

ICANN

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
December 5, 2017
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Thank you. Recordings have joined. You may start.

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the 2018 NCPH Intersessional Planning Call held on Tuesday 5 December 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Barbara Warner, Farzaneh Badii, Joan Kerr, Juan Manuel Rojas, Lori Schulman, Sam Lanfranco, Steve DelBianco, Tatiana Tropina, Vicky Sheckler, and Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. We have apologies from Philippe Fourquat. And from staff we have Mary Wong, Andrea Glandon, Benedetta Rossi, and myself Ozan Sahin.

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

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Ozan. Welcome everyone and thank you for joining our I think it's our fourth NCPH Intersessional Planning Call for this year. I apologize for my voice. I have a bit of a cough. But - so please accept my apologies for that.

I think the main focus of today's call will be to go over the agenda and I know that I've shared an updated agenda last week and I shared one with you all today just before today's call. So I'm sure you wouldn't have had time to review it. But I just wanted you to all have a copy of it in case you want to scroll directly on your own computers. But otherwise we have a few updates on logistics on the delegate list and then we'll focus the rest of the call on the planning.

In terms of the logistics, the board workshop planning is currently underway which is one of the reasons why the - we've had to make quite a few changes to the draft agenda for the intersessional meeting to ensure that we could have board member attendance for the session that you all asked for. So we'd have to shift some of these meetings around and we'll focus on that once we get to the actual program.

But that is one of the main reasons, and it's because the board chair has asked to add an additional date to the board workshop, specifically focused for new board members, and that created a few issues with our current - well our previous agenda. But we seem to have resolved a lot of this in these conflicts and hopefully we'll still manage to have the board members that we all needed for the intersessional meeting without clashing with a board workshop.

We've also while we were liaising with the board staff support we were able to have the board join the intersessional delegation for lunch on February 2. We've been asked obviously to check with you all if you'd like the full board to join you for sort of a working lunch session. There will be a one-hour meeting on February 2. So it would be great to have some reactions from you all to see if this would be helpful to the intersessional meeting just to have a full NCPH delegation meeting with the full board.

I see that Tatiana and Vicky and Steve are in agreement. So we've been asked to confirm that today if possible just to make sure that obviously they include that into the board workshop agenda. Okay I see Barbara is also agreeing and Joan as well. Tatiana, I'm - hearing this - my question right now is referring to the full board joining the NCPH for lunch on February 2. And then in terms of guest attendees we can go through it when we get to the agenda if that's more relevant since we'll be looking at the individual plenary. That seems to be more useful.

Yes, the full board for lunch on February 2. Yes, they'll all be in Los Angeles for their board workshop. And part of this -- yes, thank you Mary -- we would also like to get your reaction and feedback on the NCPH reception. Every year when we have the intersessional meeting we typically schedule a reception either on the first or second day. In this case would you like to invite the full board to join the NCPH for the reception?

If so, we would recommend scheduling it on the - at the closure of the intersessional meeting since otherwise the board will not be able to attend on February 1 due to the board workshop agenda. I see that there's support for the board at lunch and for the reception. That's perfect. Thank you.

And another item in terms of logistics is we are still awaiting confirmation on Göran Marby's availability to attend the session with the full house, and we've currently marked it on the schedule. We're working closely with the CEO office to confirm this and it's still hinging on the board workshop, but hopefully Göran will be able to join the full delegation immediately after lunch with the board. And that will be a for a 90-minute slot.

And before we properly focus on the program for the intersessional I just wanted to follow up regarding the delegate list. I was told quite a few times from our constituency travel team, who notified me that only a handful of the delegation have actually completed their itineraries. So please, please, please make sure that you liaise with FCM and follow through with the welcome email that the constituency travel team will have sent you. Obviously this is really important for budget reasons and even more so if you're requiring a visa for the meeting, especially since it's going to be in the US. So yes, if you could please finalize your itineraries as soon as possible that would be great since the deadline was on the end of October, I believe.

And we're still obviously missing - I think the only group whose names we don't have is for the business constituency pending the election. Hopefully we'll have those names finalized soon and then we can kick off the travel arrangements for the BC as well.

