

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
November 12, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, (Vicky). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCPH Intercessional Planning call taking place on Wednesday, November 12, 2014 at 1400 UTC.

On the call today we have Tony Holmes, Steve Metalitz, Jimson Olufuye, Bill Drake, Rafik Dammak, and Rudi Vansnick. We have apologies from Kristina Rosette and from Elisa Cooper. And from staff we have Rob Hoggarth and myself, Benedetta Rossi.

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

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Benedetta. Good morning, good evening, good day everybody. This is Rob Hoggarth. We have a very straightforward agenda for our discussions today at least from my perspective. My hope is that you will all be able to have a fulsome discussion and be able to narrow your expectations for the program agenda for the meeting scheduled for January 12 and 13.

What I wanted to do first was circle around on some of the logistics for the meeting just to make sure that we are all still on the same page here. The second agenda item in particular that I've identified addresses the dialogue, Bill, that you had initiated about a week and a half or so ago about the dates.

And my interpretation of the dialogue that followed your initial request and then your response is that we are sticking with the January 12 and 13 dates. We have our facilities at the CSIS office building arranged and that we're going to proceed with that. Am I correct in that interpretation, everyone? And welcome, Lori, I see you've joined as well. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think that's right based on what I saw on the list.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Okay thanks. I don't know, Bill, and I don't know if you're - have a live line or not. I see you in the Adobe Connect room. My impression was that you may have some difficulty attending but that you'll otherwise be able to make sure that you've got your full complement of participants. And I don't hear you, Bill, so I don't know if you're on mute or since you're in Adobe Connect - yes, I do not hear you. I see you're...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: It sounds, Bill, like there - you are speaking but we cannot hear any articulated words unfortunately. That may be an Adobe problem, Benedetta, I'm not sure. I mean, obviously Bill's microphone is active because I can hear some noise. Thank you, Bill, you'll call us on the phone bridge.

Okay so setting that aside, I mean, looking forward to Bill's comments on that, Steve, but I think that we have the same interpretation. We have proceeded to confirm the dates with CSIS. They will occasionally ping us and say, "Are

you still coming?" And we have connected our IT team with the CSIS IT team. You know, this is unlike the Los Angeles meeting where we had total control over the meeting facilities so we're doing coordination work with their folks to ensure that we not only have the audio capabilities but I think you had asked, Steve, whether we would also have the video capabilities. And so we're trying to make that happen as well.

I'm hopeful and confident that we will be able to pull that off so that the remote experience is a positive one. But worst case scenario we'll definitely have the audio connections.

The only thing we can't control is the winter weather here in DC in January. I'm just keeping my fingers crossed for that.

So I've sort of seg'd into Agenda Item 3 that, you know, just confirming we do have the space. Benedetta, I don't know if you were able to put together the slides; my apologies for some of the email difficulties.

But, Steve, you had asked the last time we spoke about confirmation of the meeting rooms. And since that time we did have some changes within the footprint that CSIS was able to provide us.

We do have three main rooms that are going to be available for the two days. We've got a room up on the second floor of CSIS which, you know, when you - the photo I've got up in the Adobe Connect doesn't - isn't capable of showing the whole room.

But based upon us walking around it and CSIS's experience, we'll be able to get at least 50 around a hollow square or a U-shaped table on their second floor space with room for folks around the edges. So I'm very confident that

for the general assembly times that you guys want that you'll be able to accommodate all the participants.

The expectation is that as we move to then your breakout sessions a lot will depend upon how you all want to do that whether you want to break out just into stakeholder groups or whether you also want to have some subset meetings as well of the constituencies.

We have made accommodations for that with the CSIS planners. Our second room, the large meeting room, if you go back one there, Benedetta, accommodates what they tell us 40 people around that hollow square with additional seating around the edges.

So if you guys broke out into your stakeholder groups we certainly have that covered and you'll be able to have, you know, worse case scenario about 40-45 people in your stakeholder group breakout session.

So that would give you an opportunity and I think this was a point you had raised early in the planning process, Steve, that would allow you to potentially have some expanded programming for your particular communities where you might be able to provide opportunities for other people to attend for parts of the meeting.

They wouldn't obviously be covered by ICANN travel support but if you have folks locally here in Washington or folks who happen to be coming through town or planning other trips during that period we'd be able to accommodate them during our breakout time however long or involved you guys program that out to be.

Finally, we do have a third room on the conference facility side and that's the small breakout room that we've got, Benedetta, on that slide. And that is, you know, generally for only about 15 or 16 people. We'll have this space supplemented by some smaller conference rooms that CSIS can make available to us. So it gives me comfort that if you all wanted to ultimately break down into, you know, an hour or two for some constituency meetings that we would be able to accommodate that.

There will be a little bit of logistical gymnastics we'll have to do because of the security system and some of the conference rooms being on quote unquote, nonpublic floors. But that's a capability that CSIS can provide to us. And those, like I said, would be for breakouts of, you know, 15, 16 people maybe 20 max we could squeeze folks into to a breakout room for a constituency meeting.

