

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
July 28, 2017
11:00 am CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Jizzy. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG ExCom call on Friday 28th of July 2017. On the call today we have Joan Kerr, Robin Gross, Tapani Tarvainen. On the phone bridge we have Monika Zalnierute and from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and also please mute your line if you're not speaking. Thank you very much and over to you, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Maryam. So this is Tapani speaking. We have a fair amount of - a long agenda today, so let's try to cover it quickly and move on to the membership applications without further delay. I hope you had time to review them in advance so that we don't need to spend too much time. Starting with the individual new applicants, I hope you have either - okay, Robin, I see you want to speak. Please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes. Thanks, Tapani. Can you hear me okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Robin Gross: Okay, great.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I can hear you, Robin.

Robin Gross: I just had a question. Thanks. Yes. I just had a question about this process because I started to go through the organizational membership applications and type in my votes and then I click save at the bottom and nothing seemed to have saved. So just wondering if I was doing something wrong, or if maybe there's a glitch in the system or if - you know, I just - can let me know how that's supposed to work, I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin. I think that's indeed a glitch in the system and we'll try to solve it at some - as soon as possible. I don't know exactly what's wrong. But thank you for trying and thank you for the report. That seems maybe different in the organizational applicants or something. But anyway, that's a glitch. We'll work - working on it, but for now we'll have to just make do with what we can on the call.

I'll try and that this is definitely still a work in progress. We'll try to make this much - so it should be much easier than it is now. So, but for now just not that we cannot support yet. Apologies for that. So you're all fine if we go with the applicant list? They're - you can see them in the Adobe as well, but I hope you can also review them and read.

The first one in the lead applicant is a familiar one, Martin Silva Valent, who's been already representative of an organization in NPOC for quite some time and he's applying for individual membership. Opinions, objections. Robin? Robin, please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes, thank you. Thanks. Yes. I just have a question about this. So this - so Martin already votes for an organization and now he wants to also vote as an individual and he's a (turn out). It's an awful lot of - you know, it's an awful lot of voting for one person.

Is this a - or I should say, isn't this one of the things we were going to try to figure out, do we want to allow people to have multiple votes in the NCSG? Because I know we kind of talked about it in the past and, you know, a number of us have said, maybe this isn't a good practice. It could incentivize gaming of the system and that's not the direction we want to go in.

So it seems like we might want to resolve that issue, if in fact that it is the case that he's applying to have a vote for - another vote. You know what I'm saying?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. That's something we should be talking about, but I know that it is not actually relevant for the current election because if he's approved now, it's too late for him to vote in this election anyway as an individual so. So it's not relevant for his application.

We can come back to that general point later we're talking about election preparations item. So let's include it there, but it's not really - it does not matter in Martin's case at this - during the forthcoming elections. You still want to make that - because actually I understood that the organization he's running for may be changing its representative at some point or something, so - but in any case for now ...

Robin Gross: Okay. no. I see what you're saying that if we approve this today, that could be, you know, subject to a decision, a broader decision later that really good

idea to allow people to have, you know, two different voting slots. And so, you know, we're not - we don't make that decision today and it actually isn't going to be effective for this election anyway.

So we've got some time to make that decision, but I think we should because I know we've talked about it before and, you know, sort of kicked the can down the road and that. It's not an easy - you know, not an easy decision to make. But I think ...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Let's take that - yes. Let's move to that discussion after we process member applications, but it's not yet - but if we approve today, will not be getting extra votes in this forthcoming election, any vote. So in that case it's - but we can talk about that in the next agenda item, but for now shall we approve Martin?

Robin Gross: Okay. I'll vote to approve. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Joan? Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes. This is Monika speaking. Yes, I also vote to approve - can you hear me right?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, we can hear you. Thank you, Monika. So we have Martin approved Poncelet's view when we get to him. Next we have Koliwe Majama from Zimbabwe, individual recommended by Andre (unintelligible). Have you reviewed his application? Do you want me to read it out? Opinions, anyone?

Robin Gross: This is Robin. I vote yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Robin voting yes. Joan? Joan votes yes. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes. Monika also votes yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Majama approved, again pending Poncelet later. But then we have (Brooke Gunther-Smith) from Canada. The individual referring (Brooke Gunther-Smith). Again, if somebody wants me to read out his description please say so. Otherwise, opinions, views.