I'll just turn to the program now. While I load the document, is there anything else in terms of the logistics or the delegate list or anything we just talked about right now that you'd like to - you have a question or a comment about before we turn over to the agenda? And thank you, Steve, regarding the BC elections update.

Thank you, Barbara. Yes I realize you made this comment on the - that you sent this to me via email regarding remote participation. I did want to touch on that. So thank you very much for reminding me. There's always remote participation for the intersessional meeting but it's more of like a remote - it's more less remote observation rather than participation.

We usually have an Adobe Connect room where everybody can log in and listen in and use the chat function, whereas in terms of actually speaking in

the meeting, it's usually reserved for the seven delegates from each of the participating communities. That's sort of the justification for the actual face to face time is for - so it can be spread out with the seven representatives from each group. And so the understanding has always been that if someone who's a remote observer would like to make a comment, they can either use the chat function or ask one of their community representatives to speak on their behalf. But the actual speaking is always done by the seven reps from each group.

And yes, correct. That's right, Steve. So remote participation - participants can enter comments in the chat and they can listen in. And then every single session is recorded and then the recordings will be posted on the intersessional wiki space. Okay I see that - I think that was the only question that was relative to the logistics, so perfect.

Moving on to the actual program. I've noted that there were some emails going on on the mailing list regarding the addition of one topic following what I submitted last week, which was an item regarding transparency. So I've now - so by the way, everybody can scroll on the document that's on the screen, so you can look at the agenda that is on the Adobe Connect room as you see fit.

So I've added that topic, but based on the current agenda, I've tentatively penciled it in as in slot N, so plenary session number 10, replacing the NCPH budget working group since that was the only topic on the agenda which was marked as to be confirmed. I don't know if that was something that was confirmed or if there's anybody who feels very strongly about keeping the NCPH budget working group or if there are any other spots that might be moved around. I just wanted to get your - get a sense from you all if that's an acceptable edit or if you'd really like to keep the NCPH budget working group.

And yes, thank you very much, Mary. If anybody has to drop early, obviously just let us know if you have comments per the - via email on the mailing list and that'd would great. We can incorporate them.

Steve, please go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks. It's Steve DelBianco. The transparency slot is of interest to the NCPH. A lot of us participated on the Work Stream 2 project regarding transparency, and its recommendations ended up being well short of what we all wanted because of resistance from ICANN Legal to our request that they be transparent about the reasons that they were claiming privilege or withholding documents.

And we discussed this on our last intersessional planning call, the idea that we'd like to have conversations about that with ICANN management and/or legal to better understand what that's about. It's not too late to revise these transparency recommendations if we discover that ICANN Legal has a way that they can share. It may not be the way that we had originally written up.

So I only mention this to say that I support the idea of a transparency slot, particularly focused on the Work Stream 2 recommendations and that if it were possible we would do that before we had any meetings with people from ICANN Legal or management. And that might argue to move the slot to sooner in the agenda so that we can discuss what our concerns and be ready to talk to management. Thanks.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Steve. Renata, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you, Benedetta. This is Renata here. Yes I agree with keeping the topic as well and moving it earlier. But I would move it really earlier to the session that was the first slot that was roles and support. Yes there were two roles and support. Oh one of them changed already to new gTLD, right? Yes I would just like to move this earlier as well. And yes, that's (unintelligible) the topic and focusing on Work Stream 2 (unintelligible). Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Renata. Michael, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Can't hear you, Michael.

Benedetta Rossi: Michael, your hand is up but we can't hear you. Please go ahead. Renata, is that an old hand? Okay I see that Michael is entering the chat again. So he's been having some technical difficulties.

Ozan Sahin: Hi, Benedetta. This is Ozan speaking. The operator informed me that Michael is not in the audio bridge so they have to dial his number if he wanted to.