So that's a general review of the space. What you had all agreed to last time when we met was this concept of four quarters, you know, breaking up the two-day meeting into four major components. Monday morning being a, you know, general assembly type thing where it's all 50, you know, all 42 participants plus staff involved in a general session.

And then you would break out over the course of the next day, the next two quarters, both Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning, into perhaps stakeholder group programming. And then you'd jump back into a general assembly approach Tuesday afternoon.

That was the general approach that you were taking at that time. As we begin to discuss specifics of the program I think we can mix and match although it makes it easier if we have those, you know, large blocks of time. But I think

we can work with the CSIS folks in terms of being able to shift back and forth if we need to.

We just won't have that same capability that we had in the ICANN Los Angeles office where we can quickly grab, you know, 10 staff members and reset the room and drag a wall across. That we won't have the flexibility to so that's why I liked your quote unquote quarterly approach.

The other reason why that quarterly approach I think will prove to be useful is that of course at your request I reached out and secured Fadi to come to Washington for that week. It turns out he's able to be in Washington that week Monday, Tuesday and has to leave early on Wednesday.

As you would expect, he's coming to Washington. That creates a buzz and an interest from others to meet with him whether that's new people on Capitol Hill or folks who want to talk more about the IANA transition efforts and the rest.

So what I'd really like to be able to do by the end of this call is lock down from your all's perspective what time block you would like him for. That way I can have a preserved part of his schedule and then satisfy his assistants and other people who are screaming for his time.

Again, remember, we're the ones who asked him to come for the purpose of this meeting so if you guys come out and tell me, well, we need him for 6 hours then I will block that. But the important thing particularly as we're getting into the two month window now for the meeting is that I'm really going to need to lock in some time blocks. And if we can accomplish that today that would be great.

Any questions about the meeting space or the general logistics? Is that you, Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah this is Steve. I have a couple questions.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, sir.

Steve Metalitz: First, in the meeting space the numbers that you gave for that second floor space of at least 50 plus some people sitting around, you know, behind the table, it sounds as though we may not need to be quite as severely restricted to, in our case, seven participants that we could have, you know, maybe eight or nine that could be, you know, delegates to this meeting. Is that correct and is every - is that acceptable to others? Understanding that ICANN will only support travel for no more than seven.

Bill Drake: This is Bill. We have gone around several times on the issue of parity in participation. And every time we do it sort of - I have to go back and talk to people who then say no they think that's - it's important that each group has the same number of participants. And I would really personally prefer not to have to do that again unless there's some overwhelming reason.

Steve Metalitz: Well this I Steve. I hear your preference. I don't happen to share that fetish but I understand that some people do. However, we have a lot of interest in this meeting from our constituency and if we have the capability of having more than seven delegates to it I think that that would be - that would certainly be welcomed. As far as I know we're not planning on taking any votes on anything at this meeting so I don't see that absolute parity is necessarily an issue.

And also, obviously, you know, you have people in the DC area or people relatively near by so there may be people from your side that could benefit from this as well. So...

Bill Drake: Sure there would be. I just wondered if there's - isn't a certain virtue to us trying to keep to a manageable size in order to be able to have a particular kind of conversation. And reopening all this I'm not sure - what can I say, Steve? You understand the position I'm in. I understand the position you're in. I don't know how to square those.

Tony Holmes: It's Tony. Can I come into this conversation?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Tony. I note, Rafik, that you had your hand raised and maybe on other issues. But let's let Tony address this issue and then, Rafik, if you have a comment on this item. Please, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks, Rob. I was just going to say that one way out of this may be - because I think certainly a lot of us have got people in that area and they're the ones that we may want to bring in. Maybe once the program is finalized and if it's split between having a general assembly type session and the stakeholder groups if nothing else we should be able to maybe get a few extra for the stakeholder groups. Is that something we could consider? That overcomes, to some degree, Bill's problem.

Rob Hoggarth: I'll let you respond to that, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I mean, I heard you say that, Rob, that we could have some extra people come in for breakout sessions, which is fine. But, you know, the idea here was to have a dialogue with the house and so I think it's unnecessarily restrictive to

say we can only have seven when it's clear that the rooms will accommodate a little bit more.

And so I don't think - it's not an either or, it's a both and. And I mean, I agree with Tony that if we decide in our SG meeting we may be able to have a few more or if we have a constituency meeting we may be able to bring in a few more but the question was whether we could bring a few more into the plenary. I don't think we can wait until the - well, I don't know.

Rob is going to tell us at what point we need to have our actual delegate list done. But I think it would be good to resolve that because we don't have a space limitation that would restrict us to seven; we would be able to have a little more flexibility on that.

Rob Hoggarth: One approach that we could take, and then I'll turn the mic over to you, Rafik, would be, you know, I was interested in having traveler names, particularly supported travelers not realizing that was going to be a potential distinction, by early this month.

