ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
January 19, 2017
9:00 am CT

Woman: Recordings are started.

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the non-contracted party's house and just national planning call held on the 19th of January, 2017. On the call today we have Barbara Wanner, Chris Wilson, Edward Morris, Klaus Stoll, Lori Schulman, Matthew Shears, Poncelet Illeleji, Tapani Tarvainen, Tatiana Tropina, Vicky Shekler and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

                We have Renata Ribeiro and Joanna Palmer on the phone bridge. We have received apologies from Anna Loup. From ICANN staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Chantelle Doerksen, Benedetta Rossi, Maryam Bakoshi 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 everybody. Thank you again for your dedication of doing this call on a weekly basis. We've made some really good

progress the past few weeks and I'm hopeful that we are pretty much crystallizing things at least from a gender perspective.

Some good dialogue on our calls and also via email on the lists so thank you all for that. Ozan, just one clarification - if I recall (Farzana)'s email indicates she might be a bit late but I don't think she's going to be entirely absent from the call.

So she and others may still be joining us including Tony Holmes who advised me that he's delayed on a train to London. So he'll join the call that he'll be on mute with us.

The agenda for today, again, follows the same track that we've had the last couple of weeks. In addition to these introductions, we'll provide you all with a logistics update.

I shared most of that information by email I circulated the latest version of the agenda a couple of days ago. Though I really like to do is remind you of all that and reinforce some of those items for those who have not had a chance to read the email.

And then we'll have a programming discussion. What I would like to do there is to go through the whole agenda as it set up right now. We've done it is somewhat of a strawman with different sessions at different times with different timetables or time windows set up for each.

And why would really welcome today as comments and feedback in terms of, gee, can we move this? That looks great. This needs to be longer or shorter. So I would appreciate that type of feedback.

And then I'm hoping we can discuss a little bit about the role of the discussion leaders. I did my magical pulling communities out of a hat and just doing some random assignments and would like to go into that with you.

I recall I got a question or two there about the goal of the discussion leads and you all might want to have a conversation about how you set that up as well. For those not in the AC room, Ozan has also advised us that Kathy Kleiman has joined the phone bridge, so welcome to the group, Kathy.

Are there any other agenda items or areas that anyone would like to ensure that we have on our list? If so, I'll give you a moment either to intercede verbally or with your hand raised in the chat room.

And I see nothing in the chat, and hearing nothing, we'll accept this list for right now and, of course, throughout the time of the call, anything pops up or comes up that you want to read or note, please do so. That would be great.

Let's talk briefly logistics. The biggest news, I think, is more in terms of attendance at people participating. I got the bad news about three days ago that Goran will not be able to join the group and person, face-to-face.

But I'm in Los Angeles at the end of this weekend next and I'll be talking with his team later on today to say we can nail down an appropriate time in the calendar for him to be able to participate with us remotely.

I did have some a reach out and ask, having reviewed Version 4.0 of the agenda, hey, Rob, is that - you know, is that time set in stone? And the answer to that is at present it's not.

I put that as an afternoon session on the first day because of the time zone differences. Goran, as I understand it, right now is going to be still in Los Angeles at that time so we'll have an eight hour time difference.

So I think just, you know, from a practical standpoint, so that we have him in a stage of some awakeness, if I can use that terminology, we probably would want to be shooting for an afternoon session with him. Hence, my suggestion to put him in the afternoon of I think the first day.

That's something that we can shift if you all want to but wanted to note that he won't be there in person unfortunately. I indicated in the document that David Olive will be there.

Unfortunately, David is adjusting his itinerary for some other activities so he will only be in Reykavic on the evening of the 13th and the morning on the 14th with the group.

So he'll be there in person but just for a short period of time. And then we'll likely, once he's able to get back to Istanbul, you'll be able to join us via remote participation.

He's got to be in Istanbul for the DNS forum, one of those potential conflicts, I think, that one or two of you have identified. And then, the other big piece where we had some extensive discussions on our last call is that, in addition to Markus Kummer, so far George Sadowski and Rinalia Abdul Rahim have reached out to me to about their interest and desire to join the meeting having had at least one or two conversations with some of you as community leaders.

