ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
January 5, 2017
9:00 am CT

Operator: The recordings have started.

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Non-contracted

Parties House Intercessional Planning call held on the 5th of January 2017. On

the call today we have Anna Loup, (Barbara Leonard), (Craig Thurston),

Edward Morris, Farzaneh Badi, (John Kerry), Klaus Stoll, Lori Schulman,

Poncelet Lleleji, (Charles) (unintelligible), Renata Aquino, (Stepan Salinan),

Tatiana Tropina, Tony Holmes, (Anita Schechter), Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. We

have received apologies from Adam Pete, Maryam Bakoshi and Chantelle

Doerksen. And as ICANN staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Cherie Agnew,

Benedetta Rossi, and myself Ozan Sahin. I would like to remind you all to

please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you

and over to you Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much Ozan. If you could make me a presenter that would be

helpful. We don't have a lot of slides but I want to jump around a little bit if

we need to. Happy New Year and welcome everybody, very much appreciate

everybody being able to join us so quickly into the new year. On the screen

right now you note our proposed agenda for the call today.

We've done the introductions and roll call. We'll do a logistics update with Bernadette out who will update us on a number of things. And then we'll focus the bulk of our conversation on the programming discussions. We had a really good call just before the holiday break. And there were a number of ideas, thoughts sort of culminating in a number of I won't call them decisions but sort of directions that we were beginning to take so I'll summarize those. And then we'll talk about some of the programming issues that we've got.

If it all possible what I would like to be able to do is also start talking about volunteers. But if we don't get to that -- we weren't able to get to that last time appropriately so -- we might be able to do that via email. One other logistical item. I am having my own connectivity problems here in my office. So like I just dropped out of the Adobe Connect room. So on those occasions I won't be able to see the hands going up. Ozan and Benedetta I will rely on you guys to help me out with that. Is there anything that anyone would like to add to the agenda that we don't have on our general outline here, something that we definitely need to discuss?

Hearing nothing, we'll accept the agenda as it is and of course if there's any other business toward the end if we have time we'll definitely address it. Ozan if you could just flip up the second slide that I sent you. Again I can't see it but I'll trust that it's going up. I just wanted to remind all of you who aren't already well reminded of this that as of today it's 40 days until we have this meeting. So if there's any need for encouragement to sort of nail some things down, resolve any issues in terms of programming or anything I just wanted to reinforce that a little bit for you.

This is something that we do from a staff perspective when we've got public meetings. And we usually started out in the 90 day mark to help increase the

people's energy and stress levels. So I just wanted to remind you all sort of where we stand on that. That's just sort of a tone setter if I can for today's call. Benedetta you've been able to join us. Could you give us an update on the logistical front in terms of travel arrangements and other things that you can share with the group? And we'll run through that and identify if we've got any specific fire drills or anything else that we have to address. I'll turn the mic over to you Benedetta. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Think you Rob. This is Benedetta Rossi speaking for the transcript. In terms of the logistical updates -- and it's fairly brief -- I believe that there was a slight delay in submitting the welcome emails as we refer to them within ICANN. So they are the travel email notifying delegates of their approved arrival and departure dates. And that was due to obviously there was the Christmas break and we did everything that we needed to do on our end to submit the names to the travel team. And the travel team submitted them for security clearance.

Unfortunately the security clearance took longer than anticipated and the results came back during the Christmas break after Christmas Day. And so all of the travel emails were sent out on January 2. So if anybody for some reason hasn't received it please let us know. I checked with the travel team yesterday and they confirmed that all of them have been submitted and were all being processed so you should all have the welcoming or the (space) that you can start raising with the travel provider SEM on - to book your travel.

So that's all really about the travel components. The other item is just checking whether, you know, within your communities whether you've made decisions about the constituency meetings happening after the intersessional was finished so perhaps the - on the Thursday. So far on our list we have the ISPCP NCUC and NCSG if I'm not mistaken.

Rob Hoggarth: I think it was IPC not ISP.

Benedetta Rossi: No, no it was ISP. It was Tony who notified us on the last call. I know that Chantelle let me know that the IPC was at the time of discussion was still debating it but I think that there was a call in the meantime so that might have been finalized. Okay. So I see that the BC will also have a meeting and Lori is saying the IPC as well. Is that - the chat is moving really, really fast. So Lori are you confirming that the IPC will also hold a meeting a constituency meeting on the Thursday?

Okay because the last I heard Chantelle said that it was still pending so I'm not sure if something happened in-between time.

Rob Hoggarth: Well (Greg) has just joined the call so we'll let him, you know, we'll let him confirm. Thanks (Greg) next on the chat. Thanks Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: So yes (Greg) is confirming that they will be holding one.

Rob Hoggarth: Great any questions for Benedetta? I'm back in the room and I see Renata. Renata you have the floor.