So far I haven't received any names from any of you yet so I'd really like you all to focus some time and effort on that if you possibly can over the next week or so simply because my concern is that out of towners or particular folks from out of the country may end up having visa challenges with the US holidays coming up at the end of the year and things like that.

So the earlier we can get cranking on that stuff the better. And if I have partial lists from everybody with just people that you know, because I know some of you are in the midst of or just beginning elections, that would be great so that we limit the number of folks that we're going to have travel challenges with to the bare minimum.

One approach that you could take is to say okay, here are the - we understand that we've got seven. If it ends up that we do in fact have this additional room and we're going to be going over and playing actually with seating charts and the rest with CSIS in the next 10 days or so here, say, you know, say here's our seven definitely, here's our number, because you all know what that breakdown is.

And if we have the flexibility - and this may be something you all really want to push through and resolve on this call or have some individual one on ones offline, where, you know, we're not going to be able to expand your groups by another seven but I think your point, Steve, is well, if we can expand it by another two or three can we pull that off?

And I think that's something for you all to resolve. Again, I think from a space perspective we will be able to do that. You do have other considerations that Bill mentioned in terms of the value of the dialogue, the smaller group, the ability to accomplish certain things.

So I mean, I can't make that decision for you guys, you sort of have to do resolve but I'm more than happy to, you know, help declare consensus or find some middle ground that might work for you all because this is a unique instance where we actually lost one of the rooms on the conference level because, you know, one of the big wigs at CSIS had already arranged something.

And it gave us this unexpected opening on the second floor where it does seem to be a more commodious room there. So it would be cool if we could take advantage of that.

Rafik, you have had your hand up and then, Lori, your hand came up later so you can join in as well. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. How to say, so this to be a problem I think we, I mean, we are disadvantage here because to go to DC, so it's more convenient for our colleague in the CSG but it's not for us. And so we are trying here to do work. And this is, I think it's mainly - in many aspect it's about officers. So I don't really understand why there is a need to add other representative here.

Even I think you say it's two or three if it's cast constituency do that it's almost maybe we can go up tonight. Let's change the whole dynamics here. And so I'm quite concerned in this situation here because we cannot bring six or nine people to the meetings. So I'm really concerned here.

And we need to discuss more. I'm not really in favor that, you know, we go in that path because we need to keep some size that it's more manageable, we can discuss and we have I think some kind of procedural and process point we want to discuss about if it's become quite bigger group it will be really difficult to achieve something in the two days.

We are trying to bring people, for me it will almost - twice 24 hours of travel and so on. So we need to be kind of here to understand the situation. We are coming to your city so I hope that you understand we need to keep some balance so.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Rafik. Lori, you're next and then Jimson, you're in the queue. Oh it looks like we may have just lost - or I don't know if you took down your hand, Jimson. But I'll hold a spot to - on the line. Lori, you're next in the queue.

Jimson Olufuye: Hello, Rob. Can you hear me?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes I can. Is that Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yeah, this is Jimson.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I've got you right in the queue behind Lori. Lori, can you - are you on mute? Okay, I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Jimson, you go and then we'll see if Lori can get some audio. Could not hear you, Lori, no. So, Jimson, you and then we'll work on Lori's microphone.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you very much. This is Jimson. Two things, one, I actually agree with Rafik concerning the need to manage the meeting properly because discussing the high level issues so actually agree with him. But at the same time if it is still possibility that some members can be there but manageable (unintelligible) it could be allowed. So in that way as we have said (unintelligible) to say 9 or 10 I think (unintelligible).

Then, two, I want to find out whether you have (unintelligible) of the meeting rooms to avoid crosstalk - audio interferences and things like that. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Jimson. Yeah, I think that's something - and maybe, you know, the way to approach this at this stage is to note, I mean, there is clearly not a

consensus at the moment. There may be some, you know, opportunities as you look at the program agenda to potentially play with things in terms of who would be able to participate in what sessions and the rest.

So maybe the approach at this stage is to table the conversations about specific numbers because we don't have consensus to switch beyond the currently assigned groups and then see where the program discussion goes, to see where there might be some flexibility.

Because what you are suggesting, Jimson, is, you know, if there is some way to program this square one day, you know, Day 1 is devoted to general meetings and then the second day is devoted to breakouts or something different like that that there may be some opportunities to give a fulsome experience to folks who aren't community leaders or folks that you've identified as future community leaders who might nevertheless be interested in some of the issues that are being discussed and to give them an opportunity to, you know, be engaged in the conversations.

I think that's the best way to leave it at this point. I would observe that we still also have the - and my hope is that we will have robust remote participation capability so that might be able to ameliorate some of the concerns or, you know, some of the facts that some groups may, just because of the DC location, have more interested people who are bodies on the ground.

Lori, I wanted to give you an opportunity to see if we've gotten your microphone fixed and whether we can hear you. You want to give it a shot?

