

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
October 21, 2016
8:00 am CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the 2017 NCPH Intersessional Planning call. On the call today we've got Chris Wilson, Farzaneh Badii, Klaus Stoll, Tapani Tarvainen, Tony Holmes and apologies from Rafik Dammak. We have from staff Benedetta Rossi, Chantelle Doerksen, Robert Hoggarth and myself Maryam Bakoshi. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Maryam, welcome. One last housekeeping thing, we have an apology from Greg Shatan who indicates he'll be a little late to the call but he's still planning on joining us. Thanks all for joining and making the effort to answer the initial email that Benedetta sent out. The purpose for this call is to check in and sort of set expectations and timing location and other planning matters for the 2017 Non-contracted Parties House Intersessional meeting.

Thanks to the responses from all of you. You provided positive feedback saying that you'd be willing to hold the meeting again in 2017. And I was pleased to see that if only because it tracked closely with the meeting survey results. I posted a copy of that link in the chat room just indicating that

attendees at the 2016 meeting did find value and I think in excess of 70% of the respondents said yes we should have the meeting again.

The issue in reason for Benedetta sending out the note on behalf of both of us was to really to touch base with you as community leaders the ones who are setting your community agendas and generally planning your overall calendars to have a conversation to say all right well if there does appear to be an interest in continuing the meeting and doing it again in 2017 what timing would be looking at for the meeting, what potential locations do you want us to also research and consider and to talk with your generally about how the planning for this year might be improved upon past years so that we demonstrate an ever increasing improvement in the value and the experience that you all have in coming to gather face to face outside the bounds of an ICANN meeting at least once a year.

Having gone through all that we also wanted to talk with you briefly about the roles and responsibilities for the planning team and the staff, have a conversation if not today but on a future call about, you know, how we set up the rules and responsibilities, how can we as staff best serve you, recognizing what we always seem to have are the annual challenges of your all's time not only to do the planning but also the prep for the meeting. We want this to be the best possible experience for all of you while maintaining it as your meeting but with the appropriate level of staff support.

So that's the overall message. That's what we set up as a potential agenda. What I'd like to do is just stop and pause there see if any of you all on the phone have additional items you want to make sure that we list or talk about or otherwise just make some general comments about looking forward to a meeting next year and how we make go by approaching the planning for it.

I'll pause and look for any hands or just let anybody speak up and I'll take a queue.

Right now I'm noting Klaus's hand went up so you'd be first in the queue Klaus. Let's see if we can get anybody else? All right Klaus why don't you get started and we'll see if anything that you say sparks others interests or comments. Just some introductory remarks would be great. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Hello. This is Klaus. Thank you for participating. Just let me get a step on this on potential base locations for the meeting having this is around and consulted with other people I think there are the second week in February would be from what I'm sounding the best option and the other option for location would be either Washington East Coast or (unintelligible).

To think about the meeting itself I think it would be very good if we could have the whole meeting under a specific topic or a guiding theme. The scene for me would be particularly now we are living in that new house actually empowered community we need to really fine tune and find our place and just slip into that new way of working together. And I really would think that it would be appropriate to use the - there's actually a meeting to do exactly that for the Non-Contracted House but also go beyond to the other contractual parties not that I say they have to participate but at least some dialogue should be started.

The third point which is nevertheless I think very, very important I will refuse to attend the meeting if we again have the situation that we're basically meeting from 8 o'clock in the morning to 6 o'clock in the afternoon or so without break without any kind of way to relax so just as a pre-warning. Thank you very much.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Klaus. Whether it's you or a member of your team or exec com or just community who ends up being part of the planning staff I figure you'll have a big voice in terms of the schedule on a daily basis. And thanks for presenting stocking courses for location and potential timing. You did prompt Tapani to raise his hand. Tapani you're next in the queue sir and you have the mic.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Rob. This is Tapani speaking. Klaus already said most of the things I (unintelligible) but I have to - I did so ask for opinions of the location among our people and it - it really happens a (unintelligible) is the only place that got more than two people suggesting it. Actually is an overwhelming support surprisingly (unintelligible) us. It's very convenient to reachable from almost everywhere. And the second one would be somewhere in the East Coast or had Klaus preferring Washington and some people - somebody said in Boston but otherwise no well no - in particular nobody seems to like Los Angeles. I don't know why that would be.

As for timing it would be that the beginning of February would be more convenient and anytime in January. Maybe the second week of December February would be Klaus preference. Last - the first week of January February might be second or third might work but first week of the year that is January 23, 27 would be difficult for several people so at least that would be a bad week.