Renata Aquino: Thank you. I hope you can hear me well. This is Renata.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes ma'am.

Renata Aquino: Thanks. So I missed a little about the agenda inclusion, agenda item inclusion but also this is something about more general for planning a meeting. Do we have a list of all the people that are going already up? And I noticed that the invitation letter is on for GDD Summit and other events but not for the

intersessional. Could it be possible to have the Visa invitation letter also for this event? I understand of course that very few countries need Visa but still it's important to have that for especially for folks coming from Latin America. And yes so to - is it possible to arrange that? And any other issues concerning the meeting planning of unintelligible I trust it will be to discuss the programming item. Is that correct? Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much Renata. Yes Benedetta do you want to address the question of the Visa letter? We had a couple of requests come in over the break while the meetings team was out on a break. And we've reached out to them right when we all got back earlier this week. Do you have an update on that Benedetta in terms of the availability of that or when that's going to be able to be available to folks?

Benedetta Rossi: Unfortunately I do not have an update today but I'm sure that I should have something by the end of the day today. So I can circulate something on the planning mailing list as an update about this. My apologies. I just I haven't heard back yet about this.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. And we'll make sure that letter is produced and we get that posted on the wiki space. That's clearly very important particularly since I threw up that 40 day timeframe. So thanks for reminding us and noting that Renata. That's very helpful.

In terms of the list of folks this is something that I think Ed you had reached out to me to earlier in the week on. And I will confess this is a relatively new sensitivity that I have developed over the course of the last year with various regions and governments continue to ramp up the matters of privacy. We have traditionally provided at every one of these intersessional meetings a complete bio package if you will for all of the attendees that we share when folks show

up. What we've never done just because we have never thought to do it was post the list of attendees prior to the meeting. You know, when I chatted a bit with some of our meetings colleagues about this in terms of what we do with the ICANN public meeting where we also don't really produce a list of new - and then only then produce a list of supported travelers after the meeting is that there has been heightened sensitivity from a privacy perspective.

And what we didn't do when we reached out and asked you guys on the problem we need to remedy is whether your delegates are comfortable with us sharing publicly the information about their travel.

We typically haven't done it prior to having everything finalized because there are situations where folks end up applying for Visas and don't get them or there are other issues where folks are just not comfortable sharing that or, you know, saying yes I tried to go but I didn't get my Visa or something else. If you all are within your own communities willing to have us share that information even if it's just for planning purposes I'd be happy to do that. I would like to get a lead from folks in terms of your level of comfort whether on a scale of one to ten this is very important from a privacy perspective for a ten not to release it until we have a confirmed list or it's not really that big a deal for you so you'd rate it one. But I am very sensitive to that and actually hadn't thought about it in terms of the planning process.

So I don't know if that answers your question Renata but we do produce a list because the people who are going who are supported by ICANN we do have a transparency obligation there but we typically have not done it prior to the meeting. You know, it's - if you want to look back and see people who've attended the meeting in the past yes that information is all there we just haven't done it beforehand.

And that's something that we, as Benedetta indicated earlier we've got to get together with the meetings team actually tomorrow to resolve any other logistical items, to confirm things in a number of fronts with travel. So we'll discuss that with them. And so I will work to see if we can have that list available for you all before our next planning call next week at the same time.

Does anyone have any observations or comments they'd like to make out of that? I note in the queue I've got Benedetta Renata I don't know if that's a new hand and so you're in the queue and anybody else. And Benedetta your first.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you Rob. My understanding based on Ed's comments via email was to share the list of delegates within the planning team as opposed to sharing it publicly. And that is actually something that we did I believe last year because I remember I created a document that just included the list of the delegates as of X date and so whenever I produced the document. And that was circulated just internally within the planning team just so that the various groups were aware of who the other attendees were from the different groups.

I don't know if that's a privacy breach if we just send it to the to the NCPH intersessional planning mailing list which is on a closed group because I believe a few of you have mentioned that that would be helpful in terms of planning for the actual topics to see who the different delegates are as opposed to publishing them on the wiki which is something that as you said Rob is something we do later on when we publish the full (via) document, et cetera. And that's publicly accessible.

Rob Hoggarth: All right great. I am looking at the chat. I know Ed has raised his hand but then it went back down so I don't know if we resolved that. Ed I think you're responding to that. So yes let's take that approach. I'm treating as some of you

have (Greg)'s comment as the joke that it is. So yes let's go ahead if that's what we have done in the past let's continue that process with the understanding that, you know, things will change over the next 40 days. People have changes in their personal or professional lives that may make the list incomplete but so long as we have that date that as of this is who we're hoping or this is who were planning let's go ahead and do that.

