have the official kick off and then kind of split up into some quick planning opportunities. Because face to face is a little different than Skype or Adobe Connect kind of the way we're doing it here. You know, when you have everybody in a room it's running, you know, with the agenda decided. It's a good opportunity to work and prepare. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Kathy. Actually in the past we did not do that. Where we did have a difference in the past is that because of the schedule we were able to give you guys the opportunity to meet prior to the meeting rather than after. Unfortunately, given the short period of time for planning and the availability of the venues in Reykjavik, we weren't able to say, yes, you can all gather and have your individual community sessions on the 13th which would help you prepare for the 14th.

In terms of the availability of the space this time around, we only had the Thursday morning flexibility. So you're right, in the past you may recall getting together. It wasn't a part of the formal program but sort of individual

communities taking advantage of that pre-meeting time as opposed to the post-meeting time.

So, yes, I'm hearing now a number of positive comments and ideas about having that, you know, hey, welcome, everybody, let's get together then break out. Why don't you give me an opportunity of playing with the schedule here to see how we might be able to work that out. Perhaps what we could explore is looking to do that, you know, maybe quote unquote starting the meeting earlier around that 8:30 timeframe, get everybody together and then say okay, now go take an hour and a half, recognize that you've got to pull things together.

You've added an additional intriguing element to this, Kathy, that only occurred to me as I started to look at flights, but, yes, people coming from the West side of the Atlantic, will likely be taking red eyes and arriving, you know, at 6:00, 7:00 am. So we need to be very careful about that. Either a number of you will be recovering (unintelligible) or, you know, haven't slept at all on the plane so we should take that into some consideration making sure we have extra coffee and other things.

So I'll play around with that from the framework document and see how you guys might want to react to what something like that might look like. I'll also chat with the meeting planners. Typically we've had those breakout sessions in that afternoon the first day because you've all had a chance to digest some of the conversations. But we may be able to flip that in terms of the preparations.

We're already going to be doing the meeting setup, you know, getting all the rooms organized, getting them all wired and everything on Monday. That's

why we need that time. So we should be able to pull off the breakout rooms from the logistical standpoint first thing.

And then we can just slide the agenda to reflect that time has moved forward and maybe we split the time a little bit, follow Lori's recommendation and say okay we used an hour and half of your time, take 45 minutes at the end of the day and sort of collect your thoughts as a group, see where you are and reset for the next day. Thanks very much for those suggestions. I think those will all be very helpful.

I have not seen any additional hands go up. There's been some very active and useful feedback in the chat. Only some of which I've been able to continue to track. So in a moment, Benedetta, I'll ask you to perhaps summarize some of that stuff to see if there's some really good nuggets there that we want to capture from a discussion perspective.

I wanted to address the Göran question that came up on a couple of chat comments. We won't know until after the holidays, because I think basically after Mexico, and the IGF, Göran was doing a number of internal management things and now I think has started his Christmas break. His team told me, Rob, we'll be able to give you a better idea right after the first of the year what his schedule looks like and whether he'll be able to do something in person.

The pitch I made was that you all very much wanted to have him there in person, that all previous meetings had the CEO there in person, granted, much more geographically favorable to someone from California. But, that, you know, given his other travels and given where his homeland is, there may still be the option to have him there in person. And if so, we will flip the schedule any way, shape or form to accommodate when he's coming in and when he has to depart.

Absent that, you know, the next best thing would be some sort of video or voice conferencing capability which we'll also explore. So basically I asked his team to block that time for him whether he's traveling here or whether he's somewhere else in the world and participating with us remotely.

David Olive has made it a tradition for him to be at all these meetings to be able to brief you on various policy development support matters and other operational things that are going on with the organization. He's going to be able to be there the entire day of the 14th. So depending up on how those schedules work, we'll move some of these sessions around so that you guys get the maximum participation from senior staff at the appropriate time and with the appropriate block of time available. So I just wanted to make sure that I addressed that and Göran's availability.

Has anyone else seen anything in particular in the chat? And, Benedetta, I was just interested in terms of any of the feedback or any of the brainstorms that are occurring there whether there's something that folks want to make sure that we explore here as a group. Let me look here. So there's been some further recognition of the value of the brief, you know, sort of get together for the constituency meetings in the morning.