And for the planning purposes it would be very good to have - not only the agenda but in time but so much in time that we could actually work on then stuff and then some - then not get started on what's going to be let's say to let's start working on that now in the location but do some preparative work and email in advance. Its good though. I know that it always is.

And I do must - I agree that with Klaus that too tight schedule will make it too difficult to get actually anything done and so at least have a bit time for - but slack in the schedule also for unanticipated ad hoc sessions which might turn up. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thanks very much Tapani. I'm seeing some common themes here. We're taking copious notes and I'll see if I can sum up once we hear from everybody. You started the ball rolling Klaus so thanks. I know Klaus your hand is still up so if you want to get to the back of the queue I will do that.

Klaus Stoll: Tony's (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Robert Hoggarth: I've got Tony next then Chris. Benedetta's going to share some of Greg's comments assuming he hasn't joined by that point and then, you know, we'll circle around to anybody else. So Tony you have the mike. Please proceed.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Tony Holmes speaking. Just to make the point that we're only representatives here of much larger groups that we represent. So I think that in terms of the timing the sort of timeframe is good. End of January beginning of February seems to be coming out and fitting quite well. I would suggest that we go back and consult with our organizations constituencies to try and get a feel for what they would prefer and come back. So maybe if we tabled those three weeks the last week of January first couple of weeks in February's we could use that as a basis to start.

But in terms of location certainly the conversations we've had in and the ISPs haven't really said that anything is in or out at this stage. But one requirement that I would like to emphasize is the need wherever we go to have the

appropriate ICANN staff available. So I think that should be a consideration as well when we pick a venue. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Tony. I've recorded all those. As I indicate I'll, you know, try to respond or sum up themes here. And to your point this is not intended to be a meeting or a call to make any decisions. Just sort of a - the kick off if you will. So it certainly is valuable for issue spotting, identifying some common themes, maybe beginning to narrow just so that you all can offer at least some suggested options to folks when you go back to your communities and perhaps we can loop back around in Hyderabad and if meeting ends say okay well we seem to have settled to a choice of two or three. What I'm hoping to do is just that we get some narrowing so that we can look from a staff perspective at time - at, you know, at the options to the timeframe's work and the potential cities that you're all suggesting. So this is going to be a very helpful discussion for moving that forward.

Chris you were next in the queue. That will be followed by Benedetta representing Greg. I note that Tony and Tapani if you do want to get back in the queue keep your hands up. If not please take them down. Chris you're next and have the mic. Thank you, sir.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Rob, Chris Wilson for the record. Just I want to know for scheduling purposes and Phil Corwin made this - noted to me yesterday that the Names Con conference which I think, you know, at least critical mass of many of our stakeholder group constituencies may be attending is occurring in Las Vegas on Sunday, January 22 through Wednesday, January 25. So that may impact - or sorry, I guess that maybe we should consider that I guess for scheduling purposes in case, you know, we have conflicts with people that can't attend both obviously.

So that said, you know, it sounds like maybe LA is not an option but if LA was to still be an option, you know, it's also conceivable that you could think about doing it at the end of that week so those that are - that may be in Las Vegas can easily get on a plane and shoot over to LA at the end of - for the end of the week to do at the intersessional. But it sounds like that, you know, if LA's not a viable option for folks then that may be moot. But at least for scheduling purposes for what week or days in the calendar in January February we may want to consider block off that - those three or four days for the Names Con conference in January.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thanks Chris, appreciate the input. I don't know whether that's an official request to add LA to the potential mix just for discussion purposes. So far the names we've got are LA, DC and Reykjavik. I mean the world is your oyster. Obviously from a staff perspective we look and try to narrow. And depending upon the themes that you come up with as a group maybe that drives some of this as well. I'm not sure.

Farzaneh your hand is up and that puts you next in the queue. Benedetta please hold and we'll have you go after Farzaneh. Farzaneh you have the mic.

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry did you say I have the mic?

Robert Hoggarth: You have the mic and I can hear your voice so give it a shot.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay thank you. So one of the suggestions that Rafik wanted to make was to if it would be possible to have the intersessional meeting that the prevent to plan - to meeting B because it's extremely difficult to travel so many times for various meetings. So it would be good if that could be considered unless you want to make this like a totally separate meeting. And so I think the meeting is going to be in Copenhagen so that's was one of the suggestions. And also I

wanted to propose a (unintelligible) on this as well. As I said in the chat the world is the oyster of some but some others might have problems with getting Visas and all of these things that have been mentioned so many times.