So let's do that Benedetta when after this call Ozan you're producing the post meeting report, the transcript, the chat and things like that let's get out the latest version. We'll give you some time there Benedetta to polish that up a little bit to reflect the newest date and maybe some additional information from (Joseph) today. And that will get that out. And then I'll follow up with an updated version 3.0 of the framework document where I'll just reflect that this was something that we agreed to do again this year. Great anything else Bernadette on your list from a logistics standpoint?

Benedetta Rossi: No. I think that's all for today. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. And as Tatiana in Farzaneh have said in the chat we'll, you know, scrub that so that we aren't, you know, let's add people's names but not the other personally identifiable information if we can keep that out just as a good practice on our part. Just one other quick observation. This was at the very beginning of the chat. Thank you very much Tapani for the weather report. I don't know if it's similar weather in Iceland but please make sure you advise all of your delegates to bundle up.

The one final thing that Renata reminded me of to share with you is that Benedetta and I are in discussions and we're just trying to work through the calendar. but we are planning to proceed with the "Newcomer Webinar." It seemed to be successful last year so we are going to do that. And I hope by the

- our call next week we'll be able to share with you the date that we can squeeze that in so that folks who are going to be new to the meeting we can suspend some separate time with them reinforcing whatever briefings you've done as meeting planners or community leaders with your delegates just to give them the background in the meeting how it's come to be and sort of what they can expect.

If any of you would like to participate as presenters or to give your perspective to the group as part of that please let Benedetta and I know that so you can trust us to be fairly very open and fair and how we present the information as we were last year. But I'm more than happy to have additional help or support in that regard as well. All right any final comments or questions about logistics? Seeing none unless Benedetta that's a new hand you can put your down. Farzaneh you just put your hand up so I'll turn the mic over to you. Please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badi: Hi. Hello everyone, Happy New Year. I was wondering when is the delegate reception because we might and if it has been confirmed because we might want to do other dinners and that would be good to know. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks. We had proposed that in the framework document as the evening of day one. So that would be the night of the 14th. And I think a number of folks were already thinking all about doing separate dinners or having separate events the night of the 15th. And obviously a number of folks will be getting in on the 13th and that's, you know, covered by those who were traveling their per diem so if you guys want to organize something of your group's the night of the 13th as well please feel free to do that. But right now Farzaneh we're targeting the 14th.

Farzaneh Badi: So you know that there is some people might come with their partners that's (unintelligible). But I don't have a problem with that but you might want to consider it when arranging.

Rob Hoggarth: What we have done in the past is we have noting that we've got 50 delegates we usually plan for about 70, 75 attendees to the reception. Typically we have done that because there are outreach opportunities. And I know some of your groups have made some connections with folks in Iceland. And so if that is going to be the case just please let us know if you've got a plus 1 or if there are a number of people from the local university or business or something else who will be joining us. That would be very helpful. That will just help us in terms of our coordination with the meetings team.

Again we're targeting like 70 people but if it's going to end up being 80 or something like that we want to know so that we can make sure that everybody has something to eat. Typically and this is also for those of you who are new to the meeting for that reception our typical planning is that for it to be "heavy hors d'oeuvres" with the idea of the if someone chooses based upon jet lag or work schedule or something else that that's going to be your only meal for that evening that you can make a meal of it. Other folks have, you know, come by, hung out for an hour and a half and then they go out to dinner as a group.

So, you know, that's a flexible time where you can, you know, also plan an event that evening Farzaneh. We tried to get the thing started early enough and it's generally a 2-1/2 hour block. For those who want to stay can. Those who have some other plans can also take advantage of that.

Great. Thanks all for that feedback and always there are additional elements that we need to add to the update so thanks very much for those questions and

comments. And please feel free at any time to use the mailing list to ask those questions of us for the benefit of the whole planning team as well between these calls.

Let's turn to the programming discussion. What I'll do is I'll summarize a little bit of what you all discussed last time in terms of the various partitions. And I hope you'll see that reflected in this list of ten session ideas. One of the major things or breakthroughs I think that we had last week or two weeks ago was considering moving the breakout sessions at least part of the breakout session an hour and a half to the beginning of the meeting. So in other words on day one that Tuesday everybody coming together for an introductory session to say hello and then having the groups breakout individually to talk about the preparations for the meeting and other things.

Just I think a comment somebody made just to make sure that we're all on the same page. So when I produce the Version 3.0 after this call you'll see that reflected just to give you a sense as to how that might look, how that might work out going forward. So that was one of the breakthroughs in the call last time.

There was also a discussion of about eliminating or recasting the discussion with the counselors. There was an initial suggestion to, you know, have a separate session for the counselors or for them to be able to have some time together. There was some conversation there about perhaps broadening that session to be a broad topic session with the GNSO counselors in attendance. There were a couple of comments about how that would be a relatively lower priority for that session than any others. And so you'll see on the slide I have up in the AC Room I slid that down to Number 10. This isn't a priority list but I just, you know, pulled it in so it could be easily excised or played around with.