As we discussed as a group last week, I shared with them the history, background and context of this meeting, the general ethos of the work, and they both asked that they be allowed to participate.

They understand the quote, unquote, "group therapy," nature of the meeting and will be happy to step out or otherwise observed quietly wherever you guys see the scope of the meeting going on some of your sessions.

So I think still open as some of those opportunities for Chatham House rules. I think that Greg has suggested a couple of times, and if there are some particular sessions where you guys feel more comfortable being alone, I think you can do that.

The other thing that is possible now with their attendance, is as you have some of your breakout sessions, if you would like others to join you and be a part of your conversations, you can certainly explore that as a group if you would like them to join some of your breakout sessions.

Those were the big pieces of news in terms of general attendance, in particular, CEO and Board members. As I noted in my cover note to you all, Benedetta and I are shooting for a newcomer Webinar. We don't have the exact time and call-in details yet but we're shooting for that on Tuesday, the 31st.

It'll be recorded and transcribed so that anyone interested in the information will be able to get it. Right now we're only planning on one session as opposed to two that we did last year.

And the other thing that I noted that I would love to get perspective on, either on this call or via email with a remote participation arrangements, where I outlined what we have done over the last three meetings.

And the approach there is to allow anyone who is not physically participating in the meeting to be able to observe using the remote participation tools with the understanding that if folks had observations that they wanted to make that those intercessions would be made either in the chat or just via, you know, background, direct messages to meeting delegates who could then share that information.

What we want to try to avoid is trying to do remote intercessions for anyone except for presenters, for example, Goran, who will be remote or Jaime Hedlund who's still a potential, if you guys want to pursue that session. (Sometimes) it just doesn't work as effectively given the nature and approach that you all want to take in terms of the meeting.

That's a general overview. I mentioned a number of other things in the email in terms of highlights and the rest. If anyone has comments, questions about anything I just went over or anything else I added from a general operational or logistical standpoint, I will take a queue.

Right now looking at the AC room, I don't have any hands up. But if anyone who is not in the AC room wants to make a comment verbally, I'll hold on here for a second or two.

And welcome, Tony, for joining the phone bridge. And thank you, Ozan, for letting us know about Brian and Raoul as well. Mr. Stoll, I see you've raised your hand.

Klaus Stoll: Hello. Hello.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, if that's Klaus, I can hear you and you have the floor, sir.

Klaus Stoll: No, it wasn't me but thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Oh, okay.

Klaus Stoll: I just would like to make an observation related to the point that (unintelligible) and he makes it for such a short time that (I'm) basically not - I'm not really affected.

And I thought it would be really important that that (does) change with the policy side and it would go a little bit better. It's just not the (unintelligible). I just want to register my (point). Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Klaus. You're a little bit hard to hear but I think you said you wanted to register your concern or disappointment that we were going to get them. Is that correct?

Klaus Stoll: Yes. Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. Yes, unfortunately, we were aware of this as a potential eventuality, moving the meeting out of an ICANN or a city where the meeting was taking place hub or city where the meeting was taking place.

We're going to see how this one goes. As we've also discussed, or at least early in the planning process, I think the opportunity that you all have in Iceland, and subsequent to that, from a staff perspective will definitely put a- push some priority on it, is for you all to talk about the potential for future gatherings of the NCPH conversations about, do we do this meeting again?

If so, when? If so, where? So we can nail something like that down six, eight, maybe even 12 month ahead of time so that those processes and procedures can be made.

Nothing changes last minute, unfortunate changes and things, but it'll certainly improve the odds for participation. So thanks for your comment on that, Klaus. Greg, you've raised your hand. Let me turn the mic over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan. I don't know, Rob, is this the right time to discuss the remote participation concept or issue that you mentioned are we doing that leader in the agenda?

Rob Hoggarth: No, I think that's fine, Greg. I view that as (a typical item or) operation, so please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Okay. I know that we have, at least in our group, one member who, you know, registered displeasure and felt that, you know, it should be, you know, fully open, remote participation, you know, just like this.