Yes, thanks for the comment of Göran not starting before 9:00 am in general, again, Kathy, you guys can decide what the block of time is from start of the day to end of the day. We're generally looking at that 8:30 to 6:00 timeframe.

Yes, and the request of Göran is for a formal conversation. I mean, Farzaneh, what happens there is that we set aside about 75 minutes for each group, each stakeholder group to meet to just focus on their issues. I think the only

experience we've had to date is it's been with Fadi, his style was to make it relatively informal just to do questions and answers.

It's not a formal presentation from senior staff but more an opportunity for you all to present issues and items that are of importance to you getting updates on particular items, getting perspectives on things, particularly because Göran is still relatively new there may be, you know, more strategic or longer term questions that you want to ask him.

And Fadi was always very good at, you know, taking that stuff in and also doing follow up afterwards to the extent that they were those types of matters. So I don't think, I mean, I wouldn't reduce it so much to a chat but sort of following the general theme of this meeting which is an opportunity outside the constraints of the stressful ICANN public meeting to, you know, be able to sit down and really have good conversations and substantive chats as opposed to just a quick sort of informal thing.

Oh and, Chris, you know, if he's going to meet with you all in person it'll because he's heading back to Sweden for something or because he's heading to another community event. Yes, I'm sure that his team will be appropriately managing his time and that he'll be able to combine that with some other ICANN business. We're not going to have him spend a day on a plane just for you guys, although if he can do it I'm sure he would like to do that.

Mr. Wilson, I will let you build on any of your chat comments or present some new thoughts about the current session ideas that we have posted there by turning the microphone over to you. You have the floor, sir.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Rob. Chris Wilson. Yes, just and thank you for, I mean, obviously I'm always cognizant of people's travel schedule so the fact that if Göran is to

come he'd have other reasons to coming out there, that's heartening because I would hate to have us ask – that's a pretty hefty ask to come out just for an hour meeting and to fly all the way from LA.

But talking – thinking more about what we would want to talk to him about, and folks can – I'm throwing this out there – I think, you know, I think I believe Göran has had a phone call with every constituency group or at least the leadership, if you will, or, you know, some subset of the leadership of each constituency group over the course of the last few months.

And I seem to recall, you know, at least in our conversation he sort of provided or presented a bit of a presentation about his vision for ICANN sort of the messaging how he sees messaging going, etcetera, etcetera. I think there were some slides. I don't think that was just unique to the BC, I think he had this presentation for every different group.

And so I throw that because it's possible that that may be – it may be in February that's a time for him to provide any further update, if you will, on that presentation or changes, etcetera, from where he – from what he'd spoken to us about individually – within individual groups, you know, a few months ago. So I put that out there for folks that might be a starting point for setting up – figuring out how we want to approach our 75 minutes with Göran, that might be something to talk about there where he sort of provides an updated presentation in that regard. So I just want to throw that out there for folks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Chris. And that's very helpful as well because what that underscores is part of the preparations for this meeting in particular I think the interactions with staff, whether they be at the CEO or, you know, senior level or with different department heads like we've had over time. They've been much more productive when you all are in a position to say, Göran, we would

like you to talk about the following five topics, you know, please focus your remarks there.

The very first intercessional meeting that took place in Los Angeles, a few of you were there, that became more of a presentation-fest, if you will, by staff. It may have been appropriate for that time because you'll recall that was, you know, early in Fadi's tenure. There were a number of new staff members who had not interacted with the community before. But it sort of reduced the actual interaction and conversation. People were just looking at slides.

And in subsequent meetings, the feedback was, we don't want to just look at slides, we don't want to – we can listen to a webinar. We want to have that interaction. So to your point, Chris, the more that you all can share on any of these topics, yes, we want to have staff member participation and we want them to specifically address the following things or we're going to be asking questions in the following areas.

That will be very important particularly because in this case, as Chris noted, the, you know, travel and things like that, most of that staff participation will likely have to be remotely simply because of the relative remoteness, at least from California, where a number of the operational folks would be in terms of travel and in terms of the presentations. So please factor that into your individual session planning. The earlier we can let people know and give them a heads up that you would like them to speak with you all in mid-February the more productive some of those sessions will be.