You also wanted as a group generally to re-examine the session regarding this concept of issues of common interest. You'll recall that in the past list of potential sessions we had a couple. One was on policy through contracts. The other was rights protection management. And the conversation on our last call basically said yes, you know, we like those as examples but those are probably not ones that we collectively want to talk about. So let's see if we can think noodle a little bit and decide if there are other issues of common interest that might have higher priorities than me. And so that was an area that you were all going to go back and talk with your communities about and see if you had some additional thoughts there on topics or sessions.

There was also an idea for a different session sort of growing out of that re-examination of areas of common interest that Farzaneh and (Kathy) identified. And they committed to going back and developing a proposal for what that session might look like. Farzaneh shared that with the list last night or this morning. So if we have some time we all might want to talk about that but otherwise like Wolf-Ulrich has always done and I think a couple of others just comments on the list in terms of support for that session or ways that we might tweak it. I think there were a couple of edits suggested there as well.

And finally just more of a recognized observation. I think you made this Chris that said gee, while we're only at about ten and with some of our discussions and narrowing things we may actually be a bit down to about eight so this may not be as heavy lifting as we thought in terms of, you know, having to winnow down the list. I think the conversation now over the next half hour may be how you might look more specifically at some of these sessions but I think you're pretty close to having an overall agenda list together.

So that's just my summary of the things that you all focused on some decisions or highlighted areas of discussion we reached last week. I'll throw the floor open to hands if anyone wants to get in the queue to talk about some specific items or specific areas that may have come up with some of your conversations with the different groups. I'll take a peek here through the chat as well to see if there's something else that might be cropping up that folks are just typing.

While I wait for hands to go up there's been one other development that I'm sure a number of you saw and I don't know if it impacts what you all have been talking about but Item 4 of the discussion with the staff the ICANN compliance function. Some of you may have seen the announcement that went out yesterday. Two weeks ago I said, "Oh nothing is going to happen for several weeks." Well two weeks later we get the announcement that Jamie Hedlund is going to be replacing Alan Grogan.

I've already reached out to Jamie to let him know that there was interest expressed among this group for him to talk with the community. I haven't heard back from him yet because I just sent that out yesterday afternoon. But I'm keeping that area alive for now. And whether that becomes a complete group session or whether in some of your breakout sessions some of you want to chat with Jamie individually I'm flagging that for now and keeping that open as a potential thing.

Still looking in the chat room for any hands going up. Benedetta, Ozan you all have been observing the chat as it goes through. If you can flag anything in there that would be great. In the meantime Renata you have raised your hand. You'll be followed by Ed. Renata you have the floor.

Renata Aquino: Thank you. It's Renata. I was just wondering about Number 5 and 6 GNSO review implementation as subject to be determined. But what was in the previous version I don't really remember, just trying to just clarify. And the discussion of the Bylaws Drafting Team Report this was also something inherited from last month I believe, just trying to get those confirmations. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Renata. Yes these are ones that I didn't take off the list. They were not removed. On the GNSO review implementation something that was actually a topic of but 2016 NCPH meeting. I think you all recognize that that was an area that you wanted to explore but I've got the little addendum specific subjects TBD simply because, you know, I don't think that there was a name agreement or specific areas that you wanted to focus on.

Once we have a general consensus that you do want to keep that topic and we assigned some chairs for that area folks might want to refine specifically what topics you want to talk about in that regard. Wolf-Ulrich you can remind me because I kept Number 6 on the list because you had originally I think propose it, a discussion on the Bylaws Drafting Team Report. I think someone had made a comment about it on our call last week but I didn't, you know, get consensus one way or another whether to keep it on her take it off so I left it on this list for this call just to get some confirmation where that continued to be an area that we could explore or talk about a little bit. So that Renata is why that one's on there. I hope that was responsive to your two questions about five and six.

Ed you're next in the queue so I'll turn the microphone over to you sir. I am not hearing you Ed so maybe you need to come off mute. Is anyone else having similar problems not being able to hear Ed?

Man: Can't hear him.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay thank you. Ozan we might want to look into that whether that's Ed's
mic. Do you want to try again Ed? No nothing. So let's keep trying on that
and maybe behind the scenes Ozan you can try that out. Thank you
everybody. I was in the wrong little chat pod. Thanks Ozan.

As I explained on the last call we have essentially seven plenary sessions.
We've got - in terms of slots under the current outline. There's a vehicle now
for potentially playing with that because as Lori indicated and I think there
was some support from a number of you that doesn't require you all to have
Number one seven sessions or be tied to the current allocation of about 75
minutes per session.