And I've given this some thought, at least personally, and I'm not speaking for, you know, member of the IPC, but I'm only - and as one member of the IPC, myself.

But I think that given, A, the track record that we had of doing it this way in the past, and B, discussions of things like group therapy and Chatham House rules, and admittedly, I'm, you know, primary discussant of those things that, you know, developing, you know, a good feel in the room and keeping the conversation largely in the room to meet the same important and worthwhile.

And I think that, in spite of - and if others, you know, one should disagree with me even though my own constituency (even those) that are on the call, that's fine. But just personally, I do think that we're doing it right. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Greg. And, you know, just based upon how the original pilot meeting and then subsequent meetings have set up, that certainly has been the spirit.

I appreciate you sharing, all of you, when you have concerns from some of your membership, and it was certainly factored in some of the conversations from this meeting, and I think it should certainly continue to be something that you guys talk about for future meetings. Thanks very much for your comments.

Anything else from a logistics perspective? Well, folks, think - Benedetta, I don't know if you've been able to join us yet? I know Benedetta was coming off of a previous community call.

There were a number of questions that have cropped up obviously has removed forward with various travel arrangements about visa letters and the rest.

I want to encourage any of you have knowledge of or personal experience with any last-minute changes that need to be made or things where an itinerary is not working out or you're not hearing back, please let us know as soon as possible.

You want to make sure that everybody is taking caravan at least, you know, a couple of weeks in advance we have everybody completely nailed down. So

that would be very helpful. Poncelet, with that comment, your hand went up so let me turn the floor microphone over to you.

Poncelet Illeleji: I'm Poncelet speaking for the record. I mean, I've already sent emails to Benedetta about it, but I felt I should mention at least, I mean, I sent a request out for my visa letter (unintelligible) I've still not gotten it.

We don't have any (indices) here for - any European (indices) and I was trying to get it in London but I didn't hear from travel so I felt that I could get it from any of the (unintelligible) conference in (unintelligible).

We are having (unintelligible) can get it from (there). So I don't know why the delay. I don't know what - the delay whereby there looking at this on a case-by-case basis, why they've not (unintelligible). Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Poncelet. Benedetta, if you can do that follow up with Poncelet via email or directly via phone, that would be great. Thanks, Poncelet, for anything that. We'll get right on that.

And Poncelet, you can take your hand on when you're ready or if you've got another comment to make, I'll pause and but you make it, sir. Ah, thank you. Okay, seeing nothing else in chat, hands or hearing any other intercessions, let's move to the programming discussion.

Thanks again for everybody's input over the last couple of weeks. We really have, I think, began to crystallize things now. As I shared in my email to you all, and looking at, and playing with the agenda schedule, it doesn't look like it's critical to, you know, take out any of the sessions or any of the topics for purposes of, you know, just taking it out, You know, because we don't have enough time or because we're squeezed in any point in the agenda.

And, Ozan, if you can go to the next slide, that would be very helpful. I'm not a host. Oh, I always forget this one. We're at 26 days, so we are crystallizing it had a good period of time here.

I'd like to have done it a little bit earlier but we still have time moving forward with this. Next slide, Ozan. So we've got these nine sessions. I was able to find time for all of them in the agenda.

As you look through it, if there are particular sessions that folks don't think that we should have, that will be particularly important. There were conversations on the last call about the RPM and IP issues and you'll see that in new Item 5 or new session 5 here, the policy should placeholder, I had flagged both of those for that time period.

This may be something where you say, oh - and we have a third for - if you want to split doesn't think you have a dedicated period of time, you can do that. But right now, at least you have a minimum of about a half an hour for each of those issues and we can play with the timetables there.

So we don't have any issues in terms of timing. What I would like to do is walk you through the agenda just in, like, three minutes here, and to give you a sense as to the flow of the meeting at the moment, at least as I have it set up.

None of this is set in stone. The purpose is just to make sure that I could slot everything and begin to get a sense of pacing the breakouts and things like that so that there was time or the substantive issues might prompt for the discussions that you all want to discuss in the breakouts.

So, if you'll give me a couple minutes here, I'll just run you through the agenda as it looks at the moment. Right now we have the day minus one, if you will, on Monday, the 13th of February.