Robin Gross: This is Robin. I vote yes. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan? Joan votes yes. And this chat, Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Monika also votes yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, (Gunther-Smith) approved, again pending Poncelet later. Then we have Kris Seeburn from Mauritius. Referencing is Stephanie Perrin. Any opinions?

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes?

Robin Gross: This is Robin. Yes. Like I said, I went through all of these applications before and all of these individual applications I'm voting yes. So, you know, just put me down as a yes for each one of these individual applications.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. That's fine. Thank you very much, Robin. That will save some time. Joan? Joan, Kris Seeburn.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I actually agree with Robin because I went through them yesterday as well. I was working late at night, mind you and I agree with her. They all seem to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: So you're also voting yes for all individuals?

Joan Kerr: Correct.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan, did I get correctly that you're voting yes for all individuals as well?

Joan Kerr: That's correct.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Then I'm just waiting for Monika, Kris Seeburn.

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes. I also vote yes. And I second Robin's and Joan's opinion and vote yes for all individuals so we save time.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Just listing them quickly because we have - after Kris we have (unintelligible), Eलो Emmanuel Agbenonwossi, Muriel Alapini, Daniel (unintelligible), who's there twice, but I put the second one as a mistake, an error. (Kim Yung), (unintelligible), Michael Karanicolas, who's also becoming an individual member, having been in the organization certainly before. (Unintelligible) Lokesh Gujjarappa, Gangesh Varma, likewise an old friend.

That was the new individuals. They're all approved pending Poncelet possible objections later. Okay, let's see. Organizational applicants. I see there's - okay, there are some ghost application from FFI. They're still

(unintelligible). Otherwise there are just two new ones (unintelligible) ITC.
Opinions on that one. And Columbia.

Robin Gross: Tapani, this is Robin. I vote yes. Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Joan?

Joan Kerr: It's a yes for me, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Also yes for me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Again, agreed, approved pending Poncelet later. And another one is. OCDS. Does any of us read Arabic? This information is in Arabic.
Anyway.

Robin Gross: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, Robin?

Robin Gross: I do not read Arabic, but I did ask an Arabic speaking person what was on this website and the response I got back was that their activities are non-commercial, charity, (patient). They are promoting traditional teachers, like teaching of the Koran and that sort of thing. So based on what I got back, when I asked to have that translated to me, they look legitimate. So I vote yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Robin. Joan?

Joan Kerr: I vote yes if I guess - thanks Robin for doing that. That was great. I was wondering also just to mention that maybe when we do have them on the website, that we have them also have a bit of English profile as well, but I vote yet with that information. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Oh yes. We could actually do things like ask for English description. But I trust - okay. So you're doing it, Robin, proving this circumstance. And Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I also vote yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I take it from - trust if I try to Google translate that a little to get some ideas. So it sounds good enough. Okay. That's where the new organizations we approve, cluster Orinoco and OCDS. Now we have pending applications from last time. Let's see what we have. You know, pending individuals, have Zena Ibrahim Mohammed.

Maryam, how do we get - actually just Maryam, do we have replies from - additional information from any of these? And I'll simply skip those who haven't. Maryam, what is the situation?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi. This is Maryam speaking. We have it in the Adobe room. So if you look at the pod it will be there.

Tapani Tarvainen: So have those replied?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes. Zena Ibrahim has replied and her response is in Adobe Connect.

Tapani Tarvainen: Ah, yes. Right. So it is. Okay. So opinions? Are we satisfied with that? Anybody I guess from Zena Ibrahim Mohammed from Chad? Let's see.

Robin typing, looks okay. Joan, Monika? And Joan also says his response looks good. I guess Monika, you can't see. So I'll read it for you.

ICANN's mission is noble in helping to understand about internet sector. One of the factual reason and also unified functional piece of the systems support the internet. Having competence and unique identifiers around the world, it is my honor to better understand the best practices and knowledge in order to mingle with the community if ICANN. My current interests, identifying the strategic issues of internet governance through ICANN and its affiliates, understanding also the problems that affect individual internet users. What are the non-commercial issues? So Monika, what do you think?

Monika Zalnieriute: I think it reads very well. So definitely I also vote yet.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Let's approve him also then pending Poncelet later. Then we have Shavkat Sabirov. Unless I'm mistaken - yes. Monika, you will remember we did talk with him in Johannesburg.

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes, I do remember. Monika for the record and I vote yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: So Robin, Joan, you think of Mr. Sabirov?