And so I would like to suggest that when you consider the location you also consider for example if you consider how many times you've held it in the US there is probably just for the sake of diversity and also enabling others from other regions to travel easier to consider another location. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thanks Farzaneh, I appreciate that. Yes and I think that's right. My oyster comment aside that is a consideration that you may all want to give in terms of, you know, the experience you've had in terms of potential attendees. I also recognize that over time you have people succeeding, evolution within your leadership teams. And so the folks who participated in past meetings, you know, have given way to others who may have different issues so certainly want to be cognizant of that.

I keep going back to the theme and this sometimes is a contradictory theme but to say that this is your meeting. And so, you know, from a staff support perspective we're happy to facilitate in whatever way works. Certainly we help in terms of helping reach consensus and play a large role from the logistical side but I want to keep emphasizing the desire to have you be the deciders in terms of themes, agendas and different things.

We will have some suggestions later on in terms of roles and responsibilities where based on our observations from the past three meetings we may be able to help streamline, fine-tune, take on roles and responsibilities that you all just can't handle or yet to given the time constraints. But that's something we can talk about a little bit more in length.

What I recorded Farzaneh is that you've added another piece of timing to the mix as well as location potentially suggesting on Rafik's behalf to look at tying this get together potentially to meeting be in Copenhagen in mid-March. So that's something that we'll also reflect as a suggestion.

Benedetta I don't think that Greg has joined yet. And just since we're doing this round robin we received his email response and perhaps you can share that with the group in terms of some of the points he initially raised and we can share with them once he joins the fact that you've done that. So please proceed. You have the mic Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you Rob. This is Benedetta for the transcript. Yes I just wanted to point your attention to Greg's points on the list. He just suggested this was not about a location but just in terms of the actual planning of the intersessional meeting whether it would be possible to actually focus doing some of the actual work, so not just agenda setting before the meeting itself so the meeting ends up being a combination of efforts rather than the just a sort of standalone meeting. That would enable delegates to actually have some tangible results at the end of the meeting. So let's see if you have what you - what everyone else thinks about that.

And that actually reflects a lot of the feedback that we received on - based on last year's transcripts of the intersessional meeting and on the survey results. There seem to be quite a few delegates who believed that the actual outcomes of the meeting didn't add up to what they had expected from the meeting. And if they had known more about the individual topics or had done some work it would have been more effective. So it was interesting that Greg pointed that out.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. Did he also have any comments on location or timing in addition to those comments?

Benedetta Rossi: No not that I'm aware of, not in the email that he sent.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, all right thank you. Great well I mean obviously we've got a number of potential items on the list here. I didn't confirm with you Chris so, you know, LA was mentioned but not, you know, presented as the direct option. There's some substantial opposition it seems or at least reluctance there. Number of suggestions to consider a place outside the US noting that previously the previous three meetings have been respectively in LA in DC and in LA. Suggestions for where it is going to be or can be in the US to look at the East Coast. DC and Boston were mentioned.

There was a recommendation 'cause I'm also trying to keep track of the chat here, a recommendation from Klaus kicking things off for Reykjavik and then some subsequent conversations about Schengen countries and the fact that Iceland in Finland sort of meet those criteria.

So that's what I've heard so far. I don't know if anyone else has reactions to Tony's suggestion basically to say hey look on issues of location or timing we obviously want to consult more with our own communities. Perhaps you guys can - thanks Chris not recommending LA. Perhaps we can take back to your groups these initial suggestions which now with no LA seem to be DC, Reykjavik or some other potential Schengen location including Copenhagen.

On the issues of timing what you all seem to be mirroring around particularly given your concern Chris about the Names Con is not looking at any time in that third week of January the 22nd to 26th obviously because folks are

attending another industry event. Some decided interest or preference for that last week of January to maybe second week of February window.

The recommendation from Rafik and Farzaneh to look at adding on I guess before or after the Copenhagen meeting at ICANN 58. And something that somebody mentioned to me on the phone before -- and Klaus I see your hand - - I'll get to that in a moment -- that no one has mentioned yet but this was a recommendation from Rafik actually last year.

And he may have mentioned it to me or somebody else brainstorming in the last week or so thinking out of the box and saying gee it doesn't necessarily have to be between meetings A and B. It could be between meeting B and C so not the January February timeframe but potentially the April May timeframe. There is a gap there between March 16 and the 26th of June that, you know, provides a potential sweet spot between late April and early May that some folks might be interested in considering. You know, if you all enjoy northern hemisphere winter meeting that's fine. We'll make the arrangements to do that.