No programming that day. But David Olive suggested that it might be helpful for folks who arrive early to give him an opportunity to interact with folks if we have an informal reception that first evening just for folks to be able to gather and connect so you don't have to wander the halls or the lobby of the hotel.

So we are looking to set up a short reception from, like, 6:30 to 8:00 that first night. We then convene the next morning at 8:00, you know, 30 minutes for everybody together.

We doing introduction are welcome for about half an hour for us to be able to go around the room, for me to share with you and hear from (Mia Sito), our meetings team representative who will be there working for all the logistics for us on that Slot A.

We'll then take a break to allow you all to go into introductory breakout sessions. I slotted that for 90 minutes. You all talked about that and thought that that was really good timing to have that breakout, everybody together their thoughts, for you all to work through things of there.

So that would be your initial breakout. We then have about 15 minutes for you to end your meeting and everybody come back into the main ballroom for the session, the first plenary session being your community overviews.

It works out to about 12 minutes for presentation, timing and Q&A for each community group to talk about priorities and work plans for 2017. That takes

us up to launch. Right now I just like that is potentially the - just because at lunch we had speakers in the past - Jaime Hedlund to talk generally about compliance issues.

I'm noting that I did that and then shared with you all the concerns about time zone differences. Jaime has told me preliminarily that he will be either in DC or Los Angeles during that that period.

Obviously if it's DC, the time zone is not as significant as if he would be in Los Angeles. If you like this timing, I'll be talking with him in the next 48 hours or so and we can start to nail down this.

Afternoon, after lunch then sees us in a plenary session. I identified this at the moment for talking about procedural NCPH issues. You'll recall that was the topic to discuss the selection of the board member and what that process might be, also the potential there to talk about the future meeting.

You can break this up, move this around but that's what I flagged for that. Slot E, later in the afternoon, would be the conversation about new gTLDs followed by a break.

You'll note throughout the two days, I tried to religiously make sure that you have at least 15 minutes. The 15 minutes gives you plenty of time for your sessions.

If you want to make the break bigger or shorter, that's something that we can discuss in the moment as everybody notes their energy levels and sees how things are developing there.

After the gTLD session in the break, that's wife suggested that discussion with Goran with an eight hour time difference from Los Angeles that I think it is, that's about 8:00, 9:00 in the morning for Goran in the Los Angeles times on.

Not really possible to do too much later in the day for you all, and going earlier makes it a little bit of a challenge. I would know your options here would be easier to have that discussion on Monday afternoon or - I'm sorry, Tuesday afternoon, day one or the next day in the afternoon.

But we run into a little bit of complications there because you all noted that you wanted the ICANN presenting discussion to be our last one for day two. So we've got Goran there.

From a logistical standpoint, just real quickly, I'd like you all to work on, you know, on an SGA level, individual topics that you would like to talk to Goran about so he has that information about a week ahead of time so we can give him the opportunity to prepare remarks or do research or whatever prior to talking to you all.

We then adjourn that session, so it's interesting there, for those of you who haven't been at previous meetings, is for the roundtables, what we do is about 60, 70 minutes with each group individually which gives the other group during the hour and ten minutes or so that they're with the CEO, the opportunity to meet on their own.

So this afternoon session, not only features that interaction with senior staff, but also gives you the opportunity as a group to meet. So that the slots where you'll all individually or collectively, as stakeholder groups, want to talk about what your agendas might be during that time period, so please note that.

We then adjourn at 6:30 and those can freshen up a bit for the formal reception for delegates. You'll recall what we've done in the past on this is it's a longer time period, heavy hors d'oeuvres so that if you choose to do so, you can make that your meal for the evening.

Some of you make further arrangements about half an hour early to do dinners or stuff like that with smaller groups or with your community so you would be certainly welcome to do that.

Day two, we start about half an hour later, recognizing that we can make that - or make some adjustments to that time period. But we've got you gathering between 8:30 and 9:00, and again, we look to do breakout sessions.

You know, as I looked at this, I said, gee, you may or may not want as groups to do essentially to breakout sessions in a row, having just done it the evening prior, so we can play around with that a bit.