Benedetta Rossi: Renata, please go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you. Renata. Yes a follow up. We still have the two roles of the board session. The transparency is right after the community reviews among the board, and then we have during the beginning the act and role of the board, slot B. I understand that there are specific topics that these sessions could broach, so I would change the focus here to those topics. So a topic on geo names and instead of reviews I would suggest something on RPMs, which is a missing topic, and replacing the RPMs replacing the community reviews

and role of the board because this will already come up in the previous session. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Renata. Just to confirm, you would like to remove - to change the topic from the organizational review topic to RPMs? Is that what you suggested?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Yes. Renata again. If RPMs is overall missing, as I don't see it in any topic so please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that would be an interesting topic to have.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Renata. In terms of adding a topic, I mean we could definitely try to add the topic. I thought that there was a lot of traction in terms of having the topic to discuss with some of the board members from the Organizational Effectiveness Committee for the GNSO organizational review and the role of the board in the community-driven reviews. Is that still the case from the community planning side or is everybody in agreement to remove this topic? This is very important since we've invited the board OEC members to join the intersessional for this topic.

And I see that Tatiana and Steve have their hands up. So, Tatiana, please go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Hi. Tatiana Tropina speaking for the record. When I see these topics and when I see the timeslot as far as pertaining to timeslot M, we have only one hour. I doubt that we can discuss both GNSO organizational review and the role of the board in community-driven reviews. So I would suggest, even if we don't replace this with anything, we remove the GNSO organizational review for several reasons just because it's not enough time. Secondly, I do believe that it

should be discussed on the GNSO level with the contracted party house as well.

So if this topic is not to be replaced by anything, we just have to - we might want to use this hour only to discuss the role of the board in the community-driven reviews without the GNSO organizational review, just strike it out and leave the role of the board if we are going to schedule the board member in that spot. But I don't believe that one hour would be enough to combine these two topics first of all. And, secondly, I don't think that they did much here. So that would be my suggestion just to get rid of GNSO organizational review. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Tatiana. And, Steve, please go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Hi. Steve DelBianco. In Iceland when we had members of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the board they were able to cover both the GNSO organization review topic as well as the community-driven reviews in a single time interval, and I believe we could do the same this year in the intersessional. Let me suggest why.

The organization review that we're discussing with them is only the GNSO, the one that affects all of us. And the topic of interest, at least to the Commercial Stakeholder Group, is to understand to what extent the community will have some input about the terms of reference that are given to the vendor they select to do the next GNSO review so that we'll understand whether that would include interviews, would it look at structure, would it only look at changes in process.

So I have been told by members of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee that the board and staff do want to let the community have more

involvement at setting up these reviews, even to the point of having some input upon which vendors are selected. So I believe that a 15-minute segment from the time that's allocated here in terms of one hour, a 15-minute segment would be more than adequate to address questions about how we're going to do the next GNSO organizational review and what level of input the community could have in that. And that would leave 45 minutes to cover the community-driven reviews, such as SSR2. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Steve. Renata, please go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hi. Yes. Renata. I want to agree with Tatiana. So my first impression with this agenda is that we're discussing roles of the board at two different times but then as we have the community review in focus, that would give a whole new meaning to the session. So then perhaps we can leave without the typical review. I just think it's so much for this amount of time and creating a slot won't really help that much because we need to focus on the topic. Role of the board is already a lot. And change the other role of the board into geo names. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Renata. Tatiana, please go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much. Tatiana Tropina speaking. I wanted to address the logistics (unintelligible) Renata because I see that first of all last year we didn't have this outstanding case of a review team like CCR2 to be kind of (unintelligible) for awhile. And I think that raised lots of discussions and maybe it would be better to focus on this.

But I bought your point about the board being able to update us, but I think that in this case the title is misleading and we have to narrow the focus of this session and not to talk about the GNSO organizational review but then put it

like an update of the board on its participation in GNSO organizational review and in the community review. So then we have to specify that we are discussing both those topics, because otherwise I do think that this topic is just too broad and there's, you know, we are missing Contracted Party House here if we put it in a broad perspective.

So if we are to leave this topic, we really have to narrow it down and just explain a little bit about the role of the board, and GNSO review is just one of the examples. Thank you very much.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Tatiana. So I think what we're trying to say is to potentially remove GNSO organizational review from the - at least from the beginning of the title and just have the role of the board and actually feed in community-driven reviews, and then we could have as sort of a sub topic the GNSO organizational review maybe, as Steve suggested, for something like a 15-minute slot to just go over what the next GNSO review is going to look like.

