ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
October 10, 2016
1:00 pm CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Good morning, good afternoon good evening welcome to the NPOC Charter Review call on Monday, 10th of October 2016. On the call today we have Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Joan Kerr, Klaus Stoll, Poncelet Illeleji, Tapani Tarvainen.

And from staff we have Benedetta Rossi and 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 Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much again Maryam. So I think while I don't have too many things to say only I would like to start the whole thing up with the kind of proposal which I would like to run by this group and see if that is approved by you. I don't think it makes sense now to go through the charter line by line and say okay let's change this like I like this I don't like this. Instead of that I think we should have a clear timetable and we also should have a clear way of procedure forward.

That you will have seen I send out a timetable to you all. And I know it's a very ambitious timetable but I think it's a timetable which we should aspire to and at least have it as a guideline. And - but what I find most interesting the most important point which how we actually procedurally go through this charter with you. As I said I don't think it would be a good idea to (IRA) but I don't think it's a good idea now to go line by line by the charter.

Instead over the weekend I worked on a little small document basically the NPOC Charter Review 2016, 2017. And I gave three very important base documents. So the first document was of course the NPOC charter. As we are part and under the NCSG of course we have to keep in mind and always be aware about the content of the NCSG charter which I by the way if you read it, it is to a certain extent actually very helpful.

And also as we just finished our revision of the NPOC and perhaps the NPOC base document available and there are some things which we are clearly need for the NPOC charter we feel while a new NPOC charter I really thought it might be a good idea to add it. Are there any more comments with regards to the records documents which other reference documents we would like to have added for our considerations into the process and what documents you think is absolutely vital and essential that we take them into the account for the process? Are there any other documents or comments? Poncelet please.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes. Good late afternoon now, Poncelet speaking for the record. I think and Klaus all the documents you've sent so far really feed into what we want to do within the charter review. So my suggestion would be we should get into the real gist of the matter in the particular items you want us to look at in regards to this NPOC Charter Version 2.0. And so we start looking at it prior to the final presentation of the draft during the NPOC considered in Hyderabad. So

it will be better we just start with just go into point us to key points you want to think about. I think that would help everybody to look ahead. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: NPOC - Poncelet thank you very much for your enthusiasm. I'm sorry I have to completely disagree with you. And you have to bear with me for another five to seven minutes because there are a lot of people on the call who would like to know the process. And the process is not clear. And it's not agreed as a group it just comes out of my feeble mind and things like that. So at least I would like to have a chance to one present the process and to get your approval or agreement before we move ahead into these substantial matters. But I think we need our - to give ourselves these five to seven minutes just to go through the process.

Sam your hand is up. Unmute Sam you were unmuted. Sam can you speak or what's the situation there at the moment? I can't - Sam I'm sorry you won't get through…

Sam Lanfranco: No I'm having trouble.

Klaus Stoll: No now you're okay Sam. Thank you.

Sam Lanfranco: I'm…

Klaus Stoll: Yes Sam, we can hear you.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay I'll know. I said go ahead and do what you're going to do. I wanted to come back to one of the items in the charter itself so I'll wait.

Klaus Stoll: Yes. That's wait five to seven minutes please. Be patient good people of NPOC and (field). Okay what I proposed was to have a kind of template in

which we basically put our issues the age issue is defined in the clear template. And the template as it looks at the moment and feel free to suggest changes to the template is basically to give the issue a title to give the relevant existing NPOC charter take if there is any and also refer to the relevant existing NCSG charter if there is any. Then to describe reissue what is a problem why do we think there needs to be addition changes or whatever. Then to actually propose the language we in which that issue should be addressed in the charter.

After that one basically we should keep it open for everybody to comment on that point before. And then at the end when we finish that discussion and analyze that discussion to results to actually come to the proposed charter language the result new NCSG charter language which I think and assume that we also will need some legal advice and support to just to get the language right. So the question here is now do you approve to that kind - the use of the template to identify the issue, to discuss the issues and to get the language drafted? Is there - are there any comments? Are there any additions or do you propose a completely different process? Joan you're up.

Joan Kerr: Hi Klaus, thank you. Can you hear me okay?

Klaus Stoll: Yes fine, thank you.

Joan Kerr: That's great. Hello everyone. So I like the go forward work plan in quotation and templating, you know, I like that kind of stuff. The question is who decides what is the relevant issue? Is it - are you asking the ExComm or will that be a membership engagement question?