This essentially mirrors the day one breakout sessions, again, an opportunity and a need for you all to decide how are we breaking up I what groups and what do we want as our agendas?" So that's an opportunity there.

Then coming back from those meetings with plenary Session 4 right now I've got that identified as the policy discussion topic with RPM and IP being the major conversation topics that you've identified in previous calls, lunch then and ICANN budgeting discussion. I ask the question and I'd like feedback from you all in terms of whether you'd like the CFO, Xavier Calvez to be a part of that either to make a presentation, engage with you all in conversations. He'll also be in California so there'll be issues there probably with timing. But, I figured Xavier has a history of getting up a little bit earlier so he could do

the, potentially that lunch slot with you all. And maybe we slide that time a little bit so, he's not up at 4:00 am.

Then the other two substantive topics that afternoon focusing on the topic that Farzaneh and Kathy Kleiman develops maintain the GNSO's traditional policy-making. I've got a little bit longer time period there. You'll see an hour and 45 minutes. And obviously we can play with the lunch block if you want to make that a little bit longer. That seemed to be a fairly robust topic for discussion. And then the presenting as opposed to futuring conversation of the group as many of you suggested that might be a good way to end the week.

So you've got a total there of eight plenary session at least as I'm referring to that. And that's not including the introduction and welcome and a number of breakout sessions. Again we can talk about shifting some of those around. If you have individual comments that you want to make, you know, via email or other suggestions you have from their - your community group that would be grant. But I'll take a queue on any comments about where we are in terms of programming.

And don't limit your conversation on that. Please, you know, if you want to topics or if you want to talk scheduling and timing I would welcome both. Tapani you're first in the queue with your hand up and you'll be followed by Kathy and anyone else who pops their hand up. So Tapani you have the floor sir.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Rob, just one comment at this point or actually a question to mainly our GSC counterparts looking at the meeting with Goran. It would be - could you be willing to scrap those so that we would have the first slot with Goran at 1600 Hours (SLG). It seems we had at least one person who needs -

at - in other meeting remotely at that very time. So it would be easy to - convenient to swap if it's not a problem for you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks for that question. I'll give any of our participants from the CSG side an opportunity to see if they're open to do that. I would note that all of the opportunities where I had to pick someone going first through the rest I just pulled something out of the hat this went - as well with the opportunity to be discussion leads so that was totally random. So if you guys want to shift that and there's no objection from the CSG community I'm happy to make any adjustments you guys would like.

So I'll give folks an opportunity and the absence of objection I'll be happy to do that flip as well. Thanks for taking down your hand Tapani. Kathy you're next in the queue. I'll turn the microphone over to you.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks Rob. Good morning. Good afternoon everybody. Okay, so I have a question and then I'll have a comment. And the question is with Goran. Could you explain again how this works? One we're not meeting with him collectively? We're meeting with him separately? And then who's the m- I'm sorry if I missed something. Who's the meeting with for the group that's not meeting at that time with Goran if you could just explain that whole block. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks. And I'll hold open your opportunity for comments after I answer that. What we - what I did there is I again I set it up traditionally as you all have done in the past where we've actually had the CEO there in person. The feedback originally and by experience going forward has been that each group feels like it has different sets of priorities and different issues. And so they really like the opportunity of a separate conversation with the CEO so they can focus on their priority issues. That's why we broke it into two. The

expectation doesn't have to remain the same. You all, you know, if you don't like that idea say well, you know, we'd like the whole 2-1/2 hour slot or so for an overall conversation with the CEO. You could conceivably do that but that's why it was set up that way Kathy and that's why I've put it in the way it is today.

The idea is, you know, that when one group is in with the CEO or conversing that the other group is free. And in past meetings that opportunity has been used by the other SG to sit down, have a conversation or hold a meeting of their stakeholder group. And so, you know, whatever you all want to do as individual stakeholder group members in the slot when you're not in with the CEO is entirely up to you all in terms of agenda or activities or anything else you want to do during that time. That's for you all to talk about within your own individual community. Kathy I hope that was responsive and you have the mic back for replying to me and your other comments.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thank you. That was a great clarification. And of course I do remember well some of the very interesting topics that have been discussed in these breakout sessions in the past with the CEO. Okay my comment has to do with David Olive's time. He's leaving at some point on Tuesday, right?