If anyone's up for a spring meeting that could also be a potential. I am only raising that because I heard that is a brainstorm. It's not a staff suggestion. I see that Klaus and Tapani have raised their hands. Klaus I'll turn the microphone over to you.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Robert just two comments, Klaus for the record. I think we really should take that February week, the last January week out because also for the NCSG people are going to have events on the 27th. And it really would be good if we just look at maybe the second week of February or something like that. I think that would cause the least harm.

The other argument that we - what we just brought up having the meeting between - in April or May or June I just would like to let you know that it's basically the time where all the events and presentations and happenings happen in Geneva around Internet governance. So this might be even be combined just what the GAC will - this is from is in June in Geneva from the 12th to the 16th or something like that but might be a strange suggestion but it might actually work out, make sense. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Klaus. What month did you say? I heard the 12th through the 16th. I didn't hear the month.

Klaus Stoll: June.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay thank you. Tapani your hand is up. Sir you're next in the queue and have the microphone.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Rob. Regarding the timing I did trace option of - or I have some comments on the possibility of having it between meetings A and B in the April, May timeframe and too commented not too many so it would not be a good idea. So the preference Klaus I think would be definitely on the beginning of February or thereabouts.

As for exact dates there I can have that 21st of January is - I have four people saying that they can't do that. In the very beginning of the next week at least one important person can't do that. The end of the first week of February that is February 2, 3rd has somebody with as possible but difficult versus the second week of February have no conflicts that I know of at this time. So that would be the - that's my preferences would be the 6th to 7th of February and then 2nd of February but not before that. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay thank you. In the past people have observed that, you know, the fact that it has been so far a two-day meeting is somewhat of a challenge in that, you know, many people or several people I'll say have had significant itineraries and the travel for a two day meeting is almost as long if not longer as the meeting itself. So as something for you all to consider potentially I think we could handle this budget-wise is make it 2-1/2 days or three days. Again I don't know what your preferences are. I'm just throwing out thoughts that people have expressed in the past.

One of the functions I think to your earlier comment Klaus with respect to, you know, having people meet straight from 8:00 6:00 and once we finish the agenda I think only anyone realized that in the experience we didn't have sufficient breaks during the day but is more a reflection of trying to fit as many things in as possible. If you consider, you know, expanding the window slightly maybe that works. My observation was for the most part you all made it a three-day meeting anyway because there was an effort to meet before is a individual community and so doing that before or after the meeting and making it a three day affair seems to be a model that is starting to work for you all. You all may have some observations or comments about that.

I do note that Tony noted in the chat that later in the year certainly adds the potential for clashes with other events. As you came back Tapani taking credit for the initial suggestions for considering that timeframe it now seems that you all are narrowing to that early February window which certainly is something that we will explore from the staff perspective. Klaus I see your hand up but before I turn it over to you Chris you had raised your hand then it went back down then you put something in the chat. So I want to give you an opportunity to - at the microphone. Is there anything you want to do to expand on your chat comment?

Chris Wilson: No Rob thanks. I just was - this was about the clarification regarding Los Angeles and...

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Chris Wilson: ...making sure. I wasn't per se recommending it so thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. I also recognized a little dialogue that went on in the chat between you and Farzaneh with respect to only Europe and US, why not think about Asia? That was Farzaneh's observation. Singapore was thrown out and Chris you observed that that's very expensive and there was some opposition last year to that.

And interesting it was oh yes, the room would stand in for a meeting B. So yes I don't know if anyone is formally making that suggestion or recommendation. For historical purposes or contextually just by way of background I think the first couple of meetings ended up being focused more in the US at least the first two one because of proximity to ICANN senior staff and the potential for those types of meetings and two earlier on before he really had a good handle on this there was, you know, budget considerations in terms of just seeing if there was, you know, more reasonable flights and things like that into the US.

Last year you'll recall at some of our initial conversations and a good deal of staff research went into considering the Istanbul option. Obviously world events sort of took that off the list but it is something where we have considered various other locations. When you all go back and talk with your community members if you have other suggestions that raise beyond DC or Reykjavík or Copenhagen which seem to be the opening salvos here please let us know and maybe we'll utilize the chat conversations for that.

Klaus I now treat this as a new hand so I'll turn over the microphone do you. Any comments on dates/locations/planning would be welcome. You have the floor sir.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Robert. This is Klaus for the record.

I just did a very, very quick Kayak search on the (unintelligible) -- which the GAC supplied -- and hotels. And it actually looks much more reasonable -- like for example Los Angeles or even Washington just as a side note -- because I think what I want to do is to support to the idea if we can actually get a good spread -- reasonably dry (unintelligible) but I didn't say cheap location, a reasonably priced location -- that that would enable us to have a three-day meeting I think that many people (unintelligible). Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, appreciate that. Appreciate that quick research. Thank you.