Klaus Stoll: I think to and to give you my personal answer is I think it goes to the complete NPOC membership and beyond. We are part of the NCSG. And I think that in

part an important input also should come from the NCSG side. And that's why I want to keep that at least at the beginning as open as possible to spread it as widely as possible but is that the final decision itself stays with the NPOC membership and with the NPOC Executive Committee. The finally draft the proposal which will go to the board after the NPOC from everybody after the input from staff and from the planning decision will be made by NPOC itself. But I think it's important that we have as many - yes Tapani you're right yes, yes.

Okay I wrote that Sunday - Friday night. Okay so it's changed the results to new NPOC charter language in 1.6. But that's basically how I thought what might be the way. I really want that to have as not as a sectarian exercise where we decide how NPOC should look like but also where those from outside can give input. And I think especially that input from the NCSG because it's vital. And I think that we have to also explain to our members and explain to everybody involved that we are doing this as NPOC as part of the NCSG and not so standing initiative. Joan, again please.

Joan Kerr: Okay thanks Klaus, it's Joan for the record. And so in looking if we're going to the broader community which I agree with I think that those timelines are a little bit tight then if we're going to go to them. I think if we want substantial that we should be a little bit more respectable on the timeline so that people one, you know, how people they're busy and everybody else is reviewing their charters as well so to give them time. Now (unintelligible) that we have to have this done at a certain time but I just think that it's a bit restrictive at the moment if we're going to the larger community in order for us to collect the information and synthesize them and review them. So I just want to say that.

Klaus Stoll: Yes Joan I recognize that. And I think the English word for the timeline is aspirational. On the other hand I think it's very important that we have an

aspirational timeline is to make clear that what we can't have that process going on forever and ever and ever because this is really a process which is tempting everybody to spend forever on it.

And I think the way the process is designed through the template allows us to have one, or two, or three, or five, or ten issues discussed and other issues coming in later or being added later and things like that. So - and things can be debated on different levels in time.

So for example an issue just can be introduced whilst other issues are basically already on the resolve. So what I'm trying to say here and answer to you is let's try to keep the aspirational timeline but being clear that it will probably have to be changed but let's keep it there just for the moment if that's okay with you. Any more comments? Joan you have your hand up. Is that an old one? Okay Joan you're back again. Do you want to speak?

Joan Kerr: Yes. Sorry I just, you know, I have to say that I disagree with the timeline if we're going to have a broader involvement and only because I do believe in timelines, and goal setting and all of that. But I also believe that if you put it too restrictive for example I'm looking at it and I'm thinking if I was reading that from - I always read things from an end user point of view as you know.

I look at and I'm thinking oh I'm not going to be involved with that that's, you know, it's too tight for me to debate my point. I always think that to be able to one inform them about it, two engage them and three receive those - I mean people just don't necessarily respond. And I'm just thinking that it just seems yes you have to have a document that you have a timeline to but I think it just sounds too restrictive at the moment the way it stands. That's just my opinion.

Klaus Stoll: Okay. So we have a competing set of opinions. So what I would call on the rest of the participants is there anybody else who has an opinion on the timeline? Going once, going twice going the third time. Okay if nobody has an opinion on that so Joan I would advise you to have a look at that timetable and the timeline again and to actually propose an alternative timeline. Is that okay with you? So then we can look at the alternative timeline at our next call next week. Joan, can you indicate if you okay with that?

Joan Kerr: Sure. I'll suggest something but it would mean that he would have to respond and agree or disagree. So I'll be happy to do that but my chat doesn't work by the way so, you know, I respond in the chat so…

Klaus Stoll: No Joan all we need is your suggestions for an alternative timeline and we discuss it with everybody at the next meeting next week. Nothing special just saying okay I find that realistic or not realistic. And then we had something actually to decide on the call next week. Okay any further comments on this one?

Okay. Then I have one more question and then we can go really into the subject areas and the real issue is about the leadership of about the leadership of the charter review. Is there anybody who really would like to assume the leadership and the responsibility for managing the process (rapping) people, reminding people, telling people to get their work done to move on?