Rob Hoggarth: Correct. He's basically - I mean I think his flight is like 12:30 or something like that. So he's...

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...got a very short window.

Kathy Kleiman: That early on Tuesday?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Uh-oh, okay because I was wondering if it's possible to do - that may answer the question if it was possible to do any of the policy topics most of which are on day two on day one when David was there including the one maintained in the GNSO traditional policy making leadership position at ICANN. We would certainly benefit from his ideas in that discussion.

Rob Hoggarth: That's - yes, sure. That's entirely up to you guys. I mean I think David would feel bad if you're completely changing your schedule just for conversations with him. But we'd be certainly open to talk with you guys at any point given his window of opportunity. I think that's one of the reasons why he wanted to push for at least, you know, face time with you all for those who are interested on Monday evening.

And of course under your scenario Kathy I think you would have to have that topic as sort of your first thing as opposed to the initial community breakout sessions. And that's up to you all if you wanted to shift those or move those a bit. Unfortunately yes, I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: ...David would love to be involved in any one of those topics. And actually by having that topic towards the end of the meeting he'd be back in Istanbul and be able to participate fully although remotely in that conversation.

Kathy Kleiman: Is there any way to confirm exactly what time he's leaving the hotel to get to the airport or have you - just the 12:30 that absolute time?

Rob Hoggarth: The flight, that's when his flight is.

Kathy Kleiman: Oh.

Rob Hoggarth: So, I think he would be leaving probably the, you know, allowing for an hour and a half or so before the flight. And I'd - I know Ed Morris might be able to share with us better sort of, you know, how the airport works in Reykjavik. But in terms of being there ahead of time you're probably going to have to leave realistically, you know, no later than about 10 o'clock I would think which is very narrow slot of time. I mean, it - he was able to I guess do a stopover or whatever to allow him to be there for just that time because I think he's got the keynote back the next morning in Istanbul for the DNS forum there.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Okay thank you for telling us how tight that window is on Tuesday morning. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you and thanks Ed for your comment in there. Thank you. It's not good news but for confirming that time period.

                   Tapani I'm trying to look here, two big group with one remote presenter is a bit difficult to manage these tentatively. I think I prefer separate sessions with Goran. Oh, I see what you mean. Yes, okay thank you for that. That was in response to, you know, why don't we have a bigger group.

                   And I noted previously in the chat and Wolf-Ulrich I note your hand is up. I'll go to you in a second here. Matt asked about why not a session individually with the NCUC? You know, if we were in person we might be able to pull off that approach (Matt) but I think remotely that's just very difficult scheduling-wise. In the - you know, in the past where we've done the breakout sessions there seemed to be a definite willingness to be able - and an ability to do it

practically if we drilled down to the SG level breaking out into the - each individual constituency level. I think at least in the past folks felt that, you know, the time period with the CEO just became too short and brief.

And at least in the recent past you may have been in one or two of those conversations Matt. I think everybody at least from a membership within each SG found that they were able to get their issues addressed and everybody was able to have an opportunity to speak in that, you know, 70 minute window with the CEO. Welcome, you know, suggestions for changing that or breaking it down if you want to do that as individual SGs.

But right now I'm just trying to nail down Goran's specific time tables and things like that. And so once we have that if you guys as individual groups want to break things up a little bit more I'm more than happy for you to have those conversations. Wolf-Ulrich you had patiently had your hand up. Let me turn the microphone over to you. You have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Wolf and all hi. Just a comment and well it's also a question with regard to the entire time table. So now I understand the discussions was that we have a little let me say flexibility with regards to the - well to the timing where it's - the slots are placed and to the length of the slots to some extent as well besides, you know, the what is fixed with regards to the ICANN CEO and maybe also lunches fixed. But the other things are could be flexible.

