ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
August 23, 2016
8:00 am CT

Man: The recordings have started now.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the NPOC Open ExCom meeting on the 23rd of August, 2016. On the call today we have Klaus Stoll, Janhangir Hossain, Joan Kerr, Martin Silva Valent, Poncelet Ileleji, Sam Lanfranco, Tapani Tarvainen.

And from staff, we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Martin.

Martin Silva Valent: (To repeat a little bit), (myself), just in the record. This is Martin speaking. This is the open (ex com) call (unintelligible) regular executive committee call from (NPOC) that is open to anybody who wants to participate.

We're trying something new. We think this is for the advantage of the work of the (executive) committee. Specifically, we're looking for new feedback, the people that want to help or (unintelligible) us information and ideas just so we can have a much more diverse input and (approval) work.

And, of course, for transparency and also to make the (NPOC) (unintelligible) to participate more and what the (NPOC) discussions are. We are trying this new kind of set up, of course, so we probably are going to be changing the more tweaking them or doing different things.

We definitely want to make this call is open as possible so we're going to have a much more aggressive outreach in each community (unintelligible) in the next sessions. We are trying them.

So no further thing to say. Let's go to the agenda. I think we all ourselves some sort of explanation of what happened yesterday (unintelligible) but mainly yesterday from the NCG, the whole GNSO election and the NCSG election.

I don't know, maybe (unintelligible) that is in the GAC (unintelligible) wants to do some sort of (unintelligible) what it is, what happened, what is the (unintelligible) that everyone was talking about, something so that at least we can have some common ground.

Joan Kerr: Sure. It's Joan for the record and also Poncelet is on that committee, so Poncelet, feel free to jump in or maybe when I'm done, you can at something. So the call for election went out. It has started and there was some dialogue around the procedures and an issue called NOTA, None of the Above and it garnered a lot of discussion.

And basically I think what a lot of the discussions were about was the procedure. Some of the members felt that there should be more dialogue and interaction between the members and so there was a lot of discussion around that.

However, Tapani, the chair, looked at a lot of the charter at some of the discussions and he has since closed that discussion in terms of proceeding with the election.

The discussions between the EC in the community was - not everybody was an agreement either, just for the record - was around the changes of none of the above and essentially I think we felt that the issue was actually addressed just if you didn't want to vote for someone you didn't have to vote for them.

And it was basically a procedural issue but the outcome is that we looked at, you know, the overall. Certainly that's what I looked at and so I was in agreement with us continuing on. So as it stands, there's still ongoing dialogue but the chair has actually closed that issue. So - I think that's all just for now because…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Silva Valent: The (unintelligible) has not arrived to any sort of (unintelligible) yet.

Joan Kerr: If they have arrived one it? I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

Martin Silva Valent: Have they arrived to any…

Joan Kerr: Tapani closed the discussion after entering according to the charter but there's still a bit of dialogue going on right now.

Martin Silva Valent: Okay, I will give the microphone to Klaus. Klaus, your turn.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, thank you very much. Klaus Stoll for the record. Let me try to explain a little bit the situation for my point of view. I think it is absolutely vital that we need to be as open it and as transparent as we can.

And I fully agree and wholeheartedly agree with everybody says, look, we need to have a broad election and a democratic election as possible. But what a lot of people don't seem to understand is that we're not looking about how the ballot form now looks explicitly.

It's about what NOTA, what does it actually mean in electoral terms? And as Avri and Tapani quoted - Avri, in the 2011 statement, it basically means that you don't agree with a covenant but it doesn't mean that you are basically voting against as a person so that the NOTA actually becomes a person.

So in case that somebody who would, let's say, becomes - gets ten votes as a person and the NOTA gets eleven votes, has returned to reelection. And I think this is quite simply not the case and as Avri has (self) stated in her email, it just simply means if you have eleven votes against the above, it means that you have to work harder that you have to do a hell of a lot more to be sure that you represent the membership.

And I think what it all points out to and why am very, very happy about that discussion, also is that in long part, is the really hearty and not so (unintelligible) discussion, is that it will lead hopefully after the election to a reform process inside the NCSG, and as we already pledged, inside the (NPOC) and maybe NCUC - hopefully will join the (fray).

I just hope that we managed will be get out of this is that none of these processes are -- how do you say that -- none of these processes are perfect. Everybody will go out of these things with pain but on the other hand, and that

is why (unintelligible) has joined, we have to stick with what we have and can't make things up on the way as we seem (to need).

And so this is how I see it in a very happy if people would all agree with me because this is some - this is a hard one. Thank you. Sorry for (popping on that).

Martin Silva Valent: Thank you very much, Klaus. So what we have, I understand that these are discussions, first of all, (unintelligible) that the process is fraudulent or I believe that it is not a due process and, therefore, is not a legitimate election and will be - it won't arrive to a legitimate conclusion.