If some of these topics actually merit shorter periods of time we can certainly
do that. If someone – if some of them merit longer periods of time we can do
that as well. I think either of those would work. Item 8 I think is a good
example of that.

And a number of you commented on Farzaneh's contribution that she and
(Kathy) pulled together maintaining the GNSO's traditional policy making
leadership position in ICANN. IN one of my back and forth's with (Kathy) she
indicated that this might be given the meeting this of the nature something that
potentially goes longer than 75 minutes depending upon, you know, where
things come out on this. So I think that's something to consider as you look at
these different areas just in terms of the time commitment and how much
energy you want to devote to any of these particular issues.

Looking back on for hands up I still see Ed's. Are we having any luck with
him Ozan? No luck, still can't hear you Ed. All right and I'm scrolling through

the chat just to make sure that I capture for the recording anything that in terms of folks who are noting feedback or comments. I've gotten a couple comments in support of the Item 8. Ed I'm going to put you in stasis for the moment until we resolve your microphone issues. Farzaneh your hand is up so I will give you the floor to make a comment generally or to share a comment or ask some questions about your proposal for Number 8. Please you have the microphone.

Farzaneh Badi: Thank you Rob, Farzaneh speaking. So I can see that we have ten topics here and do we have to decide whether we want to have these topics on for the intersessional today? And also we have to discuss who should be the leader of what I just said we do that after we decide on the topics. But specifically on the discussion of Bylaw Drafting Team Report I don't think that we need to discuss this. I think Wolf is not here to tell us why he suggested this. I cannot remember it. But I think our work is done in that report and is something taken up with the council, in the GNSO Council.

The other thing that I saw I think (Vicki) mentioned was that Number 8 topic should be the council, should mention GNSO Council. We can of course discuss this on the mailing list. But when we drafted this I specifically had in mind that sometimes even the sometimes even the public comments that we make could be effective or ineffective. And maybe we should not on the limited discussion to the GNSO Council and what it does but to like a broader issuing public comments and how we get together and focus on one issue and then (unintelligible) the council and how council decides on topics to work on.

So I think it would be right but I'm going to - we can discuss this definitely on the mailing list. Add Ed - so I can see that Ed's hand is up and he's here so I'm just going to go. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Farzaneh. Yes as you were talking I went ahead and move the slide down to and I had a placeholder for yours - your concept. And there's been very positive feedback, no negative feedback importantly on this session. So this may be an area where a number of you do want to focus on providing some additional feedback. Just in your comments there Farzaneh you identified potential additional questions that you might add to this.

So I will look at - as I produce Version 3.0 of this agenda there are a couple of ways to go. You have all - and so one of them would be to begin just pulling things out of the hat in terms of assigning not individuals but communities who would take a leadership role on some of these sessions. And then folks from those communities could volunteer with the understanding that generally these are going to be consensus sessions and people can horse trade if they don't like the random pull out of the hat assignments that I do. We did something similar last year and it seemed to work pretty well.

Let me go back real quick to the list here. So you have proposed Farzaneh to take off Number 6. Wolf-Ulrich you are on the call or at least I see you in the room. I don't know if you have access to a microphone but if you could give any feedback that you have with respect to Item 6 whether you want to keep that on the list, whether you agree that that's sort of past its prime in terms of timeliness that would be great. It never hurts to be able to remove something from the list.

When - so let me stop for a second check my list here. Wolf if I could have you just answer that question first sort of leap the queue and then I've got Ed and (Greg). So Wolf I'll turn the mic over to you sir.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks Rob and all thank you. Well my intention especially for Number 6 was not to discuss the Bylaws Drafting Team Report rather than

after the council now has accepted, you know, the draft report with some implications for the future for the implementation of that were to find out - while let me say it this way to discuss, you know, potential issues with that. You remember, you know, this report had in advance a very broad discussion on council and on the GNSO and especially, you know, that the CSG had problems with the original report and with this, you know, the implications.

And right now we are going to first steps. Now the Council is going to develop a guideline or a process for the selection of members for future review teams for example. You know, well this starts, you know, and that implies also that the council has a role on that. And, you know, the big issue was the council role versus the GNSO role in future. And why shouldn't we take, you know, this is the starting point for discussion within our house about, you know, to get more understanding of each other and the problems which might be implicated here?

So it's not just to go through the report itself but to pick up some really detailed issues and to find out (con) ways to deal with. That's my idea of doing that. So if that is not, you know, the majority of this team well I don't have a problem now also to leave it and then to restore from that issue. I will come back later on to another issue. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Wolf Ulrich. I mean I think you made an interesting comment in the chat saying it sounds like we have to have a discussion about the proper roles of the GNSO Council versus the GNSO generally. And I guess what I would ask you as a group to consider and then, you know, if someone wants to raise their hand on it is to know whether that GNSO review implementation is that an area to have that discussion? Is it actually an area of discussion to have under the Item 8 maintaining the GNSO's traditional policymaking leadership position at ICANN? Is it something that falls under either of those two?

