
ICANN82 | CF – GNSO: NCPH Work Session
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 PST

ANDREA GLANDON

Hello and welcome to the Non-Contracted Party House Work Session. My name is Andrea Glandon, and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. And I will now hand the floor over to Rafiq and Mason, whoever would like to begin.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Andrea. Good afternoon, everybody. Mason Cole here, chair of the CSG. Good to have you all in the room. Good to have some folks joining on Zoom as well. I'm here with Rafiq, the chair of the NCSG, and our agenda is on the screen for you. One housekeeping item, if you would kindly log into Zoom so that we can manage the queue that way, that would keep our meeting in order. So, before we start, are there any requests or updates to the agenda? Farzi?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Hi, everybody. I have an AOB. I want to be mysterious and tell you later what's about. No, it's about internet governance. I just wanted to tell you a little bit.

MASON COLE

Okay. All right. An AOB for Farzi. Okay, great. Rafiq?

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah. Thanks, Mason. Yeah, I think we can start with the first topic, that administrative matters. It's just basically about some follow-up from the last meeting, which was the Day 0 in Istanbul. So, first about the membership system and mailing list. I believe in that time what was agreed is that we will have some group of volunteers maybe to discuss about requirement for a membership system kind of to share some ideas. And I believe also for the mailing list is just to have that set. I guess for the last, maybe we can do it as soon as possible. So, to have that channel-- Okay, more people coming. To have that channel that we can share more information to both of our groups. So yeah.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Rafiq. So, we have a number of things on the agenda that we may have to juggle a bit today because Paul's not here yet. He was going to lead a discussion about Board Seat 14. We can have that discussion, but we'll see if Paul makes it in on time. But on the administrative matters in terms of the membership system and

mailing list and the regularly quarterly house meetings, Rafiq, if it's okay with you, let's address those in reverse order. Is that okay? Okay. Yeah, I want to talk about the quarterly house meetings. Okay.

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah. Sure.

MASON COLE

So you'll recall that when we had our meeting in Istanbul, we've talked about as a house meeting quarterly, whether that's in person or virtually. And that would be a way for us to trade notes on what's happening in ICANN, talk about our mutual priorities, and talk about how to advance those priorities.

I think on the CSG side, we're prepared to move forward with that and with ICANN staff help get those arranged. Does anybody object to that or have any ideas about how to make those meetings more productive and useful for all of us? I'll open the floor. All right. Stunning input. Okay. So, Andrea, Brenda, can we request your help?

DAVID HUGHES

Mason, I have one question.

MASON COLE

I'm sorry, David. Yes, please.

DAVID HUGHES

Okay. So how to make it more efficient. So, do we have a way to, I don't know, dump the issues that we're various constituents in the room might have a concern about, and then find the things that we're-- Do we have a plan for how we're going to?

MASON COLE

Yeah. So, we did a bit of that exercise in Istanbul. And Andrea produced some great notes for us, which are available somewhere on a wiki, I believe. Okay, that'd be great. Thank you. Hey, Paul. Welcome. Those are available to us, David. And it's a good starting point for what you suggest. So, I'll take the action item to make sure that that's circulated around and that we use that as a basis for our kick-off meeting. Anyone else? Okay.

ANDREA GLANDON

Anne has her hand up. She must be on Zoom.

MASON COLE

Oh, okay. Thank you. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks so much. Mason, I'm remote until Tuesday. But what I'm kind of wondering is if there are quarterly meetings, is there any possibility that one of those could be in person and hybrid, but not necessarily funded? I know they're trying to cut costs and stuff, but I also know that we have so many members, I guess, compared to

contracted parties. I really don't know the numbers. I know Paul had mentioned in one meeting with the new CEO that contracted parties meet three and a half days in Paris or whatever. But on the quarterly meetings, could any of them be hybrid, in-person and Zoom?

MASON COLE

It's a good question, Anne. I mean, that would be a nice outcome if we were able to do that, whether it was funded or not, if we could all get in the same room together. I imagine at least one or two of those meetings, Rafik, I'm not sure how you guys feel about it, but I'm sure that at least a couple of those meetings will be at ICANN meetings.