I wanted to address something else I saw in the chat here. Greg noted that the IPC delegation will not include any of the councilors from the IPC. And that's a great reminder that you all have chosen your delegates based upon, you know, different criteria, different expectation and different goals. So, I mean, I

have now heard, you know, one suggestion from one of the planners about the separate session for GNSO councilors and have had a number of you now comment on this call that that would not be a priority session or probably wouldn't be a productive session for folks to have and would probably leave out a number of the delegates.

So that may be one that we'll put at a lower priority or sort of at the end of the list but it'll be a nice to-do if the councilors who are in attendance want to grab a drink together at the bar or go out and have a separate sort of social dinner but maybe we'll just leave that at that and take that off – take some of the pressure off this top 10 to maybe make it more the top 9 now.

Chris, if you're still near a microphone or by your phone, maybe you can also comment to us not necessarily about the specifics if Items 6 and 7, but this concept of common community issues. So if you could think about that for a moment. Kathy raised her hand, I'll give her the floor. And then just sort of what – how you all might organize a session on areas of community commonality.

And as you think about that, you know, Greg had the great idea last year for the 2016 meeting that you all put in which were sort of, you know, our biggest headaches and, you know, biggest areas of potential areas of coming together. So maybe that session starts to roll, you know, starts to raise its head again or maybe you guys just have different topics you want to discuss there. And you could perhaps address that after Kathy's remarks, that would be really great.

Kathy, I'll give you the floor. You have the microphone, ma'am.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks, Rob. I apologize, I'm rolling back to the prior issue that I think there is some interest in the councilors getting together as long as some of them are

face to face and provided, you know, as Greg recommended, that there is some remote participation.

So the idea of giving them an hour, you know, for their own meeting, you know, they're involved in a different part of the process kind of managing the policy making process. We're about to start talking about the very important items that are involved in the policy making process. But if they want to some time to talk about coordinating and managing it, that would probably be a really good idea. So I just wanted to, you know, just say something about not demoting that item.

Rob Hoggarth: I'm fine with that. We can put it back in the top 10. And in fact if you wanted to explore that thought a little bit more, Kathy, I mean, I could envision that potentially being a session that is sort of led by the councilors in which they interact with you all as an NCPH and start to say, okay, you know, how are we representing your interests? Is this something that's of value to you? What more do you want to see out of the Council? What's the relationship between our various groups and the work of the Council? I could see that being an interesting conversation.

In terms of a breakout, I think what you all would have to decide there is, okay they're going to leave the room and have some other conversation. What are you guys going to be doing in the meantime? And, you know, are you just going to take a break? Is there another topic that doesn't involve them that you want to explore? So think about that if you will. Again, there are a number of different ways to break this, I don't think there are any right answers. I'm just trying to maximize your brainstorming to consider different options.

I sort of put you on the spot, Chris, but in the meantime Greg put up his hand. Chris, I'll give you the option. Do you want to address the question I asked or would you rather Greg go first?

Chris Wilson: Well, Greg can go ahead and I can take it after that.

Rob Hoggarth: Excellent, thank you. Mr. Shatan, you have the floor.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. And I just responding to what Kathy said. Not directly though, at least for our councilors, they also participate in the policy development process so there's no bright line where councilors only exist on the policy management side, at least for us. So just kind of – I don't know if that's different for other groups, but just the idea that the councilors aren't involved, if that's what I got from that, is – I just wanted to say that that's not the case in our constituency. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Greg. And I'll note that Vicky made a comment in the chat that, "I don't think councilors-only session makes sense. Isn't the best use of all the delegates' time." Thanks for that comment, Vicky. I mean, again, think maybe about that broader concept that I raised. If there's value and you guys looking at from an interaction standpoint and having a dialogue between the councilors and the entire NCPH as opposed to just them going off and having some conversations about what's going to happen the next day at the Council meeting or something along those lines.

Vicky, I see you've raised your hand. I'll turn the floor over to you and then I'll put you back on the spot, Chris. Vicky, you have the floor.

Vicky Sheckler: If Chris wants to go first that's fine, I'll go after Chris.