Robin Gross: This is Robin.

Tapani Tarvainen: Sorry Robin. I lost your voice. Okay, Robin and Joan both agree.

Robin Gross: This is Robin. I vote yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Robin. So we agreed on him too. Sabirov also approved pending Poncelet's letter. The others have not responded? Is that

correct, Maryam? Maryam? Okay, there are those. Okay. Alapini Muriel. They said during the session of the fellows where the NCSG was presented as a final user, I thought it was within a group that I could talk and worked within to impact my community.

But the more - a final internet user and a young Francophone woman, I want to integrate the NCSG into ICANN to engage in francophone interests and work with the community. There's a split between NCUC and French speaking users for the designation of useful information. It would be an example for young women to become interested and involve community. That's why I want to join NCSG and ICANN. So ...

Maryam Bakoshi: Tapani, Maryam here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: So Muriel had - we have already approved her and in the applications we did a few minutes ago. So I think she kind of applied again.

Tapani Tarvainen: Ah, okay. So ...

Maryam Bakoshi: So this time we asked her for more information. Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So no need to voting her again. Next one, this is an organization I think, International Center for Leadership Development Nigeria. My name is Felix Iziomoh, executive director, International Center for Leadership Development Nigeria. Writing this email in respect of Aishatu Ibrahim, our Coordinator. I introduced her to ICANN because she has a degree in computer science. She's also presently learning her Masters in Computer Science and a member of Nigeria Computer Society and Computer

Professional Association of Nigeria, is the reason I introduced her to International Computer Society and ICANN. Please kindly accord her membership. I was also finding a Facebook Internet Society International Institute for Global Leadership Coalition Project at some organizations locally. This is on behalf of ...

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Tapani. I don't know if you remember this application. This was the one, the website address wasn't incorrect. I think it was missing a letter and we asked them to confirm the website address was correct and also state their source of funding. So Aisha Ibrahim is the - was the, or is the representative chosen for this organization. And Felix, who is an NCSG member as well, is a director. So he replied on behalf of Aishatu.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Maryam. So opinions. Shall we - they have fixed the issue we complained about, at least his explanation. So opinions here. Joan approving. Robin's comment, looks okay to me for this one.

Monika Zalnieriute: Also good - looks good for me, Monika.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, Monika. Okay. So we approve him. So again we are in agreement and Maryam, is that all we have who have replied?

Maryam Bakoshi: No. I just want to ...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. This sign that not in - okay, their organization sent individuals in random order, but okay. Let's see. (Unintelligible) (Olia Nasula). I lecture full time at the second main public university in Albania, University Aleksandër Moisiu Durrës (unintelligible) classified as a commercial organization. I'm not sure how current state how those organizations can join

as an organization basis as higher education institutions, although I can represent them of course at any other event.

This is my understanding of the question. Please let me know what you need specifically. My interest in NSCG has been research, basics I teach in research particular issues dealing with that. He's an individual applicant nonetheless. So with the category employed by or a member of the larger commercial organization is too complicated (unintelligible) my organization to join on an organizational basis. So any opinion?

Robin Gross: This is Robin. I vote yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Robin. Joan? Joan also yes. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I also vote yes, Monika.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I agree. So approved pending Poncelet later. Now we have Rickson Acosta. I have been involved in ICANN for several years working in the area of civil society academics. As a matter of fact, I was awarded a full fellowship to attend the inauguration and first course at the center for (unintelligible) and internet for the Latin America and Caribbean region, (unintelligible) Asunción, Paraguay. Opinions on Acosta? Anyone? At least we have a LinkedIn page review. Robin says he looks okay. Joan and Maryam noting that Rickson attended the NCUC LAC meeting yesterday. So Joan, Monika? Joan approving. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I also vote yes, Monika.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Looks good enough to me. So we're not spending his way. We'll have to (unintelligible) as well. Now, Claire Craig. A long response. Thank

you for your notes. Okay. First, let me address the reason for my delay in responding. When I received your note asking me to provide you information, I felt I needed to step back and give it some bit of thought. I have recently attended ICANN59 in Johannesburg, again as a fellow and this time working with my coach (unintelligible), who is a member of the NCUC. I was at the (unintelligible) sessions, networked with other members of the NCUC. I believe I'm now better positioned to identify how my interest might be relevant to this group. I'm interested in topics that collect information and communication technology for development. Also very connected with the infrastructure internet governance. Also currently researching the work you saw (unintelligible) from theoretical (unintelligible) for an ICTD research concept. I'm currently working for my PhD. Just began the application of policies on these issues as they relate to Latin American program reach, small island development states (unintelligible). And was at the University of West Indies (unintelligible). Can you roll it, scroll it down, Maryam if there are more? Aligned to the academic community which fits within parameter of NCSG. I'm also on the coordinating team in the Caribbean Network Operators Group and work closely with a senior manager (unintelligible) engagement for Caribbean ICANN (unintelligible) program Caribbean. Currently in the process of hosting (unintelligible) later this year.