And yes, the contracted parties seem to enjoy a more robust meeting schedule than we do. But we've advocated for some time now that the NCPH have its own meeting time either away from ICANN meetings or adjacent to ICANN meetings. We got a little bit of that with our Day 0 event in Istanbul and our Day 0 event before that. I think that was in Germany, right? Yeah. So, I feel like we've got one foot in the door on that. And it would be nice if we could get the other foot in the door. So, thank you for the suggestion. Yeah, please, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO

Yeah. Hi, everyone. It's Marie from the BC. We talked about this briefly in the town hall session we had online with Kurtis and with Russ. And one of the points that really came out of that for me was

it's not just a question in us being together, which is vital. It's also our, for want of a better term, access to management, access to ICANN org, access to leadership. It's not even so much about the outcomes. It's about the time, about them listening to us.

And sometimes I have the impression if we cross them in the corridor, they're really happy to see us. But then we look at the agenda and the CPH have this meeting with them and that meeting with them and another meeting with them and then four days in Paris or whatever it may be. I think Paul said it could be two days in Kansas. But for those of us who've never been to Kansas, that's actually quite cool because Paris is just down the road to me. But in all seriousness, to me, there are two things here. It's one, us working together as us. But one is the them, the management, actually hearing the non-contracted part of the GNSO too. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. Thanks, Mason. So here, first, I think we are ready and we're having good pace with the three meetings like we try to meet in every or each ICANN meeting and also we have the Day 0. If I understand correctly, the proposal here is to add another meeting since we are talking about quarterly house meetings.

But the other point about what Marie raised, like the opportunity to have more access to the staff, to the CEO and the executive, I can see the merit. And yeah, something we can push for more. So yeah, we can explore, we can discuss, but just at this time, I think it's maybe a little bit too early to say that we can have another meeting because we need to think about the kind of challenge that can rise

from there. But I can hear from other members if they want to add.
Yeah, Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS

Maybe on the same lines, I think what I'm getting from this conversation is that perhaps it's worth both sides of the house to reflect on, I don't know, new discussion items and topics for us to work on together, right? And then based on that, we can work on the cadence of the meetings and the need for those meetings, right? Because I also don't want it to be just a meeting for the sake of meeting. We need to evolve and develop some sort of a joint agenda and outcomes in that sense.

But I also wanted to go to Marie's point on the meeting with leadership and so on. I just wanted to bring to everyone's attention that on this meeting, ALAC is having a full workshop with the Board, or like a full meeting with the Board. And looking back at what happened with us a couple of months ago, where we were provided just a couple of seconds for two people to be there and talk a little bit about the NCPH. I do think we need to go back on these things and raise it with the Board as soon as possible, maybe from a stakeholder perspective or from an NCPH perspective. It doesn't really matter, but we need to maybe raise the bar on when we meet and where we meet and why.

Because also looking back at the town hall with Kurtis last week, I also feel that we're always caught in the same points. Like we're friends now, we're nice now, it's good now. And it's like, no, we need to go beyond that. So maybe that's the homework we have.

Like look back on the points, look back on the agendas that we want to develop together. And based on that, we do the requests for both leadership, Board, and everything else too, for the meetings and so on. Thank you, Bruno. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY

Just a plus one about Bruno saying that you saw with Kurt that this is like, oh, it's unknowable. We can't possibly know that. Like, oh, we can't tell who's meeting with us, right? And that call I pushed back and said, this is completely knowable. I mean, this is just ours. It's math, right? And so, either we need someone around this table to volunteer to put that into a pie graph to show them, or we need to demand that staff keep track of it.

I'm not begrudging ALAC their day long meeting with the Board. That's terrific. Good for them. I want one too. And so that's the only thing. And so, I think that we either need to decide that this is really bothering us. And if so, let's put some math behind it, or it's not. If it's not great, we can just kind of grumble about it. But if we are really bothered by it, then let's do that chart and let's send it to the Board chair and open correspondence so that everybody can read it. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Paul. Well, speaking in my own capacity, I am bothered by it. Speaking for the CSG, we're not advisories to the community. We have outcomes in play, and we expect that those outcomes are met at some level. And to do that, we do need access to the Board

and to senior level staff. And I did notice on the schedule that contracted parties do have a private luncheon with the Board and private time with ICANN leadership that we don't enjoy. And it's not for lack of asking, for the most part.