This is stated by the fact that there was no (unintelligible) and NOTA. Anyway, those are the acronyms that basically is none of the above option to each candidate.

And basically, (unintelligible), okay, we don't have it. We did not in the charter. We're going to, or we could have it in the future so this election, we have already may have developed - the vote has already started.

And even so, if you only have three candidates for three spots, it's not going to be an issue because, I mean, the three candidates are basically going to get elected because any sort of voting they can have they're going to be the majority.

In the contra argument for that is that that's not true because (NOTA) could be down a candidate and it could be (valid) so we can have basically one spot free. We could leave one spot open if NOTA, none of the above, option gets more votes than the candidate.

Just a personal note on this, I actually agree with Klaus in the sense that I think we have to - this is a (unintelligible). Actually, it is a problem. We do need to rethink and redo the process but the charter doesn't speak about NOTA.

Then was is - what - why are we so concerned about it, first of all? Second, it's not weird that an election has basically a not - mandatory (unintelligible) candidate. Most of elections, actually, to have that.

Most elections will allow to choose a candidate regardless of - if that's the only candidate. But I can understand the concern. I don't know, it felt for me that there was almost a personal attack against some of the NCG candidates.

I don't know why. I understand that the problem that it means that we don't have a (unintelligible) candidate. But, I mean, there were only three that wanted to work for the GNSO, and again, I think that's the important part.

And we're going to leave one spot open that no one else wants to step in, so basically we have these three people that want to have these three spots that are going to work for us - three. They're voluntary.

And then people are going to vote against one of them to rule them out and leave one spot open so we're going to be a minority in the GNSO. It makes no sense to me. In the best interest of the (unintelligible) the non-commercial, we need these three guys and not because the election is symbolic.

We have our whole process. No one else wanted to be candidates. I can only applaud that they want to be candidates. I will leave the floor to Farzi. Farzi, I'm very, very pleased to have you here so it's my honor to give you the floor.

I will give you the floor first because you are the guest. (Shawn), you may - you will wait one more second. Farzi.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, thank you, Martin. My name is Farzi (Unintelligible) for the record. I'm an NCUC member and I'm the European representative of the executive community of the NCUC.

I'm just going to just make a point on the election and one is that the problem was really the (interpretation) of NOTA and so there was some disagreement on whether NOTA can be counted as, (like), against the vote against one candidate.

So that was really - I think that was the issue that Tapani, in his email, interpreted NOTA as an option that will spoil the whole vote if you choose it. So they don't want to - if you think that all the three candidates are not feasible for the position, you can choose NOTA which I think is, like, one of the problems.

That is supposedly not the case. If you choose NOTA and not choose one candidate, that means that, yes, you've actually voted against that candidate. That's what they had in their minds beforehand.

Now the other thing that (I can) hear as arguments that it has not been predicted in the charter, the thing is it's a procedural rule. I don't know if it should be - actually NOTA should be specifically mentioned.

The charter is, like, or like a constitution. So that's the thing. And also, when we have elections, of course, I agree that we need to have like well contested elections and people should step up and run for the solutions, but when no one

is running for these (unintelligible), we have three offices, and remember that we have three offices.

These three candidates are running for three different offices. They are not running against each other. So we have to, at least, provide a way for people that don't want to vote for candidate, just say, I don't want to vote.

And that's not going to happen if you give them -- I'm sorry, I'm blabbering on but it's my last one -- that's not going to happen if you just tell them, so don't vote for them because then you're not really showing your opinion. Your opinion is not counted in the ballot count. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Hi, Martin. We can't hear you. Martin, we can't hear you. We've lost you there. Can you hear me? Okay, we can hear you, Martin.

Martin Silva Valent: Can you hear me now?

Joan Kerr: Yes, that's perfect. Thank you very much. I (unintelligible). I don't know why. That's weird. Farzi, I was saying that I think you have a great point and an absolutely valid case.

I actually agree with you but I don't have a strong case (unintelligible) but I do think that the argument is only actually valid if the NOTA can be the candidate. If not for the specific election, it doesn't give a different result.

And that's where I have a problem. I have - we will have to (unintelligible) if NOTA can be the candidate or not and this NOTA is mandatory or not. We could say it's mandatory because it has been part of the NCSG process rules that are not in the charter but the (books are) somewhere else.

I don't have (unintelligible). But I would say the other thing is, if we leave the GNSO spot open, we're going to be weaker against commercial interest or the other interest (unintelligible). And that's the part that (really gets me).

You know, I really want to be the strongest non-commercial as we can I do think that's, while fighting something, it may be fair if we're going to be all (unintelligible). Joan, you have the floor.

Joan Kerr: Did you say Joan? Hello?

Joan Kerr: Yes, Joan, you have the floor.

Martin Silva Valent: Joan.