Is there somebody who really would like to volunteer to take the task of to be the team leader on this charter review, or would you like me to try and steer the process a little bit or do you really want to go on a completely how to say that democratic is the wrong way let a fair approach that we just amble along with taking particular (unintelligible). Carlos, you want to speak don't you?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you Klaus. This is Carlos. There is some background noise but a suggestion in terms of the team leader I think it's very important that the team leader is somebody who is participant in the discussion of the SO, AC accountability. I know there is no direct relation between this revision and what's happening there but it is very good to have somebody who can tell us what's happening there.

There is so many things going on accountability. And particularly the discussion of SO's accountability which I'm not following because I'm in other groups I think should bring some feedback. So if somebody is there I would strongly suggest that, that person would be very suitable for the leadership. Thank you, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Carlos I think that was a very, very good idea but let me suggest in case we don't find somebody who's actually embedded into the accountability working group that at least we can get somebody as a liaison or somebody could regularly report from that group to us which necessarily doesn't have to be a NPOC member. I think that would be one of the options or solutions in case we don't ourselves don't have anybody. But thank you very much for that very useful and constructive comment, Poncelet please?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes hello again, Poncelet speaking for the record. I've already (unintelligible) that I will volunteer to lead the process. You know, and then I follow although I'm not within the accountability working group what I follow what goes on there. And I think it's also rightful if I'm meeting the policy committee for NPOC that I do that.

And I've seen also within the charter. Maryam has said she will help me do reminders and also Sam. So I think I will move it. I just want to say I'm committed to doing it. And I think it's within my mandates as within on the

policy framework in such reviews that I should be highly involved on that so you can count on me leading this process. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Poncelet. I have absolutely no objections to that under only one condition I would make there. But we have to - this is not a decision this is just a comment from me before we put it to the decision to the whole group. But Poncelet I would only really suggest this if you give me the right (unintelligible) as NPOC chair from time to time to crack the whip and say get on with it. And I don't mean you alone but everybody else involved. Is that okay with you? Can you live with that?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes. I can live with that Klaus definitely. I mean your inputs definitely matter not only as our current chair but in the interest of institutional memory there are few people with an NPOC that have institutional memory in the current executives and you are one of those so it's always good to pick your brain and definitely I will be doing that - and to get your comments and stuff like that.

And then one thing I will also say I'm happy Tapani is on this call. Within our charter we have to also strongly emphasize that when we look at the overall NCSG and charter that everything we are doing goes in line with that because it also creates a good synergy. And those of the things I will try to and be working on in this and revised charters so that we are all in sync and it makes us stronger in our deliberations as we go ahead. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay. Thank you very much Poncelet. Sorry you understood me - misunderstood me a little bit. I really want to make sure as the chair that, that process is going not quickly or rashly but is moving forward. What I ask you permission for is that from time to time as I feel that the process is lacking a little bit of speed or whatever or substance that I come in and say get on with it. That's what I was talking about. Okay…

Poncelet Illeleji: Thank you Klaus for the clarification. Thank you sorry I missed…

Klaus Stoll: Okay. But you're okay with that - are you okay with that one?

Poncelet Illeleji: I'm okay. I'm okay with that…

Klaus Stoll: Okay.

Poncelet Illeleji: …Poncelet for the record. I'm very okay with that. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, Joan please?

Joan Kerr: Well I just want to say that I really want to be on that team because I really want to contribute to the charter. That's all I wanted to say and to work with Poncelet and (unintelligible) to - and that's all I want to say.

Klaus Stoll: Okay fine. Can I just ask anybody who has any objections that Poncelet becomes an official team leader of the NPOC Charter Review 2016, 2017 is and have any objections or wants to put himself forward please do so in the next ten seconds. Three, two, one Poncelet you talked yourself into a hell of a lot of work. Congratulations. Okay Poncelet from now on as you are the team leader I'm very happy to move over the meeting chair to you and please at least keep us - keep us get us going.

Poncelet Illeleji: Oh okay. Okay does it start today Poncelet speaking for the record or it start from the next meeting?

Klaus Stoll: From now you just got elected.

Poncelet Illeleji: Okay.

Klaus Stoll: If you want me to move on a little bit with the template and the issue…

Poncelet Illeleji: Move on with the template. And I kickoff from the next meeting since you - I just got elected to the as the - finish the process from today and for next week and I pick it up. Is that fair enough?

Klaus Stoll: Okay. That's fair enough yes. But you know the next meeting is next week Monday same time same place yes?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes I know that. I know that all dates are noted.