But I think, Rafiq, I don't know how you can speak for the NCSG, but for the CSG, I think it's we're willing to put our weight behind a request where we have some parity with the rest of the community in terms of our capability to advise ICANN leadership at all levels. I don't know if my CSG colleagues, I'm getting some head nods around the table. So, okay. Good. We're in agreement. Okay.

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah. Thanks, Mason. I believe it's something we can agree on that to have that access and also that parity and, yeah, something we can push together. I don't believe we have anyone objecting to that. Yeah, Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI

So, I just wanted to mention that maybe we can be a little bit issue-specific in our meetings and discuss workshop different issues that are subject of, policy or the community is raising it. And we can disagree on things, but we can understand the other side perspective. And also, when you're issue-specific, then you can actually show, okay, here is what we have been doing during these meetings. And also, we can find out which topics we actually agree on and focus on those that can advance our beautiful relationship.

MASON COLE Thank you, Farzi. All right. Any other input on agenda item number, bullet 1? Are you good to move on?

RAFIK DAMAK Okay. Just I think we need to action that. So, yeah, we can move to the next topic.

MASON COLE You need an action on that? Yeah.

RAFIK DAMAK Yeah, just we have to implement.

MASON COLE Yeah, okay, yes. The CSG will take the action on follow-up on that agenda item, and we'll share with the NCSG the approach before we make the approach. Good? Okay. All right. Let's move on to the agenda then and go to Board seat 14. Paul, can we call on you, please?

PAUL MCGRADY Sure. Paul McGrady here. So, good news. We are a wonderful, happy little group. Bad news, I am a terrible chair and have not been advancing the ball the last three weeks or so like I needed to at four weeks. Andrea is wonderful, and she's been pushing me, and I've been completely resistant to that. But we have a pretty

good document. We're meeting on Wednesday over lunch to go through it. We are proposing something that's short of a voting mechanism, which I know very few people have an appetite for, but more than nothing. So, stay tuned on that.

And my thanks to the team that has been patient with me disappearing on them for the last three weeks. But we're slowly getting there. We expect, I think, within a few weeks after leaving here, we'll have something to send around for communication, and then probably will make sense to schedule a call, at least among leadership within the House, to go over it and give us comments or feedback. But, yeah, it's a stable document at this point, and we're making good progress. I don't know what else can I tell. Oh, and then we have review of the incumbent. I'm happy to run that, too, if you'd like. So, any questions about where we are? Susan? Yeah.

SUSAN PAYNE

Just a really quick question, and you may have actually answered it by the fact that you then moved on to the review of the incumbent. I found that I got a bit confused by the agenda because the review of the incumbent was in parentheses. So, what you've just been telling us about is the work on the process for reappointment or appointment of a replacement for Board Seat 14, as and when the process next needs to be done. Is that correct?

PAUL MCGRADY

That is correct. And just to confuse you even more, that process does take a look at how the incumbent fits into that, but that's

different from this other thing. Any other questions on the first part? Yeah.

MASON COLE

We got caught on the timeline last time, right? What is the timeline for reviewing the incumbent and making reappointment or considering other candidates?

PAUL MCGRADY

Let me pull up the-- I mean, this is all, this is draft, right? So, I'm a little bit hesitant to declare one part of it done because anybody who has ever been involved with me as a chair knows that people make compromises all along the way. And the one thing that I really dislike about the way we do things sometimes at ICANN is that at the end, people want to push and then people who make compromises don't get the happy side for that. So, whenever I declare something, I'm afraid to declare something static because everything's up for negotiation until it's not. Does that make sense?

In terms of the incumbent, we have, that's actually Recommendation 1 is right at the beginning. If there is an incumbent that's up for renewal, that is how they're doing is discussed at least twice annually during the entire term of that incumbent so that there's no surprises. We have a proposed process in Recommendation 2 about reappointment by a claim. And so, we sort of experienced this recently with our reappointment of Tomslin. Where we're all like, hey, Tomslin is

great, hooray. And there wasn't any need for any voting process. Does that make sense? So, we have that concept in there.