Farzaneh, you are next in the queue and you have the floor.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Robert. So going back to the suggestion holding the meeting before and then Copenhagen meeting, I would like to know because, well, I don't see much support for the idea. But I think it makes (unintelligible).

So I'm going to ask a question. Is our meeting going to be about the Non-Contracted Party House to meet that (unintelligible) and is in their own group, or is it about kind of like a regular face-to-face meeting? Because the regular face-to-face meeting doesn't make sense because you're actually holding the meeting in February and then we are going to again meet in March at the ICANN meeting?

Well, if this about holding the separate meetings for just us, then it kind of makes sense budget-wise as well and also (unintelligible)-wise because then we don't to have to act like where we (unintelligible) to our very self.

And I think it makes sense and also someone mentioned that it makes sense for outreach as well.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Farzaneh. I think, yes, you note some nuances to how you all want to approach this.

You know, with the suggestion that you and Rafik have provided to connect us potentially to an ICANN meeting, I think then potentially changes that three-day concept, right, because you're already meeting at the part of the ICANN meeting potentially. So I think that's where there's some difference.

And given the sort of perimeters that were set up with the meeting strategy, what we would likely do is plan something a couple of days before the event. But - and for those of you who have been on the NomCom, I think you're familiar with this experience.

We would look to have it be a separate event. You know, timing it would be in sync with the ICANN meeting. But I don't think that we would be putting the burden on our meetings team directly; this is something we would have to talk to them. But we'd probably do it at a different location -- in the same city -- but, you know, across town or out in the suburbs or something like that so there's still that connection and maybe some commonality in terms of meeting room spaces. But something where there would be a little bit more distance between things so that you could sort of define the meeting as different.

That being said, the Meetings Team may have other recommendations. But I think it might affect that concept of a three-day affair.

Now if you did continue to look at that early February timeframe, obviously it would be a separate meeting.

I wasn't thinking in this mode, but then, Tony, you sort of recognized and jumped on the outreach opportunity. I mentioned Copenhagen because it was in the context of the ICANN meeting. If you wanted to look at that as a separate thing and said, "Well, yes, we'll get together in Copenhagen and then six weeks later we'll come back," that's for you all to talk about and investigate the pluses and minuses on something like that.

And Tony, you've observed, you know, the challenge of, you know, trying to put the two together creates a real, you know, strain on people's calendars. The fact that people would, you know, then be looking at a full two-week event makes it kind of challenging for some folks' calendars.

You know, you've all been able to achieve consensus going forward respecting a lot of these varieties in terms of business case and business lifestyles if you will. So I'm very confident that you'll sort of navigate that (unintelligible) going forward.

Again, to summarize what I've got then is - and I want to be careful because I only raise Copenhagen as part of the Meeting B. if someone wants to formally say, "No, I see that as an option for a separate meeting," I'll happily take that.

Right now, I've got DC and what I could reckon as two options with an acknowledgement that you all are going to talk to your community members

about location and timing suggestions noting that these seem to be areas where the discussion is circling at the moment.

We're also still circling around that early February timeframe where -- since my last sort of sum up -- it seems as if there were some, you know, substantial complications around that late January timeframe.

And just before anybody does make the recommendation or suggestion, we are trying from a staff perspective to avoid early January. That became quite problematic in the arrangements for the DC meeting that we had where we saw that because of holiday plans and schedules, you know, not just within ICANN Staff but at the various venues, it became very difficult right over those last two weeks of December to stay in touch with people and to be able to work stuff out.

We were able with some Herculean effort on the Staff part -- on the Meeting Team and folks -- to pull that together, but if we can avoid that that would be much more beneficial, I think, from just an arrangement standpoint.

One other thing that I wanted to note, and, you know, this has come up with the points about thesis (sic) and is reflected in the survey results. Consistently, the lowest rated activity/service -- whatever in terms of rating in the surveys the past couple of years -- has been the travel piece. You know, the ability to work with the constituency travel team to make all the arrangements.

And, you know, I think an important element of that is that the team has expanded its capability, they've got a new team member now. We've also, you know, affected that transition to a new service provider and you all are getting some experiences with that. But I think that's going to be an area that we really want to be focused on this time.

One of the factors that plays a role in this -- for those of you who have been involved in some of the crop planning and the rest -- is getting in the names as early as we possibly can.