Joan Kerr: Oh, sorry. Great. Thank you, Martin. It's Joan for the record. I just wanted to say from - both from being a representative of (NPOC) and being on the NCSG ex-com as well, I looked through all the dialogue that went on - because I'm new to the whole system.

And it looked for all the dialogue and there were calls for, you know, recalling the ballots and going through a different process, et cetera, et cetera, and a look at what would the end result, what would be the benefit of the end result.

And there would actually be no difference because, like you said, the - does one person get voted out? And what was the point? That made us weaker. And I looked at what was the end the goal.

Number one was we also said that - and (Esi and I) personally said it, that we would have to look at engaging the community at addressing election issues

that came up during this whole dialogue and try to address them as a community but this was not the time to do it.

So we're actually going to do that but from a transparency point of view, I didn't think that there was anything that was not transparent. I mean, it was just procedural and the point at the end of the day was that we had three candidates and three seats.

And when I looked at it, too, is - reading some of the other emails, I kept thinking that one of the issues that keep coming up this why aren't there more candidates for the GNSO?

Why would - why aren't people - and I mean, I have my own answer in terms of observer but I wanted to look at it as well and I'm thinking one of the things that keeps coming up is how much work there is.

In the amount of work that was put into this election in the last few days, I'm thinking, no wonder people are tired. I mean, if this is what they're spending their time on and not looking at how to collaborate, how can we be transparent as representatives, how we communicate better, all of those things.

No wonder they're really tired before they start. So anyway, just wanted to say that. We are looking into - we will address the election issues this coming year. Thank you.

Martin Silva Valent: Okay, thank you very much. And Sam, you have the floor if you want to.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, Sam for the record. Can you hear me?

Martin Silva Valent: (Perfectly).

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, thank you. Just to comment here. One on the NOTA. There are several different models of how NOTA works in there were two problems here. There was a misunderstanding at the beginning.

In one model, you simply say I don't like the slate and I reject the slate. The other, if you like a personal candidate, there are two different models of voting here and they (unintelligible). Both of them are legitimate. You just have to decide which one you're going to abide by.

One is you simply not vote for a candidate you don't like. When there's a slate equal to them or position, the NOTA that applies to individual candidates has a merit because somebody may only receive one vote of, say, three candidates for three positions in that person gets the position even though they received only one vote out of, say, 50.

There, the NOTA allows somebody to say it not only didn't vote for that person but I feel very strongly that they shouldn't serve so there's a balance of the votes for and against the NOTAs.

So we have the three different models into things are going on. There was confusion as to how it was supposed to apply and in the past, as they see, it's been applied differently in different elections.

The other is that there were some strong personal opinions with respect to individual candidates, and unfortunately, from my viewpoint, things got a bit nasty in the middle of the discussion. And that was not - that didn't bring honor to anybody.

And I don't know if the nastiness is because, as Joan said, they were tired or they (felt the stakes) were too high, but we do have to go back at this and clarify how the NOTA is handled so that that's off the table and it isn't used as either a (door) or a stick for some of the nastiness that went on in the dialogue. That's all I want to say now.

Martin Silva Valent: Great. Thank you very much. And Klaus, you're the last one in the queue. Go ahead. You have the (floor).

Klaus Stoll: Yes, Klaus for the record. First of all, thank you all for a wonderful discussion. I just would like to bring another aspect in there. I think this discussion has demonstrated to me that we have to strive to get on the agenda that we will get (NPOC) are on (true) counselor and that we will also strive to get our own non-com (seat).

This is our charter. It has been approved by the board and I think a lot of the toxic discussions will go away as soon as we have these (three) decisions. And I will make it a point to discuss it with the (NCOM) and with the membership to devise a strategy and then strive to go for it. Thank you very much.

Martin Silva Valent: I fully agree, Klaus, with you, but the truth is that - well, I think it's going to happen eventually. I mean, we're building (NPOC) again and it's going amazingly great and it's going to be the success of this (process) is going to be that.

On the other hand, I do believe that we share the non-commercial interest with the NCUC in the NCC member, (not NPOC). So we have to work on that. I think that that is one of also the main goals we have to get off this process.

And that's why my answer is and maybe, I think (unintelligible), I mean, what I'm trying to say is what I'm talking about GNSO, I want to - I know the enemy is the other side. I know the enemy is the business constituency.

Are they the ISPs or the IPC which is very aggressive, you know, and when I see (the open seats) that we could be using and we have very good members going on in the GNSO election this time, you know.

It's, like, I want to feel that they're fighting for me. And there's no one else to fight for me. It's not I'm choosing one over the other. If they going to have a warrior fighting for a non-commercial interest or (unintelligible).

In that case, it's not that he don't care for (unintelligible). It's that I think the most legitimate decision is the one that is going to defend the non-commercial interest (unintelligible).

And, of course, this is with the absolute condition that we have to review the process. I mean, it's not like I don't care about the process. But I think (unintelligible) the process now which I don't think we've ever been absolutely (pure) in any process inside ICANN.