Question why I'm asking or commenting on that is so just as we are just starting to prepare, you know, our topics for this it may turn out that to some extent some of these topics may create more interested and may use more time as is just allocated at the time being and others not in this regard. So, I'm - would like to understand so that we have this flexibility to organize this in that way. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir and thanks for the comment. I mean, as with any agenda and at least with this strawman that's set up I'm just trying to balance things initially for all of you, give you things to react to and play with. Throughout the course of the meeting if you all, you know, by consensus or acclimation say we don't even want to do this topic anymore, we want to change to Topic Z you've got that flexibility to do it. The only caution that I throw out and the reason for having the conversation now as opposed to, you know, a total free-for-all and free-flowing conversation is that we do and are conscious of the remote observers and with some people participating, you know, many hours removed from the time zone perspective.

For those of you who have participated in past meetings you're aware that we end up with a fairly complex-looking matrix on the wiki space that sets out the entire agenda that conference calling information, how to connect with the Adobe Connect room. And so we do want to be conscious that once we have the time periods laid out that we try to be consistent with them. So if you see things now or literally over the course of the next two weeks where you want to make changes before we all convene in person let's have those conversations.

I think you want to try to honor the schedule once you're there as much as possible because then just from a notice perspective, you know, shifting things around, someone's gotten up in the middle of the night just because they want to be on the RPM IP policy discussion and now they find that they're talking to Jamie Hedlund and that's the last thing in the world they want to do. So I just want to be very conscious of that because you will have these observers.

The fact that those folks are observing and aren't participating is more of an ethos and practicality thing as (Greg) noted earlier. And so, you know, from

that perspective we just want to honor those windows of time when we can. But up until then Wolf-Ulrich is, you know, you suggest we want to go over. We want to lengthen the session just based upon what you think will happen that's great.

Also if a session is, you know, not ending right exactly on time and things are shifting ten or 15 minutes that's certainly something we've done in the past and no one has complained about that. I think we all recognize if a conversation is really going well either the session leads or the session facilitator certainly wants to be flexible but let things expand or contract as the dynamics in the room will dictate. So thanks very much for raising that.

And Lori commented in the chat her full support for flexibility noting the condition of consensus. Any other comments or observations about the schedule? And I recognize some of you may, you know, just be really focusing on this for the first time so I welcome if not comments right now on this call but in the email observations.

What I'd like to try to do if it works with all of you is really to have a goal of getting this finalized on the call next week where next week is the opportunity to say please, does anyone have any final changes? And if someone has suggestions we talk through those. And if we don't then we basically ay okay, this is it so that the discussion lead can focus on some of their pre-prep. Let me pause a moment to see if I get any more hands in the Adobe Connect room or if anyone verbally has an intercession now about a topic they want to raise or something they want to observe from the 4.0 agenda.

Yeah, that's right Kathy. I think, you know, now it's really a matter of you looking at that say, "Yeah, okay, well we've got that session but, you know, this one should go right before it or we really don't want to do this right after

that one or something along those lines. So please think about that in terms of any comments or observations you have. And here over the next 14 minutes or so if anyone wants to raise that please do.

Let me turn briefly to the discussion leads concept and some of the conversations that the early planner participants had about the different sessions. What we have done in the past is - and it was introduced actually at the last meeting when we were in Los Angeles last February was the conversation about having individual members of the various groups actually play the role of owner and facilitator of the individual sessions. Sometimes that worked perfectly, sometimes it was imperfect but it was the first time you all tried it last year.

There are two important components of that that we learned. One was that it wasn't tremendously useful just to identify an individual. Although that worked sometimes because of preparation limitations and schedules it became somewhat challenging. And that's why this year I basically said, okay let me assign randomly the responsibilities for particular sessions just to a community. That way you can all discuss internally, all right, they've got an NCUC or a BC session here where we are identified as the lead. Who in our community wants to take that? Who's going to be there? Who's, you know, most comfortable with that issue? Who wants to develop it?

So that's what I did when you look at the Version 4.1 of the document. We've got that column that just basically says, you know, what did I say here, community co-chairs. Some of them there'll be none with purely ministerial where it just makes sense for us as staff to facilitate the conversation. And then it's just a matter of having each of you for the substantive plenary session topics take on that sort of co-chair or co-lead role.