Klaus Stoll: Okay.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: Okay. So what I tried to do is now I talked about the template I tried to actually fill out with the help of Sam's brilliant email some of the issues. And you see basically what I did there is to say give the issue title NPOC mission aspect number one. The relevant NPOC charter text I know it's boring but it's very good to know that and to always refer back to existing NCSG architect, then to describe the issue in 1.3, then to basically propose a proposal charter language basically saying what should be in the charter.

And now these things should be on a public (unintelligible) basically a Google Docs so that everybody can come in and can actually make comment and these things can be discussed also in the different forms that we provide.

So Poncelet for example you have to decide if you want to set up a specific discussion group for the charter review which might make sense. So if that's the case please get in touch with Maryam. So what my idea was is basically to collect all of the different issues we are having in this kind of template and work ourselves through this template so that basically I actually was hopeful that by Hyderabad we've got a few issues not perfectly described and worked out but that we have some issues which we basically can also then start discussing in Hyderabad at the constituency day and beyond and actually move that process and forward a little bit more face to face. In that case we have to clip in Poncelet remotely but I think that will be manageable.

The other thing is with regard I want to tell you from the previous SO, AC call it looks like that they split of the constituency day will stay so there will be two half constituency days on two different days and that the other house basically are built up mostly with high interest topics. But some of the interest high interest topics might be of high interest to others but others are more very, very high interest to us. So maybe we can actually clip two, or three or four hours from other meetings in the afternoon or whatever to have more constituency talks. So what is now the point before I move to the other point is Maryam this text is now already at the - at a Google doc is it?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Klaus. Yes that's correct. I've got that in the Web link to the right of the AC chat sorry AC screen. And then also in the chat box as well.

Klaus Stoll: Okay. Could you also send please link basically to NPOC discuss telling everybody that the document so that the membership also (unintelligible). What I would like to do now for the remainder of this call is to first talk to and invite the staff Benedetta and Robert to say if they have any comments to what they heard and basically how they feel they can record the whole charter

process so that we are also clear what's available from the capable ICANN staff.

And the remainder of the time then actually already verbally start talking all about some of the main issues people feel are burning issues. But nevertheless I think the important point now is that people go back and go into that document and actually filling out the templates ultimately creating the new templates for their issue and start working it or some it's working on the template are already filled out data on this email which is very wordy. But maybe condense it a little bit and make it a little bit more precise. I hope that is okay with it. So who do I put on the spot now first, Robert or Benedetta, who's volunteering?

Robert Hoggarth: We jabbered Klaus and agreed I'd go first and then Benedetta would correct all of the mistakes that I make.

Klaus Stoll: Yes that sounds like the right - that sounds like the right (unintelligible).

Robert Hoggarth: I'll take the first crack. First thanks very much for inviting Benedetta and me to participate or listen in today it's very helpful particularly given that this is a two part process for staff to be aware and knowing generally what you all are up to. The two steps to the process are first all of you working together to reach agreement on how you want to update, amend or otherwise change your governing document.

And then the second step is for the board to give its blessing in its overall oversight role in the ICANN bylaws. And staff plays a role in certainly coordinating that board review. So it's very helpful for us to understand where you are, what your timing concerns are and when you plan to finish your work?

I think your question Klaus focuses on perhaps how we can help in the first part of the process and that is your deliberations. And the overall message that I wanted to share with you was that we are happy to help in whatever way shape or form you find of value to help you all reach consensus on identifying where the areas for change are and what those changes ultimately prove to be. That role can be handled in a number of different ways.

You've already mentioned how Maryam is supporting you in terms of getting you together for the calls, posting Google Doc opportunities for people to edit and play with so there's that administrative, logistical organizational role that Maryam plays.

The role where Benedetta, myself and others can help is in your work Poncelet going forward in terms of how you want to conduct your deliberations and conversations. If you all proceed with your Google Doc approach there's probably less for us to do then what other communities have asked our support on. You're taking a different approach than other groups have which is perfectly fine and seems to be consistent with your work style and approach to things.

And so I mean if they're individual areas of advice that we can provide, if there are examples that you would like to share or have us share about what other groups have done, how they might have drafted up certain provisions we're more than happy to play that role. What Benedetta -- and I'll let her speak to this -- has been asked to do for the registrars is slightly different.