But (we're being pure) in the process now. We may lose a warrior in the GNSO battle and that's where the battle is actually going to take place. Farzi, they want to have any sort of (contact) on this? If so, you can do it later.

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry, Martin, I - oh, sorry, I didn't raise my hand. I'm not used to raising my hand. Just, Martin, yes, I understand your concern about not having candidates at the GNSO.

But the thing is that this NOTA thing, most of the time - I mean, it's never, in the history of (NCC) has ever NOTA has won. And I - but that's a concern that should be addressed later on.

But I'm just saying that the compromise at this point would have been to say, okay, so we interpret we will actually count NOTA in the ballots and NOTA will not - will not (spoil) all the votes. That's - I think, that could have been a solution. I don't know. We can continue the election but, yes. Thank you.

Martin Silva Valent: So you feel that basically Tapani went over the (unintelligible) when he could have easily just corrected (details). That would…

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. I think the conversation got very - in the discussion got a little bit derailed that it was a very simple solution. And I would have been that, okay, so we don't consider NOTA if a candidate does not - it will be counted if the candidate has less votes than NOTA, and that's it.

The only problem was the (interpretation). Of course, as you said, and we have discussed it extensively and totally agree with you that the ballot design is not accurate.

But, still, if you just change this slightly different interpretation, you can still work with it. And, yes, I think it would have - the solution would have been the simple interpretation and just instructed voters that if you choose NOTA, your votes will not be spoiled. Only the person that you have not voted for will be competing against NOTA. Thank you.

Martin Silva Valent: It's more (a point, an) additional argument, I want to say (otherwise). If anyone has anything else to say about this matter, please speak now or wait until later. If not, we are going to move towards the next agenda. Joan, yes, you have the floor.

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. I just want to quickly say that, I mean, all points are always valid and discussion is always good especially in civil society. For the ballots to be changed, it was - I counted the people who were protesting.

I think there were something like four or five and I'm not sure what the membership of NCUC is and, of course, the ex-com for (NPOC) was involved as well.

So, you know, do you change a ballot because of four or five people? And, you know, where do you start and stop with the dialogue in terms of change? And does it represent the membership? So that's the first thing.

The second thing is, having NOTA on the ballot and then voting for someone, choosing not to vote for someone, to me, arrived at the same end. And what I mean by that is, if we had more than three candidates, I could see that is really valid because that all the numbers would count.

We're dealing with receipts, three candidates and you can choose to not vote for someone or vote for two or three or one. So - and then those numbers would be counted.

So that's in terms of making my decisions, that's how I look at it because we didn't have a choice in terms of a fourth candidate and NOTA is not a fourth candidate. A late we do a show protest or negativity. That's how I interpreted it. So I just want to say that for the record.

Martin Silva Valent: Good. Anyone else or removed to the next item? I think this discussion is going to continue so maybe in the next call we're going to keep hearing about this and (repost) about that. So this discussion is far from over.

I think we need to (leave a fair) shot of the different approaches that we can help this matter. None of us - not all of us would agree with everything but at least I can see we have a common ground to discuss.

Again, if no one has anything else to say, I will just move to the next item on the agenda which is the (unintelligible) items. I don't know, maybe, Klaus, do want to - (I propose to you in the agenda) to talk about this. How many items do we have? How (are they confirmed)? You know, the whole summary (for them).

Klaus Stoll: Okay, thank you very much. Klaus for the record. We have, at the moment, planned to events. One outreach event and one in reach event. The outreach event is basically about reaching NGOs and not-for-profit organizations in Asia and globally.

And we have designed a program, spiel, everything so the documentation for that one is ready. It's the same for the event of - the in-reach event is basically an event where we asked the other stakeholder groups, what you expect - what are your expectations and what - how do you see the GNSO?

Because the GNSO reviews that reforms which will be going on in the future. I think we should also begin to listen to what other people - actually how other people actually see us and what they think of us.

So I think we're doing the GNSO quite a favor with this kind of event because it will not be (confrontary) in any way. This will be a real dialogue I hope. The situation is that (Glen McKnight) - sorry, our ICANN (clan) - sorry.

Joan Kerr: We'll forgive you.

Klaus Stoll: Sorry about that. That (Glen) asked, (sent) been email saying, Please submit these (grants) by a specific (format) by the 12th of September and we will you know.

And I wrote back to (Glen) and said, I already submitted everything to Maryam and I asked Maryam to put it out in the right format and also send it out, then, to - send it out to (Glen) as quickly as possible.

But (Glen), can you think about at least the outreach event because we are having Indian cooperation partners and we are planning to bring people into the event in knowing after the 12th is quite difficult for us timewise to deal with it.