Would - does that work for everybody if we mark it as such? Obviously -- I can't remember who said so in the chat -- but somebody noted that there will also be the vice chairs - the co-chairs, sorry, responsibility to make sure that the topics don't overlap or run over. Okay. I see that there is support in the chat. My apology. I keep having to mute my phone because I'm coughing.

Steve DelBianco: Beni, hey, it's Steve DelBianco. Before I drop, let's just be sure to tell the Organizational Effectiveness Committee members that when they arrive for the session on specific reviews that we want them to be prepared to update us on their latest thinking on the process for setting up the terms of reference and vendor on the next GNSO review. That way they can do that update. It doesn't

have to be in the title of the session if that is of concern to people. So let's be sure that they're prepared to speak to us about it. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Steve. Okay I see that there is support in the chat regarding the board update on the GNSO review. I think that we've settled the issue with that slot.

Mary, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Yes thanks, Benedetta and everybody. This is Mary from staff. So thanks everyone for working through this and for the great suggestions. From the staff side we just wanted to remind you that some of these timings might still change, and so for this specific session based on the suggestions today we will have to go back to the OEC because not only the timing might change but it may be question of how many of them can make it. So again, thanks for the concrete suggestions but we do need to be a bit flexible about where the slot goes. I hope you understand. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Mary. So going back to the - sort of taking the agenda from the top, I've made quite a lot of changes since the last call that we had, so if that's all right with you we could go through the agenda from the top and make sure that everyone's on the same page.

So we'll kick off with slot A. It's just an introduction and welcome by David Olive from ICANN senior staff and then that'll take us to the slot B from 9:15 to 10:30, and that'll be the initial stakeholder group breakout session so that you can - we'll have two rooms so you can break up at your stakeholder group level and discuss your meeting expectations and just prep for any of the sessions that are coming up next.

Then there'll be a break from 10:30 to 10:45. And then slot C will kick off at 10:45 and that's NCPH plenary session number 1, and it's the community overviews. I think on the last call we had this on day two because of how the agenda was presented. So we've now swapped it over to kick off with that on day one. So it's a 12-minute presentation with our Q&A from each constituency highlighting your goals and expectations for the 2018 calendar year.

I'll just pause for a second. Has any - have you had the opportunity to review the session co-chairs or is that still premature? Farzaneh, please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: Hi, Benedetta. Yes, we have discussed the co-chairs that NCSG is going to put forward. We are going to finalize that. Do we - should we set the names on the mailing or shall we discuss it on the mailing list or shall we just send them to you? And the other thing for the community overview, I just wanted to say that I understand that the CSG is going to have three constituency presentations. We are going to have a stakeholders of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group presentation and two others, NCUC, and NPOC presentations.

I think this is what I got from the constituencies of Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group has that they want to present. So it will be - so we will need for - instead of having three constituencies, we have are going to have one stakeholder group presentation and two constituencies.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Farzaneh. That's perfect. The slot already takes into account the three presentations from the NCSG side, so that's - that works out pretty well. Thank you very much.

Barbara, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Barbara Warner: Thank you, Benedetta. Just a couple of things. In terms of the selection of CSG co-chairs, I don't know that we've had sufficient time to sort of sort this out. We sort of have generally talked about it within the BC but we haven't had an opportunity yet to sort this out with our CSG colleagues. So I think we might need a bit more time on that. Wolf-Ulrich's on the call and I would welcome his perspective on that.

And then also I'd just like to propose maybe shifting, in response to Steve's suggestion about moving the transparency discussion earlier, so we have clearer thinking in terms of how we want to talk to senior management about this. If we flip this, move the roles of the board and the GAC post IANA transition to slot N, that would follow our discussion about board roles and SOs, ACs, and community-driven reviews. So it would sort of be consistent in terms of exploring the roles of the board. And then bring the transparency session up here to slot D. Just thought I would throw that out as an idea.
Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Barbara. Wolf-Ulrich, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. As Barbara said, so we have - we decided on one more week. We'll have an NCSG ExCom call within the next week about the meeting as well and talking about this question, the allocation of co-chairs to the different action items, the different agenda items. So that is how we are going to approach that, and well the others I don't have a comment. Thanks.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Michael, you're next in the queue. Please go ahead.