Okay, Robin approving. Any others, Joan? Joan approving. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I also approve.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So agreed, approved pending Poncelet's letter. Maryam, anymore slides?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Tapani. No, there's no more.

Tapani Tarvainen: So these were the all, reply to a request for more information and as usual, we'll reject those who did not reply. Agreed. Any other comments on this or shall we move on with our agenda? I see no - okay, Joan currently is typing, but anyway. So I take it we are done with the member applications.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Tapani. Can I ask a quick question please?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, please.

Maryam Bakoshi: The Center for Digital Creativity, what was the conclusion for that, on pending organizations?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. There's something we need to look at. What's the question, Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: So I was asking if it's pending or approved or denied, because I didn't get ...

Tapani Tarvainen: Which one?

Maryam Bakoshi: ... any attachments.

Tapani Tarvainen: Which one?

Maryam Bakoshi: Center for Digital Creativity.

Tapani Tarvainen: Did we get the response from them I guess?

Maryam Bakoshi: No. Oh, sorry. Yes. So that's a no. my apologies. Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: So those who did not reply, attempting to know ...

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, correspondence. Okay, thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Anything else concerned with the member application? So shall we go with the - okay. Let's move on to election preparations. As a clarification point, I sent this to a list already that now we're have having a situation where we have full council positions and the chair to elect and one of the council positions would be for one year. Others would be two years.

Then don't - there is not a quite explicit rule about that in our charter, but it's really not clear and it has been done before, I think this kind of situation. Whoever gets the least votes gets - and still get to (unintelligible) fourth one will get shortlisted.

Any - are we in disagreement to this? Okay. Yes. I see Robin agreeing so no further comment. As a timeline, I hope you have a - you view the timeline. This is the same one I posted already in a month ago. And we've been following it apart from missing to checking by a few days start, but still time.

And besides approving the timeline on such, I'm going to post a question. If we have to clarify what the date of the election in our charter sense means. But if we start the election ...

Robin Gross: Tapani, so when can we post - oh, I'm sorry.

Tapani Tarvainen: For anyone to - first what I'm talking about, election timeline. That's when we agreed on that council - that election enforcement gets the one year slot.

Robin Gross: Yes. I'm sorry. I just had a question. I apologize. I should have briefed m.

Tapani Tarvainen: No worries. So looking at election timeline, starting nominations at the last of July for two weeks. Even the - then close to voter checking to finalize the voter list in August 17. Wait for August 18, the deadline for nomination acceptance and given one more day to applicant statements and two days after that begin voting. Vote for two weeks and hope to get results out one week later on September 4th.

I note we are a little late regarding the GNSO chair election which technically start on September one. But I don't see one week in there making any difference. There's no formal rule open there. So any objections? So once on this. Robin, your hand is up?

Robin Gross: Yes. No, I think this timeline looks fine and from what I had heard from the GNSO staff that that September 1st deadline wasn't really a hard deadline, but just sort of a target. So if we're, you know, a few days or even a week after that, I think we'd be fine.

My only question is when can we publish this - timeline to the mailing list to start getting people thinking about running and all that?

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin. I intend to send a timeline to the GNSO discuss immediately after this meeting if we agree on it now. I guess technically I'll have to wait until we hear from Poncelet. I'll try to reach him as soon as possible.

But the point I was raising on to list, that the date of the election that would be defining for the 30 day period, I guess that's sensible because when the voting begins - in current situation it does not make much of a difference. We are

already too late for this to upload today to vote from that instance. But principle we should agree and then just follow up, clarify. Anybody agree on that? That's fine? Okay. It sounds it's fine.

As a side note for reference, I haven't reviewed the charter. Does see if any active NCS member who has been an active member for roughly 30 days before the date of the elections eligible to nominate candidates both in NCSG elections and proposed amendments to the NCSG charter?