So (Glen) wrote back and said, Yes, send it out as quickly as possible and then - and also tell us which are the dates you really want and the events you really want to so that we might can - give you an indication internally earlier, so what I'm waiting for at the moment is that Maryam is submitting these events and let us know that these events are submitted and I also would like you at this moment let you know that you need to have a little bit of patience and Maryam in the sense said she hasn't got her laptop and is working from her phone so until that is resolved please have (unintelligible) is Maryam.

And then basically once we've got the confirmation for the event, the limited fundraising which is needed for these events will actually go ahead and also

the probable lead, the complete implications, but to be absolutely honest, I can't go towards that at the moment then we are. I know it's not an ideal situation, but at least we are on track that means - much like several times before but we have to counsel basically running out of time. So that's a short report on this one. If you have any questions on this – on the DOV things, please let me know. Also if Maryam wants to make a comment on that, Maryam please be more than welcome.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Klaus. No I – no comments at the moment, but I will get it in as soon as possible.

Martin Silva Valent: Perfect. In my case as no one and we're also co-working with the onboarding mentorship (unintelligible) program with (Janis) and I will be turning things specifically also from that program then OIJ's on DM because I really will be on the (unintelligible) board qualification of newcomers -- so that's good news. We are also going to have at least some sort of input or (unintelligible) over there. Anyone else want to do some sort of comments on this status? I think we will so sort of have already abated, but (unintelligible) altogether. Joan, have the floor?

Joan Kerr: Hi. Joan for the record. ((unintelligible)) I just had a quick question. The – this is an event for (unintelligible) so in theory or in principle ICANN or (Glen) has agreed to -for us to have that event, correct?

Klaus Stoll: Yes, if we go the route of doing it during the ICANN meeting this is support of ICANN which I think is sensible. If we go the other route in doing outside the (unintelligible) event which means not using ICANN premises, not using ICANN technical support and dominance on value it will be quiet, of course, the undertaking.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So then are the invitee's members of – is this an inreach event or an outreach or sort of a combination? Like, are we going to be working with our members that are in India to help host the event -- I guess is what my question is.

Klaus Stoll: I think it is clearly designed as both. We will reach (unintelligible) only to the members in India, of course, with them as specific that the input we have materials in India and others and we will either have easier task to – for them to get engaged, but I also will move this (unintelligible).

The idea is to move this outside of India and use that for our (unintelligible) outreach, but at the same time through our Indian partners to try to really get organizations who have not really have an idea about ICANN let alone, (unintelligible) or the NCSG or NPOC and basically sensitizing them to (unintelligible) basically (unintelligible) government and (unintelligible) operation concern and what are we doing important for your day to day operation.

Joan Kerr: Right. Okay, thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, could I just use that occasion for one more remark and the remark is as Martin mentioned, that we know in our group talks it's now a list of events we are planning and possible for NPOC and should and could practice this page.

I - the last few days found some more events which are (unintelligible). Would just ask anybody else from the Executive Committee or even members or non- members who want to suggest an event where NPOC should become active just please feel free to ask them. Don't think too much about how much it costs or things like that because we need to after the event, of course, is we can actually analyze if we can do it or not. Thank you.

Martin Silva Valent: Great. I will be (unintelligible) like anyone who wants to do as well. The – anyone else want to help (unintelligible) question or remarks during the events? Okay. If not, I will come to (unintelligible). We have (unintelligible) chair who's just joined us. So (unintelligible) if you want to speak at any (unintelligible) hold up your hand and have the floor. Let's move onto the Policy Committee's status update. (Unintelligible) has been doing an amazing, incredible, enormous work for the Policy Committee. (Unintelligible) more, (Paul) you have you have the floor. (Paul), can you hear me? Are you there?

Klaus Stoll: Thank you. Have to unmute your microphone. Also that your microphone is muted.

Martin Silva Valent: There it goes, so this not mute. (unintelligible). Great, so connect and disconnect the mic. That work for me. Is that you?

Maryam Bakoshi: Counselor, we can't hear you. Do you require a dial out?

Poncelet Ileleji: Hello. Sorry my mic was on mute.

Klaus Stoll: Great, you have the floor.

Poncelet Ileleji: Can you hear me now? Hello?

Klaus Stoll: Now we - we can hear you perfectly, yes.

Poncelet Ileleji: Hello? Hello?

Klaus Stoll: We can hear you.

Maryam Bakoshi: I'm sorry, we can hear you.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes, oh, yes, (unintelligible). Sorry, I caught - can you hear me? Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, we can hear you loud and clear.

Poncelet Ileleji: Okay. So, okay, so basically, yes, I'm talking about what I'm trying to do with policy. I've talked to some members and Oreoluwa in Nigeria. She runs an NGO and (unintelligible) education and I wanted – I want to also get some on board because he was dead before me which in the Policy Committee so I'm not – I'm presently date on that because the (unintelligible) question, Who's - who the organization (unintelligible) part of NPOC.