And potentially Wolf-Ulrich, you know, your conversation about the impacts of the bylaws changing -- thanks for the clarification, not the report -- but, you know, what now does bylaw changes may do to the GNSO and its relative relationship between the GNSO At-Large and the GNSO Council. That sounds like a very ripe area for conversation. I'm not quite sure how you would narrow that down or divide them up but I think you have a number of overlapping potentially areas here.

And if any of you have a brainstorm about how, you know, two of these items might go into a third or how they might be combined or maybe, you know, a longer period of time with all those under them or shorter periods of time for them I would love to hear them because then I think that's sort of a little breakthrough that might help us a little bit here. Thanks very much Wolf-Ulrich and you can keep your hand up if you want to go back in the queue for something else you wanted to comment on. Ed let's try again since your hand is still up and you always have valuable contributions. Is your microphone working yet?

Ed Morris: Let's see Rob can you hear me?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, yes sir.

Ed Morris: Oh I had a brilliant speech earlier. I guess I'll (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: So this will be far less brilliant. I would respectfully disagree with my friend Wolf Knoben about bringing - it was that he was bringing this into this meeting. We're going to have an extensive public comment period the bylaws

drafting team report. This may be a topic we want to get to next year when we see how the comments go and what – how we actually implement the drafting team report itself.

I think there are other issues. And I should mention Wolf brought in the appointments policy. We're working on that now but let me try to get back to the - to this (Nigers) thing more generally. I think on Number & policy through contract we can pull that into Number 8. If you look at what Farzaneh and (Kathy) did and any alterations we have staff created policy by contrast for those of us who believe that's what's going on. Phil Corwin in particular has written extensively on this. The BC and NCSG did a joint reconsideration motion about a year ago on the issue that get labeled by domain insight, the odd couple reconsideration. But it's an example of two groups within the NCPH working together. But that can all be merged I think into Number 8.

In terms of why the RPM was suggested and the IP issues were suggested as possible policy discussion I go back with something that (Greg) said a few meetings go which is that we should use this opportunity to try to examine some issues where perhaps certain people have rigid positions. And the IP issues and the RPM what I hear when I go to the meetings are folks arguing about stuff that happened ten years ago. I hear people that are taking these ideologically perfect pure positions in the public discussion. But when I talked to some of the folks outside the calls I find people who are pretty reasonable and willing to compromise.

So I want I wanted to use what I thought would be good opportunity to use this this meeting for in terms of the IP issues considering the fact we would have the IPC there. We'll have two of the three co-chairs there or the RPM is trying to get beyond the ideological position and see if we can find some

common ground. So I thought that would be a good use of the intercession meeting to try to break down some barriers. So that's why that was there.

On Number 9, the budget discussion I was hoping to come away with the deliverable here. I do believe that the – so excuse me, the CSG and NCSG largely are in agreement on most was that budget issues except perhaps for compliance and how that should be funded. And I also believe that there is a base difference between our view of the budget and the contracted party's houses view of the budget. So I thought this would be a good opportunity to try to find some common ground and even take a deliverables, say a small working group that can work on the budget going forward with both the commercial and noncommercial parties working together on that.

I do agree as I mentioned with (Fazi) about dumping Number 6. But I also want to talk about the council proposal. I think there are some issues and (unintelligible) brought one of which is the appointments policy, you know and what we're doing in council about that. That was something - we even do appointments proposal that was written by myself and Susan Kamaguchi. We're trialing a modified version right now in the SSR appointment and I think it would be helpful to get some feedback for Susan and myself in particular about how that works and how others view what we're trying to do there.

There were also some hurt feelings coming from India where a CSG amendment at the last minute meant minute on the bylaws drafting team report, you know, we have a – one of my council or one of my – not my council but one of the councils for the CSG for example is telling me that she's not going to go to a council dinner ever again because she doesn't know when the CSG is going to drop an amendment on them which is ridiculous in my view.

But I think there are some hurt feelings that should be aired but I don't necessarily think we need to do this in a large group fashion. But what I would like if there's some chance for councilors present to get together but also to have remote participation for Heather, Paul, Rafik and councilors who can't be there to participate in some sort of it could even be an informal gathering of councilors we can talk through some of our operational issues. And as you do know Rob we do have a council meeting at 12 noon on the 16th for which I guess we will have a room availability to participate remotely. So those are just some thoughts. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much Ed. I'm going to turn the mic over to (Greg) with one observation just to comment on your comments Ed. And that is the ccNSO does have a small working group on budget items where they work together and actually prepare comments and things like that. So maybe that's something that you guys would like to explore. (Greg) you had your hand up and I'll turn the microphone over to you.