So that means we have those we approved last time will be able to vote and those we approve now will not. So it's a bit regrettable, but I don't see it can be - but I guess we should try to redefine otherwise, but I don't think it's worth. Maryam, you have your hand up.

Maryam Bakoshi: Oh, it's going down now. That was a long time. Sorry.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Also I noticed an interesting observation, that this 30 day limit applies to nominating candidates and voting, but not for running as a candidate. 4.1 says that any acting member can be nominated. I'm not sure if that's significant, but so the shadow says.

So as you're (unintelligible) with the timeline as well, Monika, you have any comments on this? Are you happy with everything at this point? Monika, are you still with us? Have we lost Monika?

Maryam Bakoshi: No Tapani. She's still on the bridge.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Monika, maybe you are temporarily offline. We'll get you a chance to comment on that later if you come back. The next item I wanted to address is the gender and regional balance rules. Our charter is a bit

ambiguous there. I hope you have read what I wrote about that in the election reform list. That was three weeks ago. And I tried to write it out.

The one problematic issue there, the most problematic I guess was that under no circumstance there should be less than two of any gender as an absolute. And I tried to make it as strong as possible because if we don't really have enough willing candidates of one gender, our committee will not be helped by leaving a slot open.

But we can do it in such a way that in that case, we will not formally fill it, but leave it up to the EC to make temporary assignments until they find (unintelligible) plan would be gender filled. So that kind of procedure seems to be as strong as we can make it. Robin seems to be agreeing. Joan as well. Monika, just in case you'll come back is not. And another less likely ... Yes? Sorry Monika. I couldn't hear you.

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes. I also agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I take it's for both the timeline or the gender balance rule or both?

Monika Zalnieriute: Both.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you. Yes. I note that there's a minor, potentially ambiguous case was that in case that there's a tie which shall be given more weight, to gender or region. But I take it my reading was that gender rule is that gender rule over the rights until there are two of them, but instead of getting the exact gender balance region that has no other candidate otherwise who are doing.

And I know that historically will have very good gender balance but if so and

regional question. So that is a reasonable. And that sends us well. So we are agreed on that.

Okay, the next issue regarding the elections. So I wanted to bring this ballot form and none of the above and abstentions. We have some job discussion on this, then the election reform list. And so I hope to read that I asked ICANN legal to review which they could consider possible.

And as I see, basically the only sensible way here is to do it the way Robin actually did that in 2012 if I remember correctly, that this will have no explicit none of the above, but it will allow extensions only if they are to be (unintelligible) but since we can do that.

And while that may not be quite satisfactory in all respect, you don't see we can do much else without changing the charter. So let's put that on the list of things to do with charter review replacement as soon as we can. Anybody want to comment, agree, disagree with this? Anybody? I take silence as agreement. Joan is agreeing in the chart.

There are some details we can talk about how we phrase the text in the ballot, but like I would indicate the abstentions. But anyway I see Robin now. So at least. Monika, any objections on this?

Monika Zalnieriute: No objection from me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so we'll proceed with that. Let's see. Going back, the other issues we've had to - how do I find that? I posted earlier that list of things we need to discuss. Okay. For the election reform list, also a month ago I pointed this note from voting in multiple roles which Robin raised earlier this call.

I had no responses on the list. I did check the legal situation here. I spoke with a number - at least Mary Wong and Monica Koning about that in South Africa and seems that they were pretty clear that there's no legal issue, no and problem with our charter, whichever way we went - that allowed them to vote, a couple deep in the census.

You might quoted us having a class representative for an organization as an individual, but as I wrote there, I don't see anything that we could the EC approval that excludes that if they so choose. I'm not sure if we'd want to do that without discussing with the membership or it's late changing rules so close to the elections is a bit ambiguous. But I'm open t opinions, discussion? Robin, please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes, thanks. Yes, I agree we don't want to change, you know, the rules right now for the election or anything. But I do think that this is a good topic for us to take back to the membership maybe after the election and, you know, get a sense what people think, if they think it's a good idea. You know, what are some of the pros and the cons, maybe some things we haven't thought about.

My initial reaction is, I don't think we should have a - we should allow people to have voting roles, more than one voting role in the NCSG. So, you know, that's kind of the position I'm coming from, just because I just - I don't want to incentivize gaming and I'm concerned that that would. But I'm, you know, open to hearing other arguments.