So, the incumbent features in here. In the event there is an incumbent and we're not at an we're not at a claim, then that incumbent will go into the process with everybody else if they want to be put into that process. But the key takeaway is at least twice a year, all of us talking about how the incumbent's doing so that we don't end up in a situation where two rows have diverged in the yellow wood to the point where one side is really unhappy and the other side loves them and then we try to come to harmony on that. If there's going to be disharmony, we'd love to spot it sooner. And really, frankly, to give the incumbent a chance to correct whatever it is that's causing the problem. Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO

If we break that down slightly, well, not break it down, but change it around slightly, what we mean, we think, and I just looked to Philippe to make sure I wasn't making this up, but he agrees, is that in Prague, in the meeting in June, we should be ready, all of us, to be able to come to the table and say, yay, Chris is amazing, or yeah, perhaps we need to be looking for somebody else, we don't want to stay with Chris.

And so, it is not the AGM of this year, but the AGM of next year, in which the Board member will change. So, if you count back in the dates we've got, it means that the summer meeting, the June meeting is where all of us need to be ready to pony up and discuss

whether or not we want to keep the incumbent. Yeah, you're good with that? Yeah, thanks.

FARZANEH BADIEI

I'm sorry, just one thing. So, I just wanted to mention that also, maybe we can talk about the modalities of that meeting. It should not be recorded, maybe, because we are talking about Chris. Yeah.

PAUL MCGRADY

Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks. So, in your process, which I think, as I'm hearing, includes some element of review of the incumbent, does that process also allow for a regular cadence of meetings with that Board seat, 14 incumbents? So, for example, if we're having these regular quarterly house meetings, is the expectation firstly that he would be invited to them? But also, is there an expectation he would make the time and come to them? Because it's really hard to have a conversation about whether the incumbent has been doing their job or not when, for some of us at least, we don't get to meet him.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, Susan. So yes, the idea is once this-- so if we adopt Recommendation 1, then we would be having that conversation with him or her, happens to be him right now, twice a year. And so, we won't this time, we'll go into June blind, because we have not

been having those conversations twice a year. But going forward on a rolling basis, we will. And we're hoping that that will cut down some of the surprise, if there is to be a surprise. Philippe?

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks. Philippe Fouquart. And I think Susan's question was about the process itself. Maybe we could be specific, because it's silence at this point, I think. So, on the principle, I think we all agree that we should meet up with him or her on a regular basis. I think it's on the procedure somewhere. But I'm not sure that as far as the quarterly meetings are concerned, that we say that the incumbent should be present. Do you see what I mean? The question was about the process itself. And I think that might be something missing there.

PAUL MCGRADY

Gotcha. I will make a note.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. I just want maybe to ask here, Paul, if he can explain more about the proposal timeline, because to give an idea to everyone what we are kind of planning. Because as we see, we have the constraint that the process should start soon. And the Recommendation 1 is more like it's not related to the selection for this time, because maybe it's like a transition phase. But it's something, as you said, it should happen on a regular basis. And in fact, it's at least twice annually. It's just at least so we can have more discussion with the incumbent, and of course, we can clarify

what are the expectations and how we want to do that. But yeah, just to clarify how it's time sensitive and also to know by when we have to make the decision. So, Paul, can you share that?

PAUL MCGRADY

Yes. And again, I apologize. We're sort of dissecting bits and pieces of something that's not finalized yet. And so, we do have a time frame that's in here. I would feel more comfortable if we would allow the team another week or two to finish this. And maybe we can do a webinar or something to actually walk through the document that we're proposing rather than break into the details of the time frame and things like that.

Rafik, you're on the team. If you want to go into them, go ahead. But I'm hesitant because if I say it's this, this, this, and this, and then when we sit down to finalize the document, somebody else comes back and they want to make a change. If I precluded that by-- So, I'm a little hesitant to get too far into the weeds. But Rafik, if you have a different view as a team member, you are 100% free to walk right through it right now.

RAFIK DAMAK

No different point of view. It's just why I ask it, the request, but it's fine to explain later on like a webinar or another way. Just because, just to clarify, since we are bringing by when we really need to start the process. And when we discuss the timeline, it's kind of moving backward from by when we have to appoint and all the steps. But yeah, we can wait when we are ready to do that.