Yeah, still not. I guess, Benedetta, you'll try...

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, this is Benedetta. Lori it's just being dialed out to buy the operator so just give her a couple more moments shall be able to speak.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Okay great. As we do that, one of the things, and my apologies for going out late, it wasn't Benedetta's responsibility. I had email problems last night. She shared a copy of the program agenda from the January 2013 meeting. And we circulated that.

In the past I'd already circulated to you all that community wiki space for the meeting. And this was - I just pulled this directly from the wiki space for the meeting. Just to give you a flavor as to what you all did last time, that could be useful only to say we don't want to do that again.

I noted as I was going back and reading through some of the materials that the program agenda for the pilot intercessional meeting was heavily focused on staff interactions and you've all said you want to minimize those this time.

So looking back at the old agenda I figured it might inform you, it might give you some brainstorm or ideas. If it doesn't that's fine too. But I was just hoping that looking back it might spark some thoughts and ideas. So that's, you know, why I had Benedetta circulate that to all of you.

Lori, it sounds like you're back so if you want to try to provide your comments on the last item we were chatting about if possible?

Lori Schulman: Yeah, because I'm not sure, and I'm not following all the voices; it was hard for me to hear. But I believe it was Bill who asked for - if there could be a few extra and Steve and Rafik expressed concern. I think that's how I followed it.

But either way I was thinking would it make sense, you know, because we talked about this in the last - or the two calls ago that may be part of the agenda is more of an open type meeting where if there are people on the East Coast who want to come for a morning - and I realize it doesn't address the issue of representation from developing countries, and I wanted to ask a question about that too.

But generally maybe if there are interested parties that are part of the communities that are active that are in reasonable travel distance and would like to participate at some level maybe we open one of the mornings or open one of the afternoons. That was one of my suggestions. But I'm generally in favor of keeping balance if we can.

But my second concern - and I know it's kind of late but I'm just wondering because I've heard rumors about room nights and travel support and that there may be people being flown in for this meeting that are only staying for one or two nights, is that so? Because it doesn't seem fair to make people travel a really long distance like Rafik but then they're only here for a night or two.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, based upon - while I've gotten no travelers so I don't know if folks are maybe doing independently but I've gotten no names so there's no arrangements that have been made yet.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: All right, so I'm not sure why I heard that. Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Nor am I. I mean, folks may be planning, folks may be looking at gee, I want to spend a week or two weeks. Folks may be looking to do some things over the weekend, I don't know. At this stage, I mean, but we had budgeted for

again was based on the experience of the LA meeting where folks came in the night before the first day and folks were leaving later in the day on Day 2. So, you know, generally we were covering two nights.

I am aware that a number of people though because of the travel schedules, because of, you know, it's the East Coast US versus the West Coast US we may have some issues and some folks, you know, won't be able to spend the whole second day if they have to cut out and travels require them to leave at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

So white I have prepared, David Olive and others, from a budget variance perspective is to note that we may, in a number of cases, have to provide that Tuesday night as well. The advantage of not is that I know some of you are thinking about doing some of your own Wednesday programming. And that's an attendant benefit of the fact that some people have to stay an extra night. I don't have any problems with that.

So, yeah, no, we're not - there's no restrictions on that, at Lori. Bill had asked the question in the chat about, you know, balancing and well, could we bring more people from developing nations. The bottom line is you guys have your numbers pending further discussions about adding a couple. But, you know, right now you have your numbers and you're going to bring who you can bring.

So, you know, if an entire delegation is all from Asia and the average cost of those trips is higher than that's just something we're going to have to deal with as ICANN staff.

My whole goal throughout any of the resources that you all get provided is that you don't have to worry about nickel and diming the dollars. You know,

there is a resource, you've got a meeting. We've got a number of people who are coming and it's our job to figure out the budget to make it work.

I don't think we're going to be eating bread and water or saltines and water, I think will be covered there. But, yeah, let us worry about that piece. And otherwise the sooner I get the travelers in the better idea I will have in terms of flexibility on budget and other things.

Lori Schulman: I'll invite everybody for spaghetti, Rob, don't worry.

Rob Hoggarth: It will be potluck.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: We won't go to your house...

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: So I think we - thank you very much. And I appreciate everybody being very frank and candid about, you know, your challenges and desires in terms of the attendance and things like that.

If we can, I mean, let's leave it at the numbers where we are - or what you originally agreed to, the dates are what you originally agreed to for now. If we can for the next 30 minutes let's focus on the program. I'm particularly interested in may be hearing - and I see a lot of hands up and so I'm going to assume their new hands. Steve, you're first in line.

And I think you were the originator of the quarterly concepts during one of our previous calls so I'd really like to hear your thoughts about how that could be realized, what a some general potential blocks might look like. And what I'd really love to do is identify some specific topics that we brainstormed on before but haven't really gelled on anything. So, if you want to grab any part of those topics, Steve, please do so.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I'm glad to do that. I do support the quarters concept. I don't think the quarters necessarily have to be of equal lengths. And in particular the idea of spending the whole first morning in a general assembly may not be the best way to start.