And so that's probably a good thing to take back to the membership after the election so we don't, you know, get people to freak out about it for this one. But that's - so that's where I'm coming from on this issue. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin. I tend to agree that they are many sides of this and between hope and that's one of the points I have - having this election reform list in the first place is to come up, collect all this kind of potentially contentious issues and talk them through and then bring them back to the larger membership for discussion and hope to resolve them.

And I don't have a strong position here, even though I note for the record. Okay, maybe I'll leave Joan to speak to that. Joan, you have your hand up. Please go ahead. Joan?

Joan Kerr: Hi. It's Joan for the record. Yes, I agree that we should actually bring it to the membership and let them decide so that - I mean it is sort of disconcerting if somebody has a vote in many constituents. So I do agree with Robin that we should take it to the membership and see what comes of it, and then maybe look at changing the rules or solidifying the policy. So I'm agreeing with that. After the election.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Joan. I would actually suggest and ask that you comment on the issue on that election reform list so we can have these arguments written down. That's for easier reference. I also note that I - for the record of course, I am one of the person who in this particular situation, but it would not be a difficult issue for me either way.

I could be trivial, because if I speak enough, it would be trivial for me to ask, place someone else to represent them and if we'll not have any impact yet. If someone who is not an individual member, they'll most likely refer to me anyway. So it will not have any practical impact there.

But I tend to agree that it would be cleaner if we made - didn't do that and had

the explicit rules is clear on that. so let's - but for now, we'll leave it as it is for this election and then try to move on and have a resolution on that later on.

Okay. Something else just for this week look earlier may have this - a few other potential issues that we might discuss. In case the chair is running, should we have a rule that somebody else should take the practical management of the election?

Again, something that is actually not current at the moment. So I'm not running for chair again obviously and I have no plans to run for the council either. But if the chair is running for re-election, or if I change my mind and run for council, should we do something about it and what kind of rules should we have? And not that it can happen even necessarily without being planned.

Say that if somebody nominates me for the council and that will take two days to decide if I accept it, then we'll have assemble head somewhere or somebody else in between. So this is something, at least theoretically really one that we might want to have a rule on. I would ideally - if we had - okay, Robin, please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes. I think that that sounds like a good practice, you know, just to - so we don't have any appearance of conflict of interest or conflict of - the actual conflicts of interest that if - and not - I don't think it actually should only apply to the chair, but any of us on the executive committee is to run in the election, that we should recuse ourselves from, you know, making the management of the election. I think that would be a good practice and good policy down the line, irrespective of, you know, who's where.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin Yes. I note that our charter basically touches the chair for the responsibility of running the election, but I don't see any reason, but sure cannot delegate it to someone else with at least the EC agrees. But we should have a sample - have a bit more clarity on how exactly it's done.

If we had a vice chair, it would be simply rule that it would automatically fall on the vice chair, unless the vice chair is also running and so forth. So that's something we should write up and try to make it as clear as possible and under what kind of circumstances, how fast things have to be done and so forth.

But for the current election, I - okay. Do you want to propose something to happen in case somebody appoints me driver for council? How fast should something happen? I would have thought - well, you know, I say I'm perfectly fine if you want to already choose someone or meet up with people. I guess something to roll in order who will pick up the step in that case.

But in order for that to function in practice would have the backup person to be involved in the process so that handover will take place. Again as noted, I have no plans to do that at this election. Okay, Joan, please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Joan for reference. Thank you, Tapani. Yes. I think we should have something in place. Now, for the record I'll state that this is my last meeting with the NCSG EC. We do have representatives that will come on from NPOC probably in this meeting from next month.

I honestly think that there should be something put in place just so that we have a decision making device that we can refer to and in case somebody - so a chair or a committee member has the freedoms at that point to run and know that something is already in place.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Do you have any concrete suggestions or shall we just note that this is something we have to work on for the future, Robin? Please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Well, this is just an idea kind of off the top of my head. But I was thinking, the constituency chairs could maybe appoint someone if they could agree who to appoint in that case that the chair or the manager election were to decide to run. That's just, you know, an idea off the top of my head that might satisfy all parties.