PAUL MCGRADY

But just to assure everybody that there is a level of detail. When you see this, it says eight months we'll do this, seven months we'll do that, six months, five, four, three, two, Day 0. So, we were trying to do two things with this document. One is to provide a process that keeps us on track for the timeline. And also, to find, we're hoping by having a process, we do not end up in a-- I can't remember what the word is that people dislike. I'm not allowed to use one of the words. But we don't end up missing the deadline. I think I'm allowed to say that. Missing the deadline. We don't end up missing the deadline.

And if we are getting towards the end and we still don't have a decision, we're trying to come up with something that will maybe nudge, nudge one candidate over another, something that would give us some hat to hang something to hang our hats on at the end without being a proper voting mechanism, because there's no appetite for that. But yes, there is a level of detail on the calendar we're proposing.

MASON COLE

Farzi, is that a new hand?

FARZANEH BADIEI

Thank you. So, happy International Women's Day. We also, in our document, we kind of say that diversity is important, right? And some kind of, not like strict criteria, but we encourage reflection on

how to bring diversity to the Board by appointing a diverse Board member.

PAUL MCGRADY

Again, once a team member brings something up, then I feel like that I'm okay to talk about it. So, this was the big idea in the current draft languages. In the event that the SGs are unable to reach a consensus on a candidate by the deadline, there will be a strong but nonbinding presumption that the candidate that enhances the diversity of the Board from the point of view of the search committee will move forward.

And so, again, that's not language that's relatively, very new language. We've not smithed it. We don't have buy-in in the concept, but as Farzi mentioned, that's one of the things that we're kicking around that might-- If we really have two candidates that are otherwise equally suited and we can't get there, then we'll say, okay, well, the Board doesn't have anybody from South America right now. Let's pick that person. Or the Board's 19 men and 3 women, let's pick the woman, or whatever.

And it's not meant to be political or anything else. It really is looking at how to make our Board as global and representative as possible. And so, since we're not going to get, I don't think, to where the registrars and the registries are with waited voting and other, we're just not going to get there as a group. We're just not there. We're trying to find things. That's the idea that at least would help maybe nudge somebody across the finish line. If we

really have two really awesome qualified candidates, nobody's blinking and we're running out of time. Yeah.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Paul. Any other input for Paul, please, on this issue? Or for the room?

PAUL MCGRADY

And just again, this is, we, the goal was to have a finished document so that this conversation would not be as weird. And it's 100% on me. The team has been fabulous. They've met their meetings. They respond. It's just the last three weeks I wandered off the reservation, but I am back.

MASON COLE

Well, welcome back. It's good to have you. So, speaking of making the conversation weird, Rafik and I wanted to introduce one other corollary topic to this, and that has to do with GNSO representation at the Board level. And this has been brought up in different contexts before where the fact of the matter is the GNSO where 95% of ICANN's funding comes from, and the significant majority of policy work is conducted has only two representatives on the Board.

And we've talked about this for a while in the context of a holistic review or other review of ICANN structures. And whether or not it makes sense for us as the GNSO, we would have to work with our contracted party colleagues on this to request or insist on or

otherwise advocate for additional Board seats, maybe two for each house rather than one for each house.

I don't know how everybody feels about this, but it was something that Rafik and I wanted to put into play here, because at some point a holistic review will come up, and the entirety of ICANN will be examined. And this is probably something that we're going to need to an opinion on, if not advocate for. So let me open the floor on that before we proceed on the agenda and see if anybody has any thoughts.

MARIE PATTULLO

Marie from the BC. The way that I would see this is our house has two SGs. The CPH has two SGs. If we had a Board Seat 14 and a half for the NCSG, and 14 and three quarters for the CSG, and 13 and a half and 13 and three quarters, yes the Hogwarts reference was intentional, but let's not go there. And we have two less seats appointed by the NomCom. So, it would not actually change the number of the Board, but it would be more representative of the community. Anyway, it's an idea. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Marie. Other thoughts? Is it the sense of the room that this would be something that the CSG and NCSG could work together for to advocate? I'm seeing some head nods. Yeah. I'm surprised we don't have a little more feedback on this. Paul, do you have a thought on this? Because it's something that we've been sort of batting around for a while.