Again I think there are - we need to have some time for breakouts whether it's of stakeholder group or constituency to, you know, to be decided. But - and then I think our plenary time comes in two flavors. One is the plenary time with a very minimal staff participation where we're really kind of discussing more the internal issues of the house.

And then if there are particular topics on which we want to have a dialogue with staff that's kind of a separate quarter in my view. And we should identify what those topics are and who the right staff people are to have them.

In terms of Fadi, I guess my thinking is we could either have the right at the beginning or we could have them right at the end. You know, we could start with him and kind of have that set the tone with a plenary session or we could have him come in on Tuesday afternoon after we've already had a number of discussions some of which might, you know, need to be presented to him, and have him then. I don't have a strong feeling either way on that.

But I do think if we can - if we can kick off with like a half the morning on Monday plenary and then start breaking out or else having our house meetings, that could be very useful. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Next in the queue I have Bill and then Rafik. And, Bill, I hope your connection is working this time. I like your saltines and (Durian) suggestion but...

Bill Drake: Hi, sorry about that. Can you hear me okay?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, sir.

Bill Drake: All right. Going back to both the participation and the program in an integrated way, we talked about the possibility of adding a day to take advantage of the location. I don't know if we are still talking about that or not, the possibility of having stakeholder groups meeting with (unintelligible), more inclusive meetings with groups that are available in the DC area on the Wednesday.

If indeed that happens I would think that that would be one way of doing this kind of broader more inclusive kind of discussion that Steve was talking about.

Second point is, from my perspective I think it would be useful, further to Steve's point, to have Fadi actually on the second day after groups have talked together and in their own - I mean, I'd like to see a configuration where we meet at the house, we meet at the stakeholder group level and we meet at the constituency level because each of those different groupings have somewhat different dynamics and concerns that they're going to want to share together and thought.

And if people have a chance to brainstorm and come together on specific sorts of points that they would like to raise with Fadi, having him come on the second day after we sort of done the preparatory I think might be more useful. If he comes on the first day he might be more tempted to give a kind of broader kind of overview which we really would - most of us would be sort of familiar with already.

And it wouldn't be as high value added in my view, as having a meeting where the IPC, the NCUC and everybody else has done some brainstorming together and identified a, you know, a set of bounded things that they really want to talk through with him. So my inclination would be to have him on the second day and hopefully make them available to groups meeting at different levels.

In terms of substantive questions that we might want to spend some time on, I mean, I don't know how much time we want to spend on house dynamics and business and ways of working together but I think that would certainly need to be personally my view at least one segment that we would have.

And then in terms of broader external discussions of like hot topics in our world where we would want to have some focused non-contracted discussion I would think that, you know, and we talked a little bit about this before, it would be useful to talk about the future of the GNSO environment given the changes on the contracted side.

I think it would be useful probably to have some discussion of the IANA stewardship issues and I think probably people would want to talk about accountability as well. So that's at least three segments I could see right there off the top of my head. You could add to that, you know, the EWG if you

wanted to get into that or whatever. So there's a number of things to do. So I've just thrown a whole bunch of things on the plate.

Again the main points were are we adding a day for outreach type of engagements with the wider community? Secondly, when to put the Fadi and how best to use the time with him. And third, how to organize the time.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Bill. Thank you. Those are all very helpful. The one thing that I would - that I can answer, and then I know to Rafik, your hand went down but I'll ask you in a second if you want to still make a comment there.

On the adding a day piece, I know a number of you have reached out to Chris Mondini to explore opportunities that you might utilize for later in the week. In terms of the arrangement that we - and I think, by the way, that's a very effective approach because when I look at what we've got in terms of available resources and the rest, the focus on this - of this group initially was the two-day meetings. And then we've got, you know, some extra stuff that we've got to figure out in terms of travel and pieces.

So if a number of you who have already started discussions with Chris can continue those, if there are some of you who haven't started any who would like to explore that, please reach out to him now because he's got some resources that he can use and contacts here that I think could be very helpful in terms of identifying another half-day program or something's that's a group of you might want to add on to for Wednesday morning here in DC.

And then have folks, you know, still, you know, you get the extra night because of the travel schedule and the flights on the intercessional meeting so

folks can hang around until 3 o'clock, 4 o'clock on Wednesday and take advantage of that by having a program or a meeting on Wednesday morning. So, I mean, I think that's one way to address that issue.

We did arrange because we were having some challenges with dates, some backup. And I had reached out and Chris had reached out to (Wylie Ryne) and they've got some meeting space that we could make use of on Wednesday morning. CSIS is completely booked, that's not an option.

Obviously we have the ICANN space here but, you know, that doesn't accommodate many folks. But (Wylie Ryne) does have some available space that we reserved that I'm going to lose in about a week or 10 days. So if some of you are thinking about that and have been talking with Chris then that might be a useful way to go.