Tapani Tarvainen: That's - okay, I guess that the chair or the Executive Committee could delegate it out, but we cannot decide that without talking with them first. So but let's first put it this way. Do we need to decide it now or are we happy to run this election as we have done before so that I will run it kind of - promise I won't run for chair anyway. Joan? Joan, you have your hand up.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Great. Thank you. It's Joan. Yes. Robin, that actually sounds like - just for a sort of short term committee, that could work and then we could work on a policy for the longer term. I think that would work. I think obviously speaking to the chairs - I guess I'm thinking that, you know, if we have something in place, people have the freedom to then know exactly where they stand and to run for any position that they may be nominated for or at least have the answers.

I agree with Robin. I would think that we can approach the chairs and ask them if they would at least create an ad hoc election committee for this election. That would probably work in the short term. But yes, I would agree to that.

Tapani Tarvainen: And given how far we are with the election process at this point and what our charter says that if the chair who's supervised by the EC went to this

committee that includes outsiders of this legislation is kind of difficult to get done in time. But if you want, then of course happy to try to work it out.

But we can also - given that this is actually - okay, in case some of the EC members is running and you know most instances, I don't see, that would be a problem if they don't have a specific role in the managing the election. And normally all the chair does - the EC only supervises.

Okay, I see Robin writing that we've done most election preparations already, so there isn't much left in this election. So can we agree on this point that we'll - this election run as before? I will manage it and if necessary, I don't see actually that necessity to happening but we can't really do much else at this point.

Unless someone - if someone wants to volunteer to run as a backup manager in case somebody appoints me and I change my mind, please say so now. That's why I'm fine with that, but as I say - then or do that later. I have more issues here. This is actually useful to talk now when it's not an acute issue. So that's why I've - but we've come up with a list and try to come up with the procedure later. Robin, please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes, thanks. I do think we should have something in mind for if in case the manager of the election wants to run in it. I'm not sure we need to decide at this moment, but I think maybe any one of us on the Executive Committee who is not planning to run in the election could maybe take over at that point, because we're going to be so far down the line anyways. What's going to be left is to make the announcements of who the winner is.

Tapani Tarvainen: That is true. So actually at that point, if it happens like mid through - halfway through the nomination period that I'm suddenly nominated, should

we get - have a backup person in place until I get time to decline? I'm not sure if that's typical at this point, but we definitely should have a policy within that group discussing the agenda and keep - try to draft out a comprehensive rule for the future anyway.

But if it happens now, well, can always call an emergency meeting, but happening at that late stage, I don't think it's going to make much difference. So no decision at this point. We can carry on. Okay, Robin, you have your hand up.

Joan Kerr: Yes. No, I was just going to say yes, let's not make - necessarily make a decision now. Let me go back and talk to, you know, the constituency about if they've got some ideas for this. Again, I don't think it's going to be that big of a deal because, you know, the election preparations are mostly done.

But just in the case, you know, we'll have something in place, but let's give ourselves a couple more days to figure out exactly what that's going to be.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm fine with that. So we'll continue discussion on the list, either on the EC list or the election reform list if you like. Actually that would be better for the purposes of getting more people involved and I think we are all in that process. So that would be better for discussion purposes, but to decide something then we go back easy. Okay?

Looking at the other issues, I have the election reform agenda. I don't see anything else that's urgent enough for us to decide for this election. But there are also stuff - other things that we should have rules written down in case they actually happen at some point.

I hope you will take time to relook at them and comment on that list. I'll keep

bringing them up one by one in there. I was hoping to get these results. Anything else related to this coming election at this point? Shall we move on with our agenda? Okay, I take it that we have nothing urgent.

The next one is the temporary alternate councilor appointments and that's actually easier than probably expected. (Avri) notified me that she is no longer available. So we have exactly one candidate, that's (Tatiana). Anybody - let's see. I know that Robin, Monika and Poncelet have already supported her. Joan, do you wish to throw your weight behind (Tatiana) as well? Joan, please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Yes, it's Joan. I agree with the temporary appointment of (Tatiana). Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. That was an easy decision surprisingly. One clarifying point. I assume that we are making the appointment until the new councilor is starting that they sent to Abu Dhabi to this last but one day in Abu Dhabi I think actually his appointment there, new councilor start. We are agreed on that?

Robin Gross: Yes, Tapani. That's my understanding as well. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So that's we'll we do. On that we don't need to wait for Poncelet because he expressed his view in advance. The next - I presume Monika will not - but she also expressing support in advance. So, unless you wish to speak, Monika please go ahead.