It's much easier when you're just doing it for a speaker than it is for a particular topic. So I've done those random assignments. Feel free individually to reach out to different groups and say I see you're assigned to that one. Can I do it? Gee, our community doesn't really want to do this session. Would you guys like to take it on and do some horse trading there.

Every community has at least two sessions that you're responsible for. And given the number of sessions a couple of you have three. So please observe that and feel free to push back or like I say, trade back and forth, if you feel there's too much or not enough responsibility that you don't want to take on. I'd like to have those assignments nailed down by next week. If there are some of you who feel terribly strongly about getting off a particular issue please let me know and staff can help you facilitate some of your trading discussions if you will.

The other major piece of this that we were challenged by last time that we will be challenged by this time is the pre-preparation time table. Obviously you all knew in going with this February timeframe that we would be relatively tight on the press time. And we're going to have this schedule and topics nailed down only about two weeks before the meeting.

From a staff perspective we would still like to help you all in terms of, you know, setting up or facilitating those conversations between groups so that you can at least have one conversation between co-owners of each session prior to the meeting. As you talk about future meetings I hope with, you know, the knowledge of things, you know, four, five, six months in advance there'll be more opportunity for pre-work. But again I think this year the prep time is going to be very limited and so it's not going to be as robust as many of you would probably like it to be. That's I think jus the reality and the practicality of the timing.

So that's just an overall overview if you will of the role of the discussions leads. You can be very flexible in terms of how you want to approach each of your topic sessions. And our community desperately wants to make sure that certain points are being made in a session that you are not currently assigned to. Please reach out to the groups who are leads on that.

For the moment from my perspective the proxies for this leader are the chairs of each of the groups. So for example, (Chris) if we see BC on there you would be the point of contact until we otherwise hear from you that a BC ExCom has assigned that session to person A or person B. I think that's just from a practical standpoint. Particularly people have come if they want to make or if you all want to do horse trading behind the scenes at the moment. You know, reach out to the individual chairs of each group.

And then as, you know, that's finalized over the course here of the next week and a half or so we'll have the roster opinion, you know, the individual within each of the groups who's going to take the lead for chairing or facilitating your various sessions. I think that was an element that did work well when you all gathered in February. I just liked the optics. I like the dialogue that was presented by it for as each sessions begins you as individual community leaders or teams are up there sort of running the sessions. I think that was an element that really did work well.

Let me stop there and see if anyone has any comments, questions or observations about discussion leads or anything else about the topics and the agenda flow. I see nothing in the chats and I hear nothing verbally. I know a number of folks have a hard stop at the top of the hour and so I'm not beyond giving you all back about 5 minutes, an extra little bit of time to take a look at this and issue spot or flag anything that you want to talk about or send

everybody emails about. We'll just wait another 10, 15 seconds here. All right, well seeing nothing else in terms of hands raised I'm not declaring wild consensus here, just noting that we don't have any particular additional items or objections that anyone has to the current draft.

I will take a look at it. Obviously if things develop here I will generate a Version 5 or 5.0 for all of you to take a look at prior to our next call. The focus for the next conversation would just be to finalize assignments, see if anyone has any last minute concerns to have the slot open to address any other eventualities that may crop up that I think we need to talk to or talk about as a group.

But (unintelligible) let's look toward next Thursday at 1500 UTC to be our final get-together. If everything's great and we only need 15 or 20 minutes super. Please advise your groups, particularly your delegates for whom this will be their first session of the date of January 31 and Benedetta and I will let folks know particularly the specific timing of that Webinar and also our interest in talking with anyone individually who may want to reach out and have questions about the background and just getting themselves in the best frame of mind for preparing for the meeting. So we're very happy to do that.

And again seeing no final hands up in the AC room or hearing any other intercessions thank you all very much for joining. Please, please, please take a final look on at least the 4.0. This is the opportunity to flag anything else and getting very excited about seeing you all here in just a couple of weeks. Thank you all very much for joining. Have a productive rest of your day and we'll do a final touch base next week. Otherwise see you on the email list everyone. Thanks. Bye-bye.

END