That's the question I couldn't answer. Bill, I would look to the rest of the group to comment on the Fadi timing, which I by the way think would be great on Tuesday late. Or any other additional hot topics. Rafik, your hand went back up, I'll turn it over to you sir.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Okay. So first I want to kind of talk about let's say the issues that we want to discuss in the non-contracted party house in particular some procedural issues. I guess maybe we can start talking about working on them before the meeting so maybe we can then focus on other more may be substantially of policy related issues.

So this is something that just kind of - invitation to our colleague in the CSG if we can start talking like about the election and so one, more process and procedural, we can start working a kind of proposal. And then just when we are in DC we just kind of agree and then we can spend much more time and

do other substantially of issues. So this is to make the meeting may be more effective.

The other side, so if I understand this quarter idea so we will have kind of stakeholder group meeting and then non-contracted party meeting and then maybe meeting with ICANN staff and Fadi if I'm not mistaken here.

So is it possible just, Rob, if you can circulate this kind of plan or - so we can get something out lines that we can share because now we are talking, but at some level we need to write down stuff and then we can populate it and we can circulate with the group and getting more input so to avoid the situation that we are talking about the same issues in several times we are - and we are not really moving ahead so much. So yeah, and that's it.

I mean, I think for meeting with Fadi I guess, yeah, makes sense the second day, depends if we, I mean, the stakeholder groups can prepare or even the whole house we can prepare and then if we have questions or inquiries to Fadi it makes sense if it's in the second day.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Rafik. Some good comments there. And I like the offer of the opportunity to perhaps put together the first framework based upon what you've all agreed to of what the today's might look like simply as something for you all to react to and start messing up.

You know, it's easier to edit something then it is sometimes to create it so I'll take on that obligation and pull a lot of the input that you're providing on this call as well as from the previous call in terms of some of the brainstorms you came up with.

And just one quick note before I turn to Mr. Metalitz, whose hand is up and he's in the queue, is that yeah if you - whatever time you pick for Fadi, and, you know, again I'll put in my advertise, and I like that concept of the second day, I would block out like two or three hours just to give you all the opportunity particularly with what you might be coming up with prior to the meeting or during some of the conversations the first day and a half just to get a fulsome opportunity for a real useful dialogue.

Just, you know, what Bill and Steve and Tony and Rafik, what you all have mentioned in the past is just a brainstorms, you've got a, you know, a boatload of issues that could prompt some very I think useful conversation.

One last thing before turning to you, Steve, is that David Olive is also going to be in town so he's going to be available the second day. There are some other travel advantages we might want to take the opportunity to grab other staff who might be flying through DC or the rest.

Right now the Fadi and David are the primary ones. We might have Marika coming through on some other travel so she might be able to sit in and provide updates if people need those. So we will be able to supplement a little bit if there are particular issues. And otherwise, you know, we can handle things from a remote perspective as well.

Steve, your hand was up so you're next sir, please.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. This is Steve. Just wanted to respond to some of the suggestions that have been made. First, I'm fine with Fadi on Tuesday afternoon. I think that make sense for the reasons Bill stated.

Second, both Bill and Rafik talked about - well, Bill talked about the house dynamics and working together, Rafik talked about procedural issues and the elections and I certainly support Rafik's idea that let's see if we can get some of that work done before the meeting. But I think it would make sense to have at least a placeholder slot they are in our NCPH plenary that deals with, you know, elections and the work that we have to do together and trying to resolve some of that going into the future.

In terms of the substantive issues, those that Bill listed, I know there is some support and interest within IPC to have accountability be one of those issues. I think there's probably less interest in the voting our limited time to the stewardship transition issue.

The future GNSO environment, you know, we need to flush that out some more but, you know, that's potentially an issue. But I think in terms of substantive issues we should also be looking at a couple of other things and one I would suggest is the upcoming review of the new GNSO program.

I mean, this is something - it's a very busy work plan over the next year on this. And I think that as non-contracted parties we have some commonalities of interest; we're obviously not going to agree on everything. But we have some commonalities of interest in making sure that that process has adequate input from people other than registries and registrars.

So I would certainly suggest that is another topic that we should try to fit in there. And possibly there's a staff person that we should ask to have dialogue with, although I'm not 100% sure about that. But those would be my suggestions on substantial issues.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, and Steve, this is Rob. If I can clarify, you said, you know, next phase of GNSO, do you mean gTLDs?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, next phase of gTLDs.

Rob Hoggarth: Or were you talking - okay sorry.

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry if I misspoke, I meant the new gTLD review that is, you know, the AOC review and all the other reviews that were presented in the work plan in LA. So sorry if I misspoke on that. But I think we have a lot to work on together in terms of evaluating the current round of new gTLDs and planning for any future rounds.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Now would you all anticipate as part of that discussion, you mentioned potential staff input, if you did what level would you be looking for that? Would that be an Akram? Would that be a Karen Lentz? Would that be a Cyrus is based here in DC? Any thoughts there?