So if we can -- you know, as a group -- agree that, you know, you all go back to your community members on between now and the end of the Hyderabad meeting, perhaps adding this topic to some of your meeting agendas, that if shortly after Hyderabad we can have confirmation on timing and location, then we can move immediately.

I understand some exceptions because of some of your election cycles. But be able to capture as many potential attendees as early as we can -- like by the first week of December which is our typical target -- but really stick to that this time, then I think we will be in much better shape in terms of the impressions you all have from a service provision perspective for travel. So I just wanted to make sure that I got that out there.

Obviously, nailing down the date and location is critical for us being able to do that. So if that timetable is acceptable, you all have your conversations with folks, and as we move forward, either this group or your representatives going forward from planning perspectives, then I think we'll be in good shape.

So we can sort of target that, you know, Hyderabad meeting ends, an email goes out from Benedetta saying, "So, what was your feedback," and then we have a call, you know, like two weeks after Hyderabad, then I think we can have all that nailed down.

Does anybody think that that would be a problem in terms of timing and sort of adding all that together? Okay, I mean I would normally expect someone to

say - objections to speak up, assent, I appreciate seeing that in the comments in the Chat. So we'll proceed from that perspective.

On planning committee members, meeting time and frequency is probably something that we should confirm with you all here.

What I'd like to do is to look at - and I don't know if it just happened to work out, but this day of the week and this time, Benedetta -- given the (unintelligible) poll responses -- would be a good one.

But if we could consider meeting maybe for, you know, starting two weeks after Hyderabad for three straight weeks, my sense -- given past experience on (unintelligible) -- is if we drag out the planning over a two-month period, you know, we sort of lose focus.

If we focus all those efforts in a very compressed period of time, we seem to leverage results a little bit better because folks can immediately go back and find information.

I recognize that a countervailing observation on that is that many times you all want to consult with your community. But if we can, you know, come up with a timeframe that says, "Yes, we'll look at this," for three straight weeks starting two weeks after Hyderabad and then see where we are, I'd really like you all to consider that because, you know, there will be some compressed time. We should look to finalize things by the end of December from agenda perspective so that you all have time in January to do some pre-prep -- if we are thinking about that early February timeframe.

If anything sort of fell off the table last year, I think it was the hope and expectation that there would be time for preplanning, and unfortunately, that just didn't happen.

And from a Staff perspective, I think we could have done a better job sort of bird-dogging you all say, "Hey, is this getting done, would you rather have us do it?" So I think that's something for you all to consider too in terms of timing.

But in terms of an arc where we can have some intense conversations in a several week period after Hyderabad, then I think we'll be in pretty good shape for, you know, being able to have a pretty tight agenda and set expectations before the end of the year holiday period. And I think that would be a great goal for us to shoot for -- if you all can pull that off.

And I note in the Chat, Tapani, that you talked about the elections. Obviously, if we're moving forward on this, folks who are running, you know, your candidates -- be they any of the five people running or none of the above -- we'll have some knowledge of, okay, if you join, then you'll have an expectation for joining an NCPH meeting in early February -- something along those lines.

And then, you know, given however many people that will be new, we can crank them through constituency travel. If we've got everybody else sort of in process by early December, I think that would work out nicely.

Any comments or observations about that sort of planning committee approach? Chris, you raised your hand so I'll turn the mic over to you sir.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Rob; just a quick question as far as timing is concerned. When, I guess, when do we sort of meet to nail down timing of the meeting and location? I guess we probably need to do that - I mean maybe even just before or right after Hyderabad? Or I guess to some extent that dictates you sort of work backwards, I guess, from whenever that date is.

It sounds like we're all sort of settling on maybe that first or second full week of February -- which is fine. But I guess for all of our planning purposes, we might want to block down a date certain when we can finalize the timing of that meeting.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes sir, I agree. You know, I want to give you guys chances to go back and consult with your groups. You know, again, we have a couple of working suggestions right now, but someone may come up with a brighter or brilliant idea.

In terms of timing, recognizing that we've got the Hyderabad meeting coming up and you'll have community meetings, I think that we would look to target no later than the 18th of November to sort of nail that down. That gives you all, you know, this next week and the Hyderabad meeting to talk about with your groups.

And the opportunity for a call among all of you -- granted there can be email dialogue and it would be fantastic if you want to resolve it by then. In my experience, that never works but we can try it. But to say no later than the 18th, you all say, "Yes, it's February 6 and 7 in wherever, and we've got that nailed down. Please proceed Staff."