Michael Karanicolas: Hi. Sorry that I was drifting out earlier. I just wanted to chime in on the placement of the transparency session. Based on what I was hearing earlier, it sounds like what we're - the thing that we want to get our views aligned on to discuss ourselves before we talk to the board is more related to or is as related to Work Stream 2 as it is to transparency. It just seems to be centered on specifically the recommendations around ICANN Legal.

So if that's the case and unless there's other major issues that people want to discuss related to Work Stream 2, we could potentially move the session, NPCH plenary session 11, up instead and that would allow us to keep the transparency session discussing new avenues forward like open data efforts, areas of prioritization going forward, et cetera. But I'm not sure if people have other pressing issues they want to raise during the Work Stream 2 discussion. So that's an alternative but it would depend on how much of that session people want to allocate to transparency.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Michael. The only issue with the suggestion so far about shifting some of these sessions is that we're not entirely sure in terms of guest speakers who's going to be available on the day one of the NPCH intersessional, so it's best to have guest speakers to be invited on February 2 rather than on the 1 given there's going to be other meetings going on in Los Angeles on the 1st of February which might clash with this meeting.

So we're not entirely sure right now who's going to be available to join in terms of from ICANN Legal for example and from the executive team, as well as the board. So that's why some of the topics - the way that the schedule is currently presented is for more internal items to be discussed within the NPCH on day one and then have day two with more guest speakers.

Mary's asking in the chat regarding the transparency session who from ICANN staff with the planning group would want to ask to attend? Michael, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Michael Karanicolas: I was just typing that out and realized it was probably quicker to just say it. Yes that sort of depends on the direction that we want that discussion to go in. So if we're just discussing the recommendations towards ICANN Legal then it would be good to have somebody from ICANN Legal that we can circle back and forth with. The description at the moment mentions ICANN's ongoing open data efforts and areas of approach basically going forward.

There is a couple of people that are leading efforts to improve the website and to improve information management and proactive disclosure. So that's potentially an area. But I think that that's of secondary interest to people at the moment than the pressing issue of transparency and ICANN Legal. So I - my sense is that the community would prioritize that first and if, depending on if this is the only slot to talk about that, then that would probably be more of a priority.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Michael. I was just catching up with the chat. Moving forward, unless anybody has any further comments regarding this topic I think we were on slot C. So then that takes us to slot D, which is NCPH plenary session number 2, and it's from 12:15 to 1 o'clock. And that's the roles of the board and the GAC post IANA transition.

And, Farzaneh, please to ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: So okay I can see that do we need to brief the board beforehand what we want to talk about? Because if so, then I think we want to go more than just .amazon. We want - I think it would be - well I don't know what other

colleagues think, but my in my opinion we need to talk about GAC overreach and we need to talk about, well in a very undiplomatic way of saying board giving into whatever GAC wants with regards to generic names and policy and kind of ignoring the GNSO.

So I'd like to - I don't know if we have to set the topic, but I don't think we should only talk about .amazon. I think we should talk about more than GAC and the GAC overreach that happens all the time and also like geo names now we are - we can see that governments want everything. So I think it's something - if they want the topics to be discussed, I think we should also add the GAC overreach and also .amazon. But if they don't, then let's just keep it broad and tell them we want to talk to you about it.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Farzaneh. Just to clarify, I had understood that this topic was more of an internal NCPH discussion, but based on your comments, Farzaneh, it seems like the expectation was for the actual board or some board members to be present for this. So if that's the case the latter, meaning we actually require some of the board members to attend, we'd have to shift this topic maybe to be discussed during the lunch with the board for example since some board members will not be available on the 1st of February.

Okay so I see that Renata is agreeing with shifting this topic. So is this something that should be discussed with the - could this be one of the topics to discuss with the board in terms of the role of the board and the GAC post IANA transition?