The two most recent groups that we have supported the Business Constituency and the Registrar Stakeholder Group the approach they've taken is much more of a step by step one where they basically say okay we're looking at our entire

charter. And we're going to go through it line by line section by section. And that's the way they've approached it. What they've asked us to do and Benedetta is playing this role is she just helps organize the calls, makes changes to the overall document language and then circles back and shares that with the committee, working group, drafting team whatever you're going to call yourselves going forward.

And so it's a fairly hands on role in which staff helps to facilitate the discussions under the guidance of a chair and where after each call on a week by week basis edits are made through a central documents that then people review prior to the next call and then things move on in that respect. So again we're happy to take on any role that you all think would be of value. In particular Poncelet it may be a conversation that you want to have independently with Benedetta with the overall guidance of your executive team so that you are all comfortable.

But again we'll - we can play a facilitative role, advisory role or any other role that you would like us to play. Benedetta, do you want to expand on that in any way or correct anything that I've said yet to be more practical in terms of your involvement?

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you Rob. This is Benedetta for the transcript. Just one quick clarification so what Rob was saying in terms of my role for example with the registrars and what previous staff has done with the Business Constituency was basically to play the pen holder role on every meeting or call and that's proven to be particularly effective since what other community members found particularly challenging during the process was gathering all of the comment, was also obviously figuring out what the issues were and looking at the documents and tracking all the changes.

And so that's where they found that staff support was to be effective since - basically what I'm doing with registrars is just I listen to the discussions and take notes and then track all of these changes onto the document. Nobody else is actually touching the document it's just me. And then I present it to the drafting team on the following call and then they accept or continue to deliberate on specific items.

And the feedback that we've been getting so far was that it's helpful to not have to look at a document from a community perspective, and also draft all the language, and make all the changes, and keep track of everyone's input all at the same time with limited time.

And that's where obviously staff is available if you want to go down that road. But that is a more of a line by line hands on approach which it appears that is not something that you're considering at the moment. But anyway whatever level of support you deem necessary obviously we're here ready for you.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much Robert. Thank you very much Benedetta. Of course if you decide now if we decide now as a group but Poncelet you have to move that process. If you want to go away from the template approach to approach which Benedetta described this is perfectly possible. I just wanted to give a systematic way into the discussion. So next is Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you Klaus. Can you hear me?

Klaus Stoll: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. I'd like to see us consider a two stage process here. One where we begin with the template that you suggested so we can zero in on what are our key issues and kind of hammer out those and then move over to a line by line

run through of the charter so that we're reviewing everything in the charter. And when we get to those issues we've already pretty much sorted out what we're going to do and it's just a question of getting the wording right. So I'd like to see it as a kind of two stage process starting with yours and ending with the one that was just presented.

Klaus Stoll: Sounds reasonable to me. Poncelet?

Poncelet Illeleji: Speaking for the record I will – I want to - and those that was I about saying. And thanks Robert and Benedetta for providing us insights on what has been happening with other groups. And I think definitely will need ICANN staff support. And I think we should just tell our template what is happening we discuss key issues that members want to wage within the charter.

Then after that I think Benedetta I like the ones who want to take that prep up and taking whereby you can go through line by line and then add up and whatever (unintelligible) is going to be taking. So it goes in line with what ICANN has been doing for other constituencies not that we are trying to invent the wheel. But I think within this (unintelligible) using the template that you'll be whereby we have a time a specific timeline that all the consents people raise all the add-ons and stuff like that.

And members of NPOC can look at them. And then after that we go into the line by line and we get the work done. So thanks a lot for what staff want to help us in doing this and any other specific recommendations that (unintelligible) might want us to look into Robert and Benedetta I will be very grateful since and perhaps our next meeting. Thanks.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much. Just before we go really into the issues I would like Tapani sorry I put you on the spot. But could you tell us a little bit how you -

what from what you heard if that's okay with you? But also in particular how you see the relationship because I think that it's vital between the NCSG charter and the NPOC review? And how you think the NCSG should relate to our ongoing review. Thank you very much Tapani for the point of view?

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Klaus. And first in general the plan sounds reasonable enough to me. We are doing just about the right way although well the schedule is optimistic but maybe it should be. As for the NCSG (unintelligible) part of NCSG and their charter should be comfortable with a NCSG charter.