Chris Wilson: Well, Vicky, why don't you go ahead?

Vicky Sheckler: Okay. On the councilor issue, I'm okay with the idea of exploring what Rob suggested about having a counselor and the rest of the delegate interaction. But as I said, a counselor-only within this two-day block time just isn't the most effective use of everyone's time that's going to be there. So I would not recommend doing that.

And then I want to switch over to the general topics and to ask Rob and team a couple of questions. First, do you have any updates you can tell us about a replacement for Grogan or the similar function on that because we have that on the list but if there isn't anyone in that position do we demote that one? Do we keep it as a conversation with Göran or do we substitute David Olive, as you said as part of that discussion? It'd be good to understand kind of where things lay with replacing that position.

But then also, and forgive my ignorance, I don't know how many of the ICANN staff on this call also help plan I guess the GDD summit or intercessional for the Contracted Party House. And if there's any learnings from that that should apply here. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Vicky. I'll take those in order. Number – well let me go in reverse order, it's always easier, everybody always goes in reverse order. None of u involved in this call are involved in the GDD summit planning. That's Cyrus's team who are focused on that. So I can't provide any insights there.

The only learning I would observe there is what seems to be happening with that gathering is it's becoming much more of a community-wide event in that – and some of you were either participants or generally aware perhaps about what happened at the last one. There were 100 people there or more. I

remember seeing some of the tweets coming out. Huge room, a lot of, you know, presentations and other interactions.

So we haven't been involved in that. I think the overall ethos of this meeting is much different or at least the original focus of it was. You all may choose to evolve it over time. But to be much more focused on we all really don't get a chance to talk at ICANN public meetings of anything of substance. We are very unique in the NCPH in terms of our diversity, our different points of view and we really need this time to sort of, you know, strategize and work together and improve our collaboration opportunities.

So they're really almost night and day from that perspective, Vicky. Again, you all, over time, might choose to modify that a bit. But that's really sort of been a different focus. So we haven't really looked to but I will certainly consider maybe even examining that with Cyrus, you know, what are some potential learnings that we can apply here. But they're almost completely different in terms of scale and goal.

With respect to the replacement for Allan, all that I have seen recently is the announcement to say Allan is done at the end of the year and we're moving forward on finding his replacement. I think in terms of your all's planning, something you should consider is even if that person were hired today what would, you know, right now it was just announced, we've got a new person in place, what would they be able to do or tell you or what would you be able to accomplish with that person at the beginning of February in terms of substance or your goals as an organization?

I don't, you know, obviously it's not happening today. It's not likely to happen over the next course of the next several weeks. So even if someone is hired by

then, you know, how much time and service will they have? So I don't know if that means that it changes who you want to speak to.

It takes that completely off the agenda or what, that's something of your all's judgment in terms of productivity and what else you want to do with that 75 minutes, or we want to have that be one of the lightening sessions where, you know, literally if someone is hired by that point we devote half an hour for that person to call in from the phone and introduce themselves and say I'm looking forward to working with you, see you all in Copenhagen. I'm not sure. I think that's really something that you all may want to explore a little bit more.

Was that helpful, Vicky?

Vicky Sheckler: Yes, I mean, that – given that update, it seems that saving time for Allan's replacement may not be appropriate for trying to whittle this down. And so then the question would be, you know, it is a good opportunity to talk to staff about some of our issues. Who all should we consider talking to? And again, it's something that maybe – maybe Göran can address, you know, whether somebody is hired or not at that time in terms of expectations for that position.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure, okay thanks. I mean, this is also – and just in the quick little dialogue with Kathy and Chris, I mean, it's also something to consider. And this is true of any of the items – of these session ideas, again just reinforcing the fact that you will end up – even if you have your little introductory session at the beginning, you know, where we carve out some time for that, you'll still have a couple of hours of time as individual communities.

And then if you're deciding to have a conversation the next day on that Thursday morning to have some very community specific items that you may

want to talk to and so that's something that's unique to the NCUC or the IPC or the CSG or something like that, you might want to identify those for your own individual community agendas and say, yes, we'd like to have 15 minutes with – if a person's hired, the new Compliance leader. And, you know, have a brief introductory hello or focus like we, you know, you had identified some specific issues. Policy through contracts, that was something that I think Ed suggested as a brainstorm.