And right now I'm just asking for initial sort of instinct. I'm not, you know, having you make a commitment that just in terms of what you are thinking in your head there.

Steve Metalitz: I'm actually not sure. I'd have to go back and look that maybe at the Cyrus level that we have to think about, you know, as we focus more on some of these questions.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great. Thank you. I note that - and thank you for doing this, Bill, since you're having some audio issues. For those of you in the Adobe Connect room Bill has brainstormed a very basic potential breakout from a house SG constituency perspective. So for those of you in the Adobe Connect room,

Tony, Rudi, Rafik, Jimson, Bill, Steve and I think Lori as well, if you have any reaction to that please share them.

That's as good a stocking horse as any, Bill, in terms of an approach here. NIC that the additional element suggested here is potentially having Fadi do a session with each stakeholder group as opposed to a plenary session with the house. So that's you know, that's something I believe he did in Los Angeles that worked well so if that's something you guys would be up for that would be an approach to take.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think that's an interesting idea and I'd like to take that back to our folks. But I think the idea of having separate sessions at the stakeholder group level with Fadi might be a good one.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. All right great. I will throw open to Rudi or Tony or Jimson in terms of any brainstorms or recommendations in addition to perhaps what Steve, Bill and Rafik have shared. Lori, I see you've dropped out of Adobe Connect, I don't know if you're still on the line but that invitation is there for you as well in terms of just brainstorming of topics here.

So I'll just look for hands. Rudi, you're up next.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Rob. Well I think that most has been said and I can join the idea of the presentation of the two days that Bill just made in the chat room. It would indeed be good to have a session with Fadi where each stakeholder group has the possibility to discuss their specific topics with regards the position of the CEO and how the CEO sees the stakeholder group moving forward too.

Regards the breakout sessions, I think that each of us has to take that back to the group - to their own group and see what are the agenda they want to

explore. From NPOC side I know that we have some elements that we really want to discuss with our group.

We know that we can have some visitors to our meeting, that's clear. We are working now on a kind of invitation letter that we are going to send out. The point is that looking into the travel slots and timing, I checked yesterday to see quite are the flights that are still available. I think there is a kind of urgency in defining the date and time of these sessions so that we are able to schedule our travel. Maybe that's one of the critical things we cannot lose track of and we need to work on as soon as possible.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, Thank you. Some very good comments there particularly in terms of travel arrangements. I would assume that most out-of-towners would be looking to come into DC on Sunday, you know, and spend the night Sunday night, be ready to roll first thing Monday morning.

In terms of getting out, I know it depends on what region you come from but most, you know, flights to Europe and other points east and south tend to leave later in the day in so that might, you know, cause folks to say, well I'm going to leave Wednesday unless somebody needs to get out, you know, and there's some late-night flights, 7 o'clock, 8 o'clock at night before heading back to Europe. So that's something to look at.

One other quick observation, and we might flip a little bit, Bill, your suggestions in terms of the order of the meeting, if only from the perspective of your planning and for you guys to get back to - if there's the house meeting and we've got some limitations on, you know, who's coming based upon keeping everything even Steven here, then you would be looking as individual communities to invite other folks to participate with you in the breakouts.

And you probably do want to time those in a certain way. So, you know, bill suggestion of yeah having everybody show up on Date 1 at about 2 o'clock and just spending the rest of the day with the ICANN, you know, in the afternoon in DC and then potentially - and a lot of this will depend upon how much I'm burning from a travel/hotel nights and stays and stuff like that, but we could consider a reception on that Day 1 evening to sort of take advantage of the outreach and having, you know, additional participants in the stakeholder group and constituency meetings that afternoon.

That might make a nice block of programming there for people that Monday afternoon. And then on Tuesday morning Bill notes, okay, a certain two hour period with Fadi while another group does what? Well, that would be another two-hour block for the stakeholder to meet and that goes back to how do you all are developing your own internal agendas.

It looks like if you were to accept this general time parameters you'd be looking at about four hours worth of meetings from a stakeholder group perspective. And you'd be looking at, you know, two hours for a constituency meeting and you'd be looking probably somewhere around six hours of plenary time, you know, where there are common issues.

So I'll play around with that. But let me stop talking and turn it over to Jimson then Tony, then Rudi based upon my list here. Jimson. Jimson, I don't know if that's your mic or we're not connected. We'll check on Jimson's audio issues and go to you, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks Rob. You made most of the points I wanted to make which was about the broader engagement and the way the program is set out now then it's Monday afternoon and we'll need to confirm the Tuesday morning possibility as well. So certainly full support for those.

In terms of the issues, well, like others need to take those back and see how that fits but it's shaping up pretty well. The only other thing I'd urge, Rob, is that if we are going to have this broader engagement we really need to pick a program as soon as possible so we can let those people know. So any efforts that you can make to advance that and get agreement on it then thanks for that.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I will commit to getting out the straw man agenda to you while by the end of this week so then you have next week to resolve those issues, talk about them internally. I mean, you've got a general idea right now but to give people something in writing.