And also we are planning to do that constituency review, the NCSG charter obligated to do every two years or as unless decided otherwise. And in that context it would be very useful if you look at the what the NCSG charter says about what we are going to ask you in that then and make sure that the charter will work in that context. And that's some specific requirements that were quite area for constituencies set out in NCSG Charter.

My (unintelligible) okay, we are actually planning to send out a questionnaire to the constituencies listing these questions. Please check the (still) for these and explain if you don't. So take a look at those and see how they fit with this - your charter review as well.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes that's about it. Go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Tapani. Just one question I would like to - or one regard I would like to have Tapani. I don't think it's necessary that somebody from the NCSG will be all in the time in our deliberations but it would be nice to have as much participation and observation from your part and other people in the

discussion so that when we stray and do other things that you actually can put us back on the right track. Just make sure that the NCSG knows that they are welcome to participate in the process. Okay Poncelet please?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes Poncelet speaking. I think I'll like to see - Poncelet speaking for the record, sorry. I'd like to see Tapani be (unintelligible) question out there you want to send within the NCSG if you can share that with us. And did you use Survey Monkey or you use some Internet process that ICANN provided you to create that form which I presume it's online? Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay finally, finally after 45 minutes -- and yes I lied, it didn't take seven minutes -- we are at the issues. So we have - the first thing I would like to mention there is that Maryam actually worked with our charter for quite a while. And I asked Maryam when she's got time actually to start filling out some of the templates with the issues she found where there are contradictions or omissions in the charter or something like that.

Maryam sorry that I put you on the spot. I seem to be making a habit out of this this evening. Can you just give a few comments, nothing specific now on your observations and how you want to put your observations into the process of this review because I think as somebody who works closets with their charter you're input will be really quite valuable.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Klaus. Thanks. As I pointed out to you I think when we're reported on the base document was the part of the program communique which was not in the chatter at all but it was part of the work - so it was one of the committees we had. And so that was definitely one of the issues that stands out to me.

And then I also - I have a document that is prepared with some of the inconsistencies I've found and I'll be adding that to the issue template you sent to me. So that should be ready by tonight tomorrow morning yes.

Klaus Stoll: Okay that's wonderful. I think that's extremely useful for us to have and also as a start. So we have an option now. And is there anybody now who really has an issue he wants to bring up here and now and thinks we should discuss? Okay Poncelet please?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes Poncelet...

((Crosstalk))

Poncelet Illeleji: ...for the record.

Klaus Stoll: Get ready to raise your issues.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes and Poncelet speaking for the records again. (May) and (Paul)...

Klaus Stoll: Thanks.

Poncelet Illeleji: ...the work you've done so far I just wanted to ask the way we have gone through this process because you have really helped us a lot whether there are any issues with the current proposals and if you want us within NPOC to improve on anything. I know Tapani raised the issue of about us being realistic within our timeline what the (impression is). You have worked with us over time and you know definitely about working partners and stuff like that so, if there will be any advice you want to give on that. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay before we go on welcome (Qual Manual). Okay we are at the point of issues. Who wants to raise some issues? Everybody at least one issue. We've got 12 minutes to go for this call and I want to hear at least one issue from each one of you. Who's volunteering? Okay, Sam is going first. Sam unmute, de-mute, (unintelligible) mute. Ah, yes you were unmuted and then you went mute again.

                Okay ladies first. Joan, and then Joan go ahead. What did I do? Everybody's silent now. I'll (unintelligible) it again.

Man: We can hear you Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Yes but Joan can't hear me and Sam can't unmute. It's either it's Acrobat or my account has my (unintelligible). Sam I heard you.

Sam Lanfranco: Oh can you hear me now?

Klaus Stoll: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay yes. No, there's something going wrong between here and there. Mine goes unmute. Okay the issue I'd like to raise and it comes out in the differences in the wording between SD charter and our charter but it does - oh, it goes deeper than that is that our charter has the phrase progressional organizations. And the - and one of the concerns is whether a professional organization represents commercial interest or professional interest like a group of lawyers or represents members who themselves who are not for profit or non-commercial.

                There's a confusion there that we need to talk about because you have some organizations that are social organizations but their members are all business

people whether they're a chamber of commerce or a rotary club or a professional association of lawyers that has a - their association has an education and a social mission. Also there's the move towards social business.