She's presently on holidays and she sent me notes that if she is - until she comes up on holidays before she will - and response to me properly, so those were the people that I wanted to call up into the membership and committee. That's my view. Thank you.

Martin Silva Valent: Okay, thank you very much. I think we also going to have – I need more of in the outreach and inreach with (Mazu). I have more policy content that we've been doing so far. Specifically, in the inreach we are doing to the NPOC membership and other people inside of ICANN already.

But we made that clear when we started in Helsinki we knew ExCom that the policy was going to be our main goal and, of course, it – where we are going to change at least the way we've been doing so far we don't want the X.com to be doing only the policy work. We want to be - the members to do the policy work as it's supposed to be so I think we want to be hearing a little bit more about that -- and I hope that (Maha) can jump in the conversation, but I don't think he will make it.

Anyone else have any sort of comment on the Policy Committee that wants to, you know, say? At least the last time we talked about working groups involvement, in my case I'm going to be involving three. I'm already involved at least in the right prediction with (unintelligible) are doing okay. We're moving towards the definitions of the review of the process of the (unintelligible). We are still not in the review of the General United infra-solution system that's going to be left for policy to 2017.

Basically just to be ready for the next one of the new gTLD's with a review process of part depiction and, you know, I'm still waiting on the news with a working group regarding implementations that is going to be over where it's supposed to be merged with the (Genesis) or review working group. I still have no news on that.

I (unintelligible) on that I was going to need to come up in the (unintelligible) working group --(unintelligible) -- but I will do that as soon as possible. Klaus, if you have a (unintelligible)?

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Martin and (unintelligible) first.

Martin Silva Valent: Sorry?

Klaus Stoll: And Maryam's hand was up first and I just want to let her speak first (unintelligible).

Martin Silva Valent: Yes, go on.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, (unintelligible) I forgot to put it down. Just Klaus for the record. Just to let you know I'm on several working groups, for example, on the – what I call

it with who it is to, the new gTLD and on (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) and staff responsibility in (unintelligible) and the following the GNSO extremely close.

The point is what I would to remark is at the moment very, very complicated so much that the working groups are even in the state where we don't know if they can continue because some evacuations is going on in the background to have some new - the next energy around implemented as quickly as possible. What I'm trying to say here it will be extremely difficult to really directly engage with our members into this working groups.

We have to really get them there step by step because once – if you go into one of these working groups at the moment and prepare it, you just never come back to ICANN again because you don't understand the work that is going on, you don't understand the background and it's extremely, extremely both in time-consuming. So it – with the different programs we are doing the membership (unintelligible) programs (unintelligible). I think what we have to do, work on these fronts and get step to step buy-in, thank you.

Klaus Stoll: I agree. General Counselor, I absolutely agree. Anyone else want to some sort of comment or ask for something a little bit more (unintelligible) (unintelligible)? Joan?

Joan Kerr: I don't for the record. I just wanted to point out that ICANN is actually working on how to write policy statements as an education. I don't know if we're aware of that. I'm going to get some information and send it on. But (Robert) is actually working – what's his last name -- I forgot his last name -- is working on that with a number of people.

I know that ALAC is involved in that, but I think that's something that NPOC should be aware of, if not involved, but at least be aware of that we can actually use that document to help educate our members and potential members. (Hogwarth), that's it. Thank you.

Martin Silva Valent: Okay. Let's move to the, you know, someone wants to talk about the education commitment, but maybe Maryam or Joan have some information of it - about it. Do you - don't anything about the status of the (unintelligible) we were supposed be preparing for (unintelligible)? Do you have any sort of input following (unintelligible)?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Martin, thank you very much. Maryam speaking for the record. We have tried to contact one, but I'm guessing he is (unintelligible) because we still haven't heard back from him and, of course, because of the issue my (unintelligible) as well. I'm working off my (unintelligible) so it's really difficult to be able to do anything concrete.

But like I said to Joan and (Juan), we already have enough materials on the Google drive to use so if just ask put those together and send it in and up, but I'm hoping that by next we get that list should have that ready in time for print – in time for review and printing for the third deadline of September. Thank you very much. I don't know if Joan has anything to add to this? Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, then we will have to remind some (unintelligible) because he has been absent from a lot of calls and a lot of moments of the ExCom. I wrote him specifically to engage in this call and to engage in this document so we have to do a stronger reminder (unintelligible) or (unintelligible) or he's having some problems.

Of course, (unintelligible) number (unintelligible). My real concern is to have the document ready and the best that they can especially now that we have an item support on almost any - every part of the document when we need to do the decks because we have the designer, we have the green team so we can really have to use that and it would be a shame not to.

Let's see. We have – do we have - I think both (unintelligible) short and Klaus may have information with me, but either (Amy) or (unintelligible) they need to know the financial status as there is no status then we don't have to talk about this (unintelligible) to say it?