Farzaneh, please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: So, Benedetta, it just depends on how serious this lunch with the board members are. If you're just eating lunch and having a conversation then I

think no we want to have like a more kind of like a serious setting. But if it's like, you know, if we can have lunch and have a serious conversation about GAC overreach, yes of course I'm okay with you and because there are like more board members there, so.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Farzaneh. Mary, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks everyone and Benedetta. I was just about to say that your guidance is very much needed here because at the moment what we've done is worked with board operations to just find out when the board may be available and, as Benedetta said, you know, we've got the lunch and possibly the reception times and a few other board members have been told that there are certain topics that they may be interested in attending.

If for example coming out of today this group would like us to go back and say first of all as we said earlier a board update or a briefing on certainly things and secondly hear a substantive discussion, this does change quite significantly what we informed the board members about. And of course on the staff side we, you know, are not able to influence what the board is prepared to talk about and so forth. So it is critical for us that you let us know what you'd like us to go back to the board with so that we can be very clear with the board members as to what type of session we are inviting them to. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Mary. My apologies for removing the lunch slot on day one. I will put that back into the schedule.

Okay the next - okay I see that Farzaneh has her hand up so I'll pause. Please go ahead, Farzaneh.

Farzaneh Badii: Benedetta, just to make a decision of whether to talk about it during the lunch or not, we have to discuss it at the intersessional meeting because it seems like there are not many people that have an opinion on it. So let's just discuss that during the - on the mailing list and see what we come up with.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Farzaneh. Renata, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you. I guess we have a few agreements now but we still have not discussed the RPMs topic. It seems to be really a topic missing from here. Mary has discussed it could be approached in new gTLDs but we are proposing to reexamine the outreach session proposal. It has a suggestion of sending out a survey. I think sending out a survey in December and January would be quite challenging for us to get some relevant information for the session as well.

So it doesn't seem - it seems something that constituencies could probably address better to the community, within the community they could address better. Outreach could also be tailored. But I guess RPMs is the session on its own so that's a bigger suggestion. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Renata. And I see that Bruna in the chat is also in support of replacing the outreach session. I see there's a comment in the chat from Mary asking Renata if she could be more specific about what aspects of RPMs should be discussed so we can incorporate that into the agenda. Barbara, please go ahead.

Barbara Warner: Thank you. I'm sorry. I'm just going back and making sure I understand sort of where we are here. There was some discussion about using our lunch meeting with the board to talk about what we had planned in slot D, the roles

of the board and the GAC post IANA transition, and I'm just concerned that we only have one hour with them and I'm just concerned that that isn't really sufficient time. So I just wanted to express some concerns about that and also just get some clarity as to where things stand. So we're leaving the roles of the board and GAC post IANA transition in that slot D on February 1? Do I understand that correctly or maybe things are still a bit fluid?

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Barbara. I understood things are still a little bit fluid and that it could potentially be one of the topics to discuss with the board. So we don't - we haven't actually discussed what topics should be discussed with the board at length yet.

Barbara Warner: Okay.

Benedetta Rossi: And I see Mary has her hand up. So I'll turn it over to Mary.

Mary Wong: Hi again everyone. It's Mary. So the fluidity is still there, Barbara, and obviously with the various suggestions from today, as Vicky was saying in the chat, we hope that everyone will take the time to review this in the next couple of days and get back to us.

One I guess underlying theme that I thought might be helpful to remind everyone of here is that this two-day meeting is really primarily a meeting for both of the Non-Contracted Party groups to allow you to discuss how you can work together in topics of mutual interest, whether that be, you know, post transition or new gTLDs or RPMs, et cetera.

So while it's important and desirable to have the board there, as noted, you know, there's not a whole lot of time. So I think our suggestion to the group is to take what time that you have with the board and really sort of identify what

topic or topics you have that you want to focus in a dialogue with them. For the rest of the program, the focus should really be how the two different stakeholder groups and respective constituencies can be discussing topics of mutual interest and working better together. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Mary. And, Barbara, is that - okay I see your hand is down. You answered my question. Okay I'll just carry on going through the current schedule.