And my concern is that there's a - there may be a constituency that is interested in what we're interested in and it has a home nowhere inside ICANN. I think it belongs in NCSG or in NPOC and NCSG but there's an area there that I will cultivate and bring the evidence to bear and so that - so it's this area of membership for professional organizations and organizations that are being pushed from being an NGO to being a social business and I'll leave it at that.

Klaus Stoll: I just would - Sam thank you very much for raising this issue. And Tapani is already starting a very, very nice conversation and a very valuable conversation on that one. And that in my opinion demonstrates also how our relationship to we have to consider our relationship to the NCSG because the NCSG charter has some very, very clear language on that one and so everything we do needs to be coordinated and put in at least discussed with the NCSG. Joan you're up. I trust that you work on the template.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you. It's Joan (unintelligible). Can you hear me?

Klaus Stoll: Yes. Joan we can't hear you now. One, two, three, Poncelet please. Joan we'll come back to you later.

Poncelet Illeleji: Poncelet speaking for the record. I just want to mention as...

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me?

Poncelet Illeleji: ...one of these...

Klaus Stoll: Yes, now we can hear you.

Poncelet Illeleji: Okay, I will stop. I'll allow you answer Joan because she was in here before
                      me.

Klaus Stoll: Joan please.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Hello?

Man: Wow.

Klaus Stoll: Joan? Joan and you - we just can't hear you and I'm sorry I'm going back to
                      Poncelet. Okay.

Poncelet Illeleji: Okay Poncelet speaking. Can I carry on for the record?

Klaus Stoll: Yes please.

Poncelet Illeleji: Okay. Yes I just want us to look into as we are (of) rounding up people should
                      look into the issue of in terms of the global geos and then what - and physical
                      they were one of the reasons NPOC was set up, what is - yes they have the
                      avenues that they go through to pursue their ICANN engagements.

                      But we should look into how directly and they're going to the GNSO as we are
                      rightly stated within our issue cycle.

But we should all look at how we can get them to directly be involved in NPOC issues and what way also ICANN can support this engagement process. I think it is very key in us moving our (height) with our charter. So I just said we should - I - prior to our next meeting people should reflect on that and look at that in making comments. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much. Joan can you try?

Joan Kerr: Hello? Yes. Can you hear me now?

Klaus Stoll: Yes we can hear you now.

Joan Kerr: Hello?

Klaus Stoll: Yes. Yes. Joan you have to unmute okay? Joan? We have you twice by the way. We have Joan Kerr. We have Joan Kerr II your twin sister. Hi Joan. I can hear something rattling.

Okay I'm - your hand is up but I can't hear you talking. Is there anybody else who would like to raise an issue they would for the charter review which say - which is burning for them? Okay in that case Joan, last chance to talk. Okay ladies and gentlemen is there any other business? Is there anybody who would like to raise something?

In that case I would like to mention that on Wednesday we have at NPOC Executive Committee with staff which I guess we will see Robert and Benedetta again. And I'm really, really looking forward to it. If you've seen what Benedetta sent in the PowerPoint presentation thinks that there is really some valuable stuff we should discuss. This is another then in the line to - a

line discussion and I think that will be extremely beneficial for NPOC. So I know it's a lot of calls but I think the Wednesday call is a particular valuable one. So if there's - and with regards to the charter so Poncelet from now on it's your baby and I just ask everybody...

Joan Kerr: Hello? Can you hear me?

Klaus Stoll: ...at least spend the week before - yes now - yes please? Yes? Joan I'm sorry. Okay so please feel free to go to the charter with your working document on Google Docs and I will try to raise the issues I think are important. So let's move on with that one. Robert could you have a look in your private chat? I'm just trying to connect with you.

Robert Hoggarth: Certainly so...

Klaus Stoll: Is there any other - okay, is there any other business? So thank you very much. We kept within the hour. I think we're absolutely clear about the process. Thank you for Poncelet for participating. Thank you for staff for participating, Tapani in particular. I know you've got a lot of other things to do. There's Poncelet wants to raise to say something.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes I just want to emphasize Poncelet speaking for the record that colleagues in NPOC please go through these documents especially during the weekend so we get something going by the next meeting. Thanks all for the support and me spearheading this movement (unintelligible) supporting me to do this. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay thank you very much everybody. Bye-bye. Sorry Joan but it doesn't work it doesn't work. Bye.

Poncelet Illeleji: Bye to all. Bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone for attending the meeting. Please you may now stop recording. Thank you for your support today. Bye.

END