(Greg):   Thanks it's (Greg). Hopefully you can hear me.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

(Greg):   So...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

(Greg):   Good. My comments in some way our mirror Ed's in a way. First I think that discussing issues of what I was going to call historic divergence as kind of a evil twin of when discussing areas where we have common interest so I think we need to discuss both and see if we can, you know, make some headway in

bridging some gaps. This is what I mentioned but think (Chatham) has roles or the like at least for that portion try to get people out of their kind of formal positions to some extent.

With regard to Number 8 two points. One is that both the GNSO council and the GNSO as a body to have roles here but, you know, it's clearly the GNSO council that manages the policy development process. Also, you know, it's a little bit vague in the description of what is being alluded to when statements made that inroads into policy development have been made by the GAC, ALAC and even ICANN staff. So if policy, so-called policies are contract as an example I think that's an example of an area where there's going to be divergence even if they BC is agreeing with the NCSG so we have to do with that.

And I think more broadly if we are going to approach the topic we also have to add to the description a consideration of maintaining the historical, the appropriate roles for GAC, ALAC and staff. So, you know, GAC and ALAC as ACs give advice and may also participate in PDP working groups as they've been invited to do. And ICANN staff is charged with the implementation, with Implementation Oversight Team including GNSO and ICANN staff is charged with contracting so that is, you know, their role. So trying to define contracting as an issue of inroads I think is incorrect.

Of course we can save all that for regulating. But I think the description perhaps presumes too much. And as Wolf-Ulrich said it'd be helpful to have some concrete examples of what's being discussed so perhaps we can have some areas here when we can have some concrete agreement. I think probably relatively little disagreement than watching some of the interesting maneuvers of the GAC in Hyderabad in relation to this particular item. So we may be able to link more comment common headway there. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much (Greg).

(Greg):   I'll go back on mute so I don't have to hear myself.

(Greg):   One of the areas I'm taking a number of notes Ed's, (Greg)'s, Wolf's and
                 everybody else's comments and I'm noting some similarity here I'll try to
                 capture in a moment. Wolf-Ulrich you had suggested that there was something
                 you wanted to loop back to. And so you've remained in the queue. Let me turn
                 the microphone over to you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Well can you just bring up the list again, you know, the item list?
                 I have to - some comments to several points. It is the one is first is well,
                 Number 6 well I would agree, well okay just skip it then obviously. You
                 know, it doesn't seem to be the right time now to discuss the questions in
                 regard to the implementation, the Review Team Implementation that is one
                 thing.

                 The other thing is Number 5 that wasn't my point. I didn't bring that up. I
                 don't know who brought it up. And this is also included I saw that Number 5
                 is specific subject to be defined. But that's it. If there are no subjects then let's
                 skip it. You know, I was just prepared - well I could co-chair that because I' m
                 one of the co-chairs of this review implementation group. But if there's no
                 nothing to discuss well leave it. Let's skip it yes.

                 The other - another point is well I also and after this discussion and looking to
                 the chat I would agree to combine Number 8 and 9 and no 7 and 8 sorry. And
                 well I see here some grounds in discussing Number 8. Well and I'm sure there
                 are examples so and they should be described as these examples and then you

have the basis for discussion. My last comment is with regard to the Number 10.

I remember so we discussed last time about the possibility for councilmembers to meet. I don't know whether this Number 10 is now, you know, that's the result of that discussion because there was not more understanding in the group, you know, why the counselor should meet by themselves. And my suggestion was if that is necessary why shouldn't the counselors meet on Thursday morning after the two days of board sessions? So I wonder what Number 10 is behind and would like to have some explanation. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much. This is Rob. What I'll do is sort of summarize where I think things are coming together and then note quickly that Ed and Farzaneh are in the queue. It seems that there is and there's been a consensus development to drop Number 6 to combine 7 and 8. And there are actually some other pieces here that could be combined with the new 8 including the Number 10 that you just referenced Wolf-Ulrich.

You're right in sharing that there was - there were objections or resistance to having a separate session for just the councilors, not just solely the fact that not every community delegation includes their councilors but, also just a recognition that might create some programming issues because the councilors all off on their own what's everybody else do in the meantime? And does that then exclude the councilors from the conversation?

Where we had sort of landed on that I think -- and it's an interesting way that you all have maybe backed into this, you know, we've sort of struggled in the past about what's the theme of this meeting? What are you trying to accomplish as a whole? And I think and the contribution that Farzaneh and

(Kathy) have made you're pretty close to it. It's almost a seamless meeting is the GNSO's traditional policy making leadership position at ICANN and determining how you as an NCPH, you know, come to some common understanding about what the role is and what it should be going forward.