Joan Kerr: Martin, it's Joan. Did we pass membership at all because I wanted to talk about membership?

Martin Silva Valent: Oh, I think (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Martin Silva Valent: (Unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Oh, (unintelligible) for that.

Martin Silva Valent: Yes, so, sorry, sorry, sorry. I don't know why I just jumped you. Yes, the Membership Committee and that's where status of they. I think we both have things in (unintelligible), but…

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you. Joan for the record. I sent a document yesterday. I have a committee. I am so excited. I mean, it doesn't take much for me get excited, but I'm so excited. From the very onset we were asked to fulfill a charter, I guess, to have a committee structure and so I kept thinking, you know, we

needed to really get into psyche of our members and, of course, it - one of the biggest is to engage and communicate with them and how do we do that?

Well, obviously, we've all talked about writing a document and getting an outreach strategy, etc., but then I started thinking about who would be helpful initially and I want to say -- oh, thank you Klaus -- I want to say that I did ask Sam, but he'll maybe come on later, right Sam? You don't have to answer that.

So I looked at the membership as a whole and thought, Well, we should – it would be good to get someone who was involved in the past and someone who is involved in the new memberships because then we can then get different perspectives, so I reached out by – I sent each person that I thought would be really good a private email and invite them to participate.

So Cintra has agreed to stand and so it has like Agustina -- so I'm really excited. I think they bring a lot to the table on how to engage and certainly some of it what not to do or mistakes that were made that we can, as Klaus, you put it, we have lots of lessons to learn so how we can learn from them -- so they have agreed and to be on the committee and we are going to be meeting – I sent out a – an invite to them for Thursday or Friday to put our time together and Klaus made a really good points, you know, we have to go step by step.

It's about education. It's not just about outreaching and tone and what we're going to do -- although that's good too -- but there is a whole education of ICANN and the background of what it is and how important it is and why NPOC is important and what role it plays and so all of those things are really important.

Of course, Maryam just mentioned about the document that we have to have ready for printed which we will work on next week so we'll work on that as well. The – regarding the Ambassador program, we will work with the fellows for their Regional Vice President's for India as a (unintelligible) project and then take that experience and develop the criteria by engaging the members of NPOC as well on what it takes, but at least having some content that they can read and respond to.

The other thing I wanted to say is because we're responsible for inreach activities, the committee will also look at what events are being planned and maybe look at some of the suggestions that we can give long in advance so that we can make decisions about, What do we do? Where does (unintelligible) fit into that, more recommendation and dialogue than anything, but that's – that we keep a really close eye on those things. So, that's my report and I'm really excited about having a committee. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Joan, those are amazing news. What the (unintelligible) did, the committee, but I see it work I will really, really, really just (unintelligible). I think it's amazing. I think that's big steps so congratulations on that. And then I know you have also (unintelligible) which I am very fond of. I know that she will do a great work with you. In my part I can say that, well, the onboarding program will be available for NPOC to use…

Joan Kerr: Right.

Klaus Stoll: …they will be able to give at least resources to develop that I think we need. At this time, we are working on our Welcoming Letter and that we will keep the basically useful as a starting draft, you know, to discuss with the committee…

Joan Kerr: Yes,

Klaus Stoll: …and then, of course, the ambassador who will be truly supported at least from the (unintelligible) development team by this program…

Joan Kerr: Right.

Klaus Stoll: …and it seems to be moving forward and we seem to be very in this program. So for that, you're going to have a lot of support from this program at least.

Joan Kerr: Great.

Klaus Stoll: Anyone else want to do some sort of comment in membership or (unintelligible) to jump out to final thoughts? Joan? What's your point about…?

Sam Lanfranco: Hey, good morning. Sam, for the record. No, I had to be away for a couple of minutes when Klaus asked about an update on the finances on the Finance Committee so I just wanted to make a couple of comments here. This is unfortunately holiday time in (unintelligible) so the bank official that I'm dealing with for the creation of the account here is away until next Monday the 29th so I won't know until the 29th what the status of the paperwork is on it.

I am about halfway through making sense of all this Dutch explaining what the bank account looked like for the past year – two years in the Netherlands -- well, in Belgium, but in Dutch. I hope to have that report ready in four, five days -- so that's where things stand now. Any questions?

Klaus Stoll: Not from me. I mean, that's what basically the way we're working for, but that's completely normal. I don't know if anyone else any other sorts of question on this? It's not really…

Sam Lanfranco: Oh, I actually have one…

Klaus Stoll: Yes?

Sam Lanfranco: No, I – let me add one thing.

Klaus Stoll: Sure.

Sam Lanfranco: Typically, in the past the account operated on one signature -- the signature routing. I initially proposed and operate on two signatures, but the problem with most the account does is wire transfers to service providers and those could be trickier to handle with two signatures so I raised the question earlier and I think the Executive Committee agrees that we will operate on one thing material since everything will be through the bank account it will all be transparent and accountable. If there any issues about that, I'd like to hear them now.