And then perhaps if we could then talk as a group one more time before US Thanksgiving, so perhaps the 24th or the 25th, to, you know, give some really good gelling to a program that you can all get behind recognizing that there might be some tweaks or twists. That would be consistent with what we did last - the last time for the pilot session. We agreed that we would have finalized agenda by early December. We were able to accomplish that and then we had some tweaks up until maybe two weeks before the meeting.

But what I intend to do as well that was very I think positive for the pilot program is Benedetta is already setting up the framework for the 2015 meeting wiki space, and we'll use that as a place for you to direct people to for information about attendees and the agenda and things like that.

So I'll get something out to all of you by close of business on Friday East Coast US time here and will make every effort to exceed that expectation so that you at least have the straw man to look at and, you know, share with people. And then we can have further dialogue online about that.

I will otherwise, you know, do a report on this meeting just to capture what we've confirmed for Elisa, Marilyn, some others who couldn't participate today.

Lori Schulman: Hey, Rob, it's Lori.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yeah, I just wanted to let you know I've been listening the whole time. My Adobe kept connecting and disconnecting so...

Rob Hoggarth: Any final point or ideas for brainstorm issues you'd like to share, Lori, before we...

Lori Schulman: No, just that I didn't see obviously what Bill typed but I think it's a great idea to send it out. I also think it's a really good idea to meet at least once maybe even twice before Thanksgiving. I just feel like we're still a little too unformed, that's my concern. And this is the first time I've been in a planning group like this so if this is the norm then I'll just roll with it but if not I would argue we would need more than one call before Thanksgiving.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great.

Lori Schulman: Because the American holidays, you know, but, I mean, the holidays are coming up, it's going to be very hard to get people because a lot of people take a good part of December and January off globally...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, you're definitely correct. This is something that we need to resolve and have together by, you know, early December; it just can't go past that for some of the promotions and other things you guys want to do.

Jimson you're...

Lori Schulman: I also just - also I just wanted to add, because I think Steve had added about there might be other substantive issues and I would chime in that the review of the new gTLD program would definitely be something NPOC would be behind simply because we heard so much in LA about groups particularly in developing countries who felt left out of the last round for a variety of reasons and many of those had impacts on NGOs.

And so I think it's certainly something that from an operational concern in terms of NPOC that NPOC would certainly be interested in discussing and particularly getting the input of the business side of the house.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thank you. Well, I'll look for some, in the spirit of your point, Lori, about getting consensus on an agenda. I look for some immediate email responses with respect to the program and any reactions where folks say yes we really need to talk versus being able to dialogue on email.

It's been somewhat challenging given everybody's schedules this fall to get you altogether for a particular call so I don't want to push our luck there but if you all commit to more active email dialogue I'm sure we can resolve things that way as well.

Jimson was cut off, he's back on. Jimson, I'll give you the opportunity for the final word.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you, Rob. Well I just wanted to underscore the points raised in the topics for discussion. I will not mind feedback concerning IANA, their progress so far and the ICANN global engagement efforts and especially with regard (unintelligible) outside the US.

Also, some feedback from the plenipot concerning what affects ICANN or the relevance of that to ICANN, for those that (unintelligible) I would not mind that in general the conference.

Then also to inform all that this we will be having an outreach on the Wednesday to reach out to the (business) community in the area. So thank you so much, Rob and everyone.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, Jimson. Thanks, everybody, for participating. I'll get out my strawman is and consensus capture to all of you here shortly and we'll look forward to talking again very soon. Thank you all.

Bill Drake: Rob, can I just...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Bill.

Bill Drake: ...before you hang up can I just ask you - I asked you a question in the chat that you didn't see.

Rob Hoggarth: I will - yeah, thank you. That's why I said US Thanksgiving.

Bill Drake: No-no, above. I just asked do you know what hotel you'd put people in the of we're flying in people from developing countries, some of them might want to come earlier then NCUC would have to pay out-of-pocket maybe for them to

stay an extra day and I'm just curious if you know, you're not going to put us in a - one of these ICANN \$400 a night hotels.

Rob Hoggarth: We are - the CSIS building is an interesting location where it butts up against a residential neighborhood so there are a number of smaller hotels. Our meetings team is currently in negotiation with a variety of them. We are looking to be as close as what the costs were in LA which is of course impossible. But, you know, it's probably going to be the lowest we can achieve will be around \$280 a night.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: But, Stacy is negotiating heavily.

Bill Drake: All right, so in the area is the point. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Correct. Yeah, we're trying to do - we're literally trying to do things, you know, within three or four blocks of the CSIS building and a so that eliminates the \$400 a night JW Marriott but it does include the Mayflower but we cross them off the list right away.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: All right thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. Bye.

Lori Schulman: Bye all.

Rob Hoggarth: Bye-bye.

END