All right, so that's something the NCUC or the NCSG wants to explore. They can focus on that in their own individual meeting, or the RPM reviews or something along those lines. And let me – let me have that be a segue back to you, Chris, in terms of your thoughts about, yes, Rob, policy through contracts is really just a – was a specific brainstorm suggestion. We don't even have a whole session on that.

Are there some substantive policy matters that you do all want to discuss, should you have separate sessions for those or do you want to have a lightening round of, you know, three 30-minute discussions where you just pick certain items that you talk about briefly, get a general sense of the room. Or a more substantive, you know, overall conversation like Greg had in the last meeting about areas of common interest or, you know, what's keeping you up at night. What are your thoughts on that, Chris?

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Rob. Chris Wilson for the record. Obviously we've got just five minutes left in this call so I think I would just quickly say, you know, Number 6 – I think – and of course Ed isn't on the call so I don't want to speak for him but I think my understanding of Ed's suggestion was that the policy through contracts discussion, the dotPro, dotCat, etcetera, was simply an example of where, you know, the BC particularly and the NCSG I believe, you know,

were able to come to sort of – file a joint filing, etcetera, and have a meeting of the minds on a particular policy matter within the ICANN sphere.

And not – I don't think his intention was to make that a – to revisit that specific issue during the NCPH discussion, I think he was throwing it out there as an example. So I think your question, therefore is, you know, are there other examples or are there other issues where there is a, you know, a commonality if not within the entire NCPH then maybe within some subparts. I think that still needs to be fleshed out, to be honest, I don't know if we can do that on today's call with just a few minutes remaining.

I think that's something – and maybe Number 7 with regard to RPM reviews maybe that is – that's where we focus our time and attention, maybe there's ongoing discussions and issues with regard to that that we all as a – as the NCPH can find some commonality.

I think we'll have to maybe some offline email discussions about this amongst ourselves. You know, I welcome Ed's intervention as well. I know he can't be on the call today. But, you know, after the holiday maybe Ed can also provide some further insight there. But I think – I don't – I think we're – don't want to get wrapped around the axle of having a discussion about policy through contracts. I think that specific issue, frankly, has been put to bed. It's, you know, it's an issue that's out there.

But I think it doesn't need to be part of a specific discussion among all of us. I think it's more just an example, not a specific thing. And let me just also quickly say I think with regard to the councilor's session, I think, you know, Wolf-Ulrich made a very good point in the chat, that, you know, I don't think – I think the councilors that are there that are in attendance in person can certainly get together, maybe make sense for them to get together, you know,

an hour before their councilors call on February 16, which is the day, you know, the day we're sort of – that half day we have available to all of us after the two-day session, and not make that a part of the broader two-day NCPH meeting.

And I think if that's the case then I don't think we need to worry too much about what the councilors are going to talk about, they can talk about whatever they, you know, want to talk about perhaps even prepare themselves for that 12 o'clock call, as you mentioned.

So I think that might be an area that Number 5 where we simply strike it from the broader NCPH discussion, condense perhaps, you know, 6 and 7 or sort of work on that some more and then sort of before you know it we're sort of down to eight topics. And then we may not have to do too much more culling of the list.

But, you know, I think we're going to need to have some more discussion amongst ourselves and maybe within our particular constituencies about what those areas – if there are areas of community commonality what they may be and how we can talk about them. So I know that's not as specific as perhaps we'd like but I think that's where the further discussion offline and leading up to our next call.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks very much, that's very helpful, Chris. I will take that under advisement. I'm going to put brackets now around the GNSO councilors because I think there is enormous consensus – resounding consensus, now I'm creating new terminologies for that, that you all don't see a value in a separate session for them. I'll leave it open as the potential for, you know, a conversation about whether a broader discussion with the councilors, their

role, how that interaction takes place with respect to the overall NCPH might be of value because I did get some positive reaction or feedback to that.

And then on the next call you can all decide whether that has any legs or whether you just want to take it off. I will take off the policy through contracts and replace it with just a generic sort of policy issue there given the opportunity for some folks to sort of comment on that. Obviously we're not going to get to volunteers. This has been a much more valuable discussion so I'll leave it there.