The next topic is slot E. It's from 1 pm to 2:30 pm, plenary session number 3, and that's the new gTLD subsequent procedures next expansion round, so the assessment and discussion. That's a 90-minute slot, followed by a 15-minute break, resuming at 14:45 to 16:15, slot F. And that's the NCPH plenary session number 4 entitled Reconciling Whois and GDPR.

This is one of the first sessions that we'll potentially require ICANN Legal to join, as well as our guest speaker from the GDD team. We're pending the name of the staff member who the NCPH planning team would like to invite for this slot. So if you could notify us ASAP of who exactly you'd like to see joining and ICANN Legal joins us for the slot, that would be great so we can submit the invitation accordingly.

Again, this is just tentatively set for day one but we'll have to see based on who the guest speakers are to see whether this needs to be on day one or day two based on the other meetings that are going on.

And the next slot - and the same applies for the next slot. We need ICANN Legal well. So it's slot G from 4:15 to 5:15, and that's a GDPR compliance topic. And then we'll wrap up between 5:15 and 5:30 just summarizing action items and closing for the first day.

Does anybody have any comments on the last few slots for day one?

Farzaneh, please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, Benedetta. So I see that there was a suggestion by Renata and a couple of others that we discuss RPMs and also geo names so that the PDP topics they're a little bit more focused. So now for the new gTLD sub procedure what is this going to cover? And if we are not covering RPMs, then probably RPMs should be discussed - we want to suggest that we remove discussing outreach and recruitment strategies and just discuss RPM and other work of the other PDP work.

So I'd like to know what we are going - because this is an hour and a half slot, new gTLD subsequent procedures, I wanted to know if the group has an idea of what specifically we are going to talk about.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Farzaneh. Does anybody have any feedback on the new gTLD subsequent procedures session that Farzaneh just asked about? Farzaneh, please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: So as Mary suggested, I think that the geo name could fit into this. Now are we going to discuss RPM and if we are going to discuss RPM where and when? Do we have enough to discuss it? Because I don't see a lot of contribution to this. Do we have a lot to say on this new gTLD subsequent procedures? It seems - it looks like we should.

I'm just asking the group what they're going to talk about. Is this going to be like one hour and half with talk about new gTLD subsequent procedures with like specific topics? Is that - are we going to also focus on RPM somewhere on the agenda? So I'd like to know that, because we wanted to focus on RPM

instead of outreach and RPM and geo names instead of outreach. So if the new gTLD subsequent procedures cover geo names, the WT5 work, then we can discuss RPM instead of discussing outreach and recruitment. Right, I'm going to call this my victory and my suggestion was I accept it. Thank you. Okay, Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: On such a positive note I think that we can finally wrap up this call. And then obviously we only go through the first portion of the agenda on the call and I've sent out the draft and I will be sending out an updated draft in the next - well shortly following this call with updates, but I'll wait to see if there are any additional comments received on the mailing list or to me directly. Please submit any comments as you see fit and we'll circulate another draft once we've received comments from you all.

Farzaneh, do you have a - is that a new hand or an old hand before we wrap up? And I see that Wolf-Ulrich (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: I wanted to talk about the procedural issues and - but we don't have time. The thing is that there is like people are not clear which procedural issues we have drafted. Like for example, the board seats they are not clear whether it has been finalized or not. We have to discuss this on the mailing list. So I urge group to - I'm going to start the conversation and I urge the group to respond so that we know which procedural issues we are going to talk about.

Benedetta Rossi: Great. Thank you very much, Farzaneh. And, Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Just coming back that question of the guest speakers. I'm sorry, I wasn't available at the last call. How is that meant here, and maybe Mary answered it already, who shall be guest speakers, just from

ICANN staff guest speakers are going to be invited or just for my understanding?

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Yes on the last call the community identified someone from ICANN - from the GDD department and then a representative from ICANN Legal to join the group for the GDPR discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: You're welcome. Okay well I see that we're already two minutes over so I'll wrap up this call and thank you all for joining. And I look forward to all of your feedback on the draft schedule on the mailing list and to speaking with you in two weeks' time. Thank you ever so much.

Ozan Sahin: Johnny, please stop the recording and disconnect all lines and goodbye.

END