Constituency review. In this case I'd actually like to last Joan if you would like to postpone dealing with - because there has been quite a number of stuff going on and I understand you are working on your new charter and things like that. So we might wish to postpone the discussion a bit till a later time. Joan, please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Yes, it's Joan. If it could possibly - if you could possibly find it in your heart to give us some time, it would be much appreciated.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Joan. I (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Towards the end of NPOC and for (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. But this is not urgent. We have more urgent stuff, but I hope to get this done so that we can finalize it by Abu Dhabi. I will note one specific issue that I'd like to raise here, that the publicity of various mailing lists and in particular NPOC has ExCom list has not been publicly archived.

I hope that we'll either open it up or argue why not. But we'll leave it until - discussion until later. Joan is typing something. Okay. I hope that you will - we will have time to have several meet - discuss it before I can fix it so that at that point every - all the pending issues are clear. But I really think this - to come back to this maybe in the - our next call and I hope we can at least move forward.

Okay, then we have what I hope is another easy ICANN member in normal procedures. We have basically got this more or less ready for member discussion. Last time - Robin, are we ready just to post it to the NCSG discussion and ask people what do you want? Robin.

Robin Gross: Yes, we are. In fact these have been ready since May. And so they haven't been touched at all since May. So they've been done and yes, let's shoot them out there and see what people think and put this one behind us. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you. Will you do that, Robin? I'll ask you to post it.

Robin Gross: Yes, I'd be happy. I'd be happy to. Sure.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. So for the record, make a copy of the text as well as putting the Google Doc link so that we have elementary code on the list. So nothing more about that. Any other business? I have one item might be appropriate discussion, but anybody else?

Okay. I have been - if you have any of us on the intersessional meeting next year, should we do something about it? Should we discuss about it somewhere else in here or elsewhere? Or if you have explicit views on that. Joan, you have your hand up. Joan, please.

Joan Kerr: I was going to talk about something else, but did you want to talk about the intersessional? I'll just put my two cents in. I support that sorry. Can you hear me okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. I can hear you, but let's first, in case anybody has anything to say about the intersessional. If not, I'll just note that it's something we should discuss. I put it up on the list discussion. So Joan, what's your point?

Joan Kerr: Okay, great. Well, for the intersessional, I support it and I would like to see it happen. I thought that we had a really, really good session this year, earlier this year. This year? Last year. Oh my god. I'm losing time, my time here. The session is really good and I thought that there was a lot done. So I would go on the record to say that I personally support it and would like to see it happen again.

In terms of any other business, I just want to say this is my last EC meeting and that our new appointees will be on the call next - for the next call and I will - I think I have sent those names to you. It's Gangadhar Panday and Rahul Sharma. And they will be representing NPOC on the EC going forward. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Joan. A point of clarification. Will Rahul and Gangadhar start immediately now so I can put them on the list and any discussion or decisions we make on the list, they will be participating already as of today at this meeting or only after our next call?

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. They're starting right away. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you. So basically immediately after this meeting, I'll update our mailing list and put them in there. Thank you for that, Joan.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: So Robin, you have an AOB?

Robin Gross: Yes. Thanks, Tapani. I just wanted to - or I thought we should confirm for the record that Ed Morris has resigned from the NCSG. I've seen there would have been some discussion on the GNSO council list where they were not quite sure of his status. And so I thought it was important that we just confirm that for the record. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Joan. Yes, that is a bit confusing because Ed's messages on the subject, at least the ones I have seen, have been a bit ambiguous. But the one I posted on the list earlier saying that please remove me from everything

sounds enough like a resignation to me. So I guess we can conclude that he has resigned and confirmed it. Any ...

Robin Gross: Great. Thanks. Yes, that was my reading as well, because since he said he resigned from all lists, that would include the membership list. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Anybody disagree on that? Okay, so we'll remove Ed from the member database. Any other business? Now, I see we are in good time actually despite the long agenda. We managed to do that in less than time made available. So unless anybody has any other business at this point. No? Okay, we're done. thank you everybody. It was an efficient meeting.

Oh, one more trivial point, that the next meeting I'll bring us a list. I hope, expect we'll have another call about - sometime in August before - about one month from now. But we can - I'll bring that on the list later. We'll see when we can find a good time. So this meeting is concluded. We can stop the recording and thank you everybody.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you everyone attending the call (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Thank you very much.

Maryam Bakoshi: Can I stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you very much for your time. Goodbye.

Robin Gross: Bye-bye everyone.

END