Farzaneh and Kathy, you had your hands up. I want to give you some quick opportunities to talk as our hour wraps up here and then I'll, you know, give you all a heads up in terms of what we want to try to accomplish early next year. Farzaneh, you have the floor.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, Rob. I just wanted to quickly say that I wanted to suggest that we talk about GAC and implementation talk to convention of GNSO policy making process which has happened very frequently and just go angry about it and but we have not fixed the problem. So I would like to put that somewhere in the agenda. I was thinking maybe it could be through – policy through contract, Agenda Number 6 but you are thinking to discard that. I mean, it would be thinking to lower the priority but I don't want to discuss it in an agenda item that has lower priority.

I think this is something if the group agreed, we should discuss, GAC and ICANN staff through convention GNSO policy development process. And put it somewhere. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks. If you could do me the favor, because I'm interpreting Kathy Kleiman's – Rob, no – just the word no – as reaction to my comment about

potentially removing 6. And I think that – I think there is an area of consensus you all can reach on that. There is sort of the specific sort of action maybe with that dotPro dotCat and XXX that Greg and Chris have responded to.

What you seem to now be suggesting, Farzaneh, is a broader conversation about the policy process. If I could be so bold as perhaps ask you and Kathy to, you know, put your heads together or even if it's just a quick brainstorm email back to the group list just to flesh that out a little bit to maybe explain, you know, over the email list what you mean by that and what that might look like in terms of a session, that would be very helpful.

It also helps me because then it potentially sets you all up to be – at least one of you – one of the co-chairs for that discussion. So that would be great too. But if you could think about that that would be very helpful.

Kathy, you're going to get the last word because your hand has been up patiently, no one else is behind you in the queue. I'll turn the mic over to you, ma'am.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, thank you, Rob. If I get the last word then I get to wish everybody happy holidays and happy New Year, which is a wonderful place to be. So I hope everybody gets some rest and some escape from all our wonderful ICANN calls.

I was going to support Farzi and Chris in keeping Number 6 perhaps as Greg says on the chat, more broadly. I think there really is a dilution of our policy making process and of the GNSO's role in the policy making process. It's like – to expand it briefly, and then of course Farzi and I will take the opportunity, Rob, as you suggested, to post more to the list.

But there's a real chipping way of our policy making ability and that includes policies through contracts, which is weird, kind of taking consensus policy and expanding it beyond where we had put it, as well as the GAC, as well as other areas. So I'm hoping we keep Item Number 6 in but with the broader approach. So thanks, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Kathy. Yes, so thank you all very much. We've gone a little bit over, I appreciate everyone's patience in that regard. Not everybody had a chance to talk on the call or to talk substantively on the call. And so what I'd appreciate is please utilizing over the next couple of weeks, you know, when you're staring at the – some other work that you're doing just if ideas occur to you or thoughts come to the floor about some of these items please include them.

We've got the next planning call tentatively scheduled for the 5th of January keeping our 1500 UTC time on a Thursday. I think it's very important to pull you all back together to do that and to continue to do that every week because when we come back it's literally 5.5 weeks before the meeting and there's still discussions that you all need to have in terms of winnowing this down and doing the prep work that you've indicated, Greg, is so important.

So I want to – if I can take this liberty to say keep your all's feet to the fire to keep having these conversations and just take some times, the quantity time for you to go through it and work through some of your different perceptions or differences of opinion here. And so I really appreciate you all being involved in these conversations.

We will get together in two weeks on the 5th of January. I will share with you an updated framework agenda probably next week, which includes additional logistical information that we have, fine tuning the agenda based on the

conversations we've had already today, just trying out a couple of different things.

So thank you all very much. Have a wonderful couple of weeks holiday there for as long as you get it individually and we'll get all together again in the New Year on the 5th. Thank you all very much. And we will, as usual, circulate and make public the chat transcript, the transcript and recording of our call as well as our slides. So thank you all for your participation and we'll talk to you next year. Thanks, Ozan. We can stop the recording and adjourn.

Ozan Sahin: Vick, you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks.

<center>END</center>