Martin Silva Valent: Yes. Yes, I mean, I think that's a great proposal. Klaus, do you have anything to say about that?

Klaus Stoll: No, nothing. I thought we already cleared that up, but it's good for time to remind us. What I wanted to essential ask them now that we've got you on the spot, could you also do a very, very quick update on the situation with the webpage?

Sam Lanfranco: All right, yes. The situation is that I've had to move forward than I want because I had other (unintelligible) obligations that are - they're legal obligations so I can't ignore them without being relocated to a public (unintelligible), I think, so I, you know, there are certain deadlines I have to meet as my own. Had nothing to do with NPOC and ICANN, but I can't get away from them.

Klaus Stoll: Joan, you (unintelligible)?

Joan Kerr: Sure, thank you. Joan, or the record. Sam, I just wanted to point out with the wire transfer that we agreed to with one signature if that's required that we also discussed that, you know, those amounts would be discussed by the X.com and a agree to so then one signature would be - suffice after that discussion has happened. I just wanted to add that.

Klaus Stoll: Right, yes, yes, that's clear. Thank you for clarifying that. (Paul), do we have any other business you would like to discuss? Anyone? If I need to have anything you want to add or share specifically?

Tapani Tarvainen: No, nothing, thank you, for me yet and apologies for being late.

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible)? Joan, do you have anything to add - for your time? Oh, apparently not. Joan, (unintelligible)?

Joan Kerr: Sure, great. Thank you. It's Joan for the record. It – I just wanted us to have a discussion around responsibilities for these open meetings and how they're promoted and who's responsibility it is to – I mean, it's all our responsibility, I know that, but that just to make sure that we are pretty coordinated and have these quite often I think they're so good to have but just to make sure that

we're – we have some planning time and get it promoted so that we can have more people come on a regular basis.

Martin Silva Valent: I can answer that. I will be responsible for the next one. I will be (unintelligible) on that as closely to the treasurer and I will try to work with Maryam in order to at least address the different the (unintelligible) list, but of course, I can always improvement on the way we communicate it but so far I think it's going to be their regular, you know, the regular reports to the different (unintelligible) and GNSO public helping them two or three times or one week before they call to join this.

I think it could also work -- so mouth to mouth communications. I mean, basically try to talk to people inside of telling them, you know, Hey, we have something new to tell you like we're doing this new, seeing where it's an open call. But again, since this is the next conf (sic) call, we are almost doing almost the same thing that we always do that the – I will build momentum step by step if we feel that we are really not getting, you know, this step by step progress of new people coming in the call we can try to be much more aggressive and maybe start doing some outreach to the webpage and things like that. I don't know what your opinion on that. Klaus, you have a (unintelligible)? Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Martin. Yes, I think that you are right, but I think we should really include in the NPOC discuss and given a little bit more background information on the topic (unintelligible) of one of the (unintelligible) on each agenda topic and not to do it the day before, but a week or two before just to get it a little bit further.

Although the next meeting actually, as I understand it, or let me start another point. Ask the committee chairs you all have the right to call committee

specific meetings so if the Policy Committee (unintelligible) meeting (unintelligible), Please go ahead and organized a meeting, and at the same risk communications and membership as we are the first ones whose membership on and have actually committed established as the charter says I think that is Joan who will call the next membership meeting which is not an open call, but it – this isn't, as I said in my email another type of call which is not exclusively, but basically tied to the NPOC membership. Thank you. Joan, you have the last (unintelligible). Go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Martin. Just my point about having regular meetings and if and Maryam put it in the chat, if we can say to the community that we're going to have a meeting, you know, according to what Maryam's suggestion was every second Thursday, for example, so that it starts to be known that there's an NPOC open meeting every second Thursday.

I'm not saying that's what we – the date, but I'm just saying as an example because I think it's very important for the larger communities who – to get involved and one way is consistency. When people know that's when it is, then they are prepared for it, so that's the point I was trying to make. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Great. I agree with everything with the process and we would Maryam is proposing we can toss that a little more and in a specific email. I think that will be much more efficient. If no one else have anything to add, I will finish this call. I think it was a great call -- maybe not with the best chair, but at least I think the participants were really, really active and all of them recently to each other and they give very (unintelligible) opinions what has done but not having some of whom from the outside give a strong opinion, at least.

She had a strong opinion against the one that we had and anything that was always to challenge us, you know, to feel that whether we have not only strong but a valued point or not and I think we actually (unintelligible) that we have some sort of valid point. Well, thank you all for being here. Let's continue our case, and when we talking to each other through emails, Skype, and things (unintelligible). Bye bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone for attending this call. (Anthony), you may now stop the recording. Thank you for your support today. Have a good day. Bye bye.

Klaus Stoll: Thanks everybody.

                              END