In the meantime -- just so that you know -- we're going to start the process and, you know, we'll work with the Meetings Team to say, "Okay, well what

is in Reykjavik and what's potentially available in mid-February?" You know, let's check with our contacts here in DC and see what the potential availabilities are there as well.

So we'll already be doing some of that work, and as part of the process, may come back and say, "Oh my goodness, you know, Reykjavik in early February?" Gee, I can't imagine it's going to be very busy but I don't know. And so that's feedback that we may be able to provide relatively quickly so that you can crank that in some of our community discussions.

Tapani, you say you'd prefer a deadline a bit later -- say on the 21st of November? If nobody has a problem with that, I think that's something we could work with. It gives us then sort of, you know, a couple of, well, maybe a month to do negotiations with a location and things like that.

If you think it's going to be Reykjavik, we might need more time; if it's going to be DC, we might need less time just because there are more options. You know, last time we were in D.C., we were able to do it downtown. There are also suburban locations that might have pickings in the mix.

Bottom line is every week that passes our options gets smaller. That's just the reality of the meetings and the logistics.

So if you guys are comfortable with going with the 21st, I'm more than happy to do that. That would mean we would want to have - whatever your deadline is, we would want to have a call or some mechanism for just saying, "Okay, by email, that's the day, that's the location."

And we'd have a city but we wouldn't likely or necessarily have a specific location within the city; that would be up to us to sort of work out with you.

And far as that, this is the deadline for picking the location and the timing of the meeting.

Any comments or observations on that? I'm hearing in the Chat as well as any hands going up.

Yes, Tony, it's I darkness but you'll be inside. The lights will work.

Klaus Stoll: Hey, thinking over lights.

Robert Hoggarth: There you go, there you go -- to Tapani's comments.

All right, well let's leave those two pieces there for the moment if we can. I didn't get any feedback on the thought about the planning conversations, but just sort of looking at things, that would mean we would have a call around the end of the week of the November 14 week -- around the 17th or the 18th. I would hope that most of you would be back and recovered from Hyderabad or any post meeting travel.

We then look to say yes -- pronounced, we agree -- on Monday, November 21. We would then not have a call probably until the week after that. I don't know. You know, I want to be able to have maximum participation and about half of you are in the U.S. and there's a holiday at the end of that week. Maybe we get into a mode where we're having Monday calls; I don't know.

Benedetta, we may do another duty poll for that because the folks on this call may not necessarily be the appointees or the participants in the planning conversations itself.

But we would look at calls sort of those next couple of weeks, and then look for a finalization -- or at least a 90% crystallization of your agenda -- by mid December. And I think you might look to target the 16th or something like that. And would say, "Yes, (unintelligible)," and then talk about it; whatever you want to do in terms of preplanning.

I think there are some things that we'll ask you to look at as part of the planning which were to-do's coming out of the 2016 meeting, and, you know, see what progress was made there, make some conversations or judgments about, you know, what role and how we can help you guys in terms of setting up and planning, scheduling calls, doing other things.

Something you may want to think of for a planning committee standpoint is are we going to go with the co-Chair sort of approach that we did last year -- or this year but in 2016?

I really liked how that seemed to work, I liked the concept. But many of you weren't able to do a lot of like pre-collaboration or conversations before some of those sessions. So that's something that I'd like the planning committee to explore a bit and figuring out, you know, is there or things that we can do from a staff perspective logistically for you.

Any comments from any of you on planning committee makeup, the meeting time or frequency, reactions to some of the brainstorms I've been throwing out there?

Farzaneh, you've raised your hand so you have the floor. Please.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. So I'm wondering (unintelligible) members, so how will we appoint members to the (unintelligible) meeting? If I can go and cheer or (unintelligible) in groups?

And about meeting time and frequency, I have another question. Meeting time of this months' time, but the frequency really depends on the issues that we want to discuss. And so I think it's a start (unintelligible) the issues that we want to discuss, and then we must be able to answer the question of the frequency (unintelligible).

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you; very good point. I mean, number one, I think it's up to you all from each of your individual communities who you want to be on the planning team. That's entirely up to you.

How it's worked in the past has been, generally, one or two people from each group. That seems to work out well because if we do set up a schedule -- and I would hardly recommend that just because I know how your calendars get and I know how much I hate getting doodle polls all the time -- if we could just say - you know, and maybe we do one doodle poll saying, "This is what we agree to do." So we'll agree to meet every blank day at blank UTC.

And we each have two or three people assigned to the planning team, and whoever can make those calls makes them. And those who can't, you know, communicate with their fellow representative. But just to have something moving along there.