There's a whole host of things potentially contributing to that. So I see a great interest amount you two do something with 8. And whether that becomes a multipart session, whether that becomes another number of topics that roll into it I think that's worth exploring because I think Farzaneh and (Kathy) you've sort of tapped into something here that's much more thematic as well as something that can be talked about in a detailed way.

So I will make changes to this list to reflect, you know, the decisions to cut, you know, certainly cut 6. There's a strong proposal with actually no support or follow-up to keep 5 so it's a suggestion that 5 would somehow find its way into 8, certainly that 7 would find its way into 8. Ten basically Wolf-Ulrich that was a recognition that, you know, the councilors would be involved in some of the broader topics that might involve them and their work on the council. Well that's the case that's also 8.

So I think you all managed fairly quickly to combine a number of things, maybe shorter topics, maybe combined in other ways to all put it under 8. I'll look to see what Farzaneh's and (Kathy)'s reaction is going to be whether that follows that or whether we just create another placeholder. But I think you've been able to reduce this by three.

On the mailing list I would like you all to give me feedback about those of you would want to have an exchange with the staff meeting or the ICANN compliance function so we can determine whether that would be just part of the senior staff conversation, whether that would be its own separate session

or whether you want to have a conversation with (Maggie) or Jamie in your own individual breakout session. That might be another way to go with that.

I note that some of you are having to drop off but I want to get opportunity and we'll have recording and transcribed for Ed, Farzaneh and I don't know (Greg) if you want your hand to go back up there. But any quick final comments Ed and Farzaneh?

Ed Morris: Yes thanks Rob just briefly. On number one it would be very helpful considering the fact that at least on the NCSG we have a number - a lot of newcomers coming to this meeting if each group could give a brief description as to who they represent and how they determine policy, what is there – within the group how they determine policy, for example even things like are their councilors bound or not. In other words just a brief description of their function before they go into the priorities for the 2017 calendar year.

Lastly on Number 10 I think Wolf Knoben broached Thursday. That's just - it would be fine for me if we just said say 20 minutes on Thursday morning before our formal council meeting just to have an NCPH only council meeting with the remote participation since we're probably pretty much all going to be together at that time anyhow to go into the 12 o'clock session. At least an idea. Thanks so much.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks. We'll figure out a way to make that work Ed. You weren't on the last call but we did share with folks that we will have a room for our councilors and attendants who want to sit in and collectively participate in the GNSO call. And you guys basically have from like 8:30 to 12:00 for those of who are going to have, it looks like all of you are going to have some form of a community meeting or session. And so if you'd like to all agree that you'll leave a half hour left over between 11:00 and 11:30 or something like that that

also allows people to check out then I think that there's definitely flexibility for the counselors independently to get together and maybe even rope in, you know, those others won't be able to attend.

Ed Morris: That would be fantastic, Rob.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thank you. And I think we can add to the number one presentation of group priorities for 2017 calendar year that you all propose would be a great start off the meeting to add that component (Greg) – I'm sorry Ed as to how people make decisions and how the different come together on sort of governing the work of their counselors. Farzaneh I will give you the next to last word.

Farzaneh Badi: Thank you Rob. So I am going to just assure you that we came up with this topic because as we said just because we do have examples we might actually – I do have examples that happened last year. And I think we have common grounds with CSG on this that it should not have taken place. But I'm not being clear now. I will – I cannot give you details on this call but I'm going to just briefly mention the issue on the mailing list. And then we can see whether we should also look – keep Number 7 as well and as well is 8. But anyway that's what I want to say. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much. I will take a crack at pulling together the conversations from the last two planning calls, this one and the previous one. I think whether you feel it or not you have made some substantial progress in terms of narrowing and figuring out how this list is going to work. So I mean is that the

additional request to give me feedback on the compliance function piece. I will work on that here over the next 24, 48 hours and get that out to you all in plenty of time to associate before the next call.

I am also going to pull out the magic hat and just randomly assigned community leadership slots for those sessions that still appear to remain. And then on the next call we can sort of look and see if folks want to horse trade, if you are fine with what the list looks like and some of the break outs.

The other little twists I'm going to do is to try to play around with how eight might be a longer session. I may wait until I see some dialogue from all of you on the mailing list. Thank you again not only to the new members of the planning team who joined us today but for all those of you have been through this all the way through so far. We'll meet again same time next week when we will be down to 33 days. Thanks all very much for your cooperation and flexibility in putting this all together and we'll communicate on the list and talk to you all next week. Thanks very much. Bye-bye now.

Onan Sahin: (Raymond) you may not stop the recording.

Operator: Thank you. One moment.

END