If it turns out that things aren't progressing as quickly as we expect, we can always take calls off the schedule. That's always fun from my calendar when something comes off.

But, you know, rather than burdening you with, oh my goodness, now we have to send out another poll and, you know, two people can't make it, that would seem to be -- based on experience -- the best approach.

So if you can internally at least name two people, I would love for it to include each of you individual, but I understand that there are going to be some folks not running for office again. There's going to be some of you who just have, frankly, other duties to attend to. But if you all want to stay on the list and appoint one or two more people from your community, let's do that.

My experience has been that there is always somebody in each of your communities who is very influential, who has some very good ideas but can't participate every time, and it's always good to have them sort of part of the discussions. You know, at the last minute, they don't have a brilliant idea, but that then creates the need to change other things.

So please consider that. Benedetta and I will get out a reminder to you all as we go into Hyderabad just to say, "Hi, you know, this is what discussed, this is what we confirmed. Please do the following." You know, confirm your either preferences as a community for time and location, tell us who is on the planning team from your community, and those types of things I think will help us out a great deal.

So we'll have the meeting scheduled. Whoever can attend will attend. You'll have your individual discussions within your communities, and I think we should be able to pursue with the timeframe well.

I just don't want you anytime to be in that situation where you're feeling the stress of, "Oh my goodness, it's four weeks before the meeting and we don't

have an agenda yet." I think that's where our role as Staff to help you all to sort of stay ahead of the wave here.

Any comments or observations about that potential way to move forward?
Looking for typing, look for hands.

Okay, so then just one last bit here. It's sort of been melted into our conversations; roles and responsibilities for planning team and staff.

We are very happy to take on our previous role which is obviously to work with our internal teammates on the travel side to work with you and support your efforts here. On this call, you hear me and Benedetta, but Chantelle and Maryam are also part of the discussions.

Depending upon where the meeting location is, we're likely to have either Maryam or Chantelle in attendance. That worked really nice to have Chantelle in LA last year -- in 2016 anyway. And so we'd like to try and do that again.

And so we'll handle all the logistical sides, report back to you as we find out information about the locations and the options there.

Based on the experience of last year, we're also willing to take on more of that, you know, project management role and really push you guys in terms of other calls and meetings that you may like to have -- if you go ahead with that sort of co-Chair responsibility again. And that's something for you all to think about and maybe be ready to talk about when we get together on some of those planning conversations.

I think some of the issues -- and you may want to capture this whether that's you, Maryam, or you, Benedetta, typing up -- or you Chantelle -- in terms of

action items -- just areas for consideration are for co-Chair, format, pre-meeting conversations, the concept that Klaus raised about a theme for the meeting. I heard the empowered community is one potential theme. There was also a suggestion for a single topic, and certainly, the feedback about, you know, programming in breaks and not, you know, making people work from 8:00am to 6:00pm.

Hey, maybe if we go to Reykjavik, we work from, you know, just when it's dark out and then we'd get breaks when it's light out; I don't know.

But please, this is your meeting and you guys now have experience now several times. You've got a good sense as to works for you and what doesn't. Please be candid with us from a Staff perspective in terms of what else we should do, what you need us to do more of, what you need us to do less of. So that's very important, and we know over the years that we can take any form of constructive or other criticism, and we're more than happy to work with all you guys to make this a productive meeting.

Any final comments or observations that any of you would like to make before we adjourn?

Seeing none -- looking at Chat, looking at hands -- thank you all very much for taking the time to do this while you're preparing for Hyderabad. I think it's very important that we do that.

Benedetta, you flagged Greg's comment in that "The planning team supports Greg's proposal having the intercessional meeting being a combination of efforts rather than just a standalone meeting, it might affect the timing of the meeting." Understood and that's something for you all to think about as well.

I sense that, you know, having that January month is sufficient. You may all come back and say, "No, we need, you know, six or eight weeks." In that case, to your point Chris, that will affect the timing in terms of how much work gets done ahead of time.

Thanks, Benedetta, for pointing that out to me.

Well, again, thanks all very much for this joining. We'll do our follow-up communication to you all -- looping Rafik and Greg. We'll look forward to seeing the names of your fellow representatives for planning purposes, and we will do our best collaboratively to make the early February or mid-February or whatever time and whatever location meeting a productive one for all of you.

Thanks all very much, and we'll talk soon and see many of you in Hyderabad very soon. Thanks Maryam, thanks Chantelle and Benedetta.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you everyone for attending the call. Janie you may stop the recording now. Thanks so much for your time today. Please disconnect all lines. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Maryam.

END