PAUL MCGRADY

Yeah. So, I don't know why we let people get away with this kind of thing. I really don't. Oh, we can't possibly know how many hours we meet with you versus everybody else. Although they're wearing their beret from their-- You know what I mean? This is just objective. It's like objectively where the pie is just cut in a weird way.

And again, this goes back to what I started preaching at about three years and two months ago, which is these doctrines of scarce falsity. What is wrong with me today? Doctrines of false scarcity. I'm just messing up my words. I had sushi for lunch. Maybe it was bad. But in any event, yeah, I think this is just something really objective and we should ask about it.

And again, we can do that in a low-key rhetoric kind of way. We don't have to go in guns blazing and say some-- like every now and then somebody will say something really outrageous, like ICANN is just a trade association for the contracted parties. We don't need to put everybody on their get their backup and get their lawyers out and all this other stuff. I think we just say, like, here's the math, here's the pie chart. Here's the representation. Also, here's how many hours we get with you versus everybody else.

System seems to be built in a way to make sure that you guys hear from us less. We think that's a mistake. And I started saying this recently too, because we represent the other 8.9 billion people that are not contracted parties. And so, yeah, I think it's certainly worth pushing on. And I think it's two sides of the same thing that we--

I'm sorry, it's my son calling and my family does not care that I'm here. I just think that math's on our side, we should use it.

MASON COLE

All right. We have a queue building here. Farzi, then Susan, then Damon, then Philippe. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI

Thank you. So, I have to talk to other NCSG members about this, but personally, I think a solution, because at the moment, we feel that the non-commercial voice is underrepresented on the Board. We have seen that the Board members that have been aligned with the non-commercial cause, they're not on the Board anymore. I mean, I'm not saying that all of them now, we have had additions that they're non-commercial. Please, no Board members should see the recording of this session.

So, I'm just making the point that we have to see as NCSG which path can actually remedy that underrepresentation on the Board, whether that could be by us being able to appoint two Board members. But also, another factor that NCSG has to consider is that we are underrepresented on the Board. The non-commercial values are underrepresented on the Board, because also we are underrepresented in NomCom. So, we have one delegate from NCUC, and we are a stakeholder group, and others have more, as you know, and this has been an issue. So, these are the things that we have to think and discuss to support a solution.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Farzi. Fairly brought up point. Thank you. Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah. So, not disagreeing with your point, your main point at all. I don't know if anyone here is a member of the Pilot Holistic Review or is observing it. That's excellent that you are. I was just going to say, I mean issues around things like structure and even this topic about Board representation, it's not a given that that is part of the holistic review. That Pilot Holistic Review at the moment is having disagreements and challenges about what their terms of reference are. So, something we all need to pay a bit more attention to, I think.

MASON COLE

Good point, Susan. Thank you. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. You know, I like the idea of advocating for more GNSO Board seats. Marie, your idea of rebalancing it from the NomCom and taking some NomCom slots away probably is going to be the easiest way to go. That being said, keep in mind that there's a strong feeling within the community that the NomCom is there to appoint "independent" directors and people that are not necessarily associated with ICANN. We certainly don't see that with all NomCom appointees, but you do see it with some. So, just as

we're thinking about this, keep that in mind, that that will be a consideration and it's something we should certainly be prepared to address.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Damon. Julf?

JULF HELSINGUS

Just a very quick one. We would have loved to have a representative on the holistic review pilot. We weren't allowed to have one. They basically said no.

MASON COLE

Okay. Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS

Just maybe a general comment on Board membership and diversity. I think it would be good if we came out with an NCPH message on the lack of diversity on the Board currently. It's not just about stakeholder, but it's also about the composition. If you look at that, there's basically very few female members at the Board. We don't have enough diverse backgrounds into the conversation. You don't have proper non-commercial representation there.

And I do think that a message like that need to get not just to org leadership, but also to NomCom. The point about NomCom is that ideally, they would be in touch with the community to know what are the needs and what's lacking at the Board, but I don't think they

are anymore. And I don't know, like a couple of selections throughout the years kind of just reinforce these points to me. I don't believe they're looking at the questions and the discussion points that are relevant for ICANN right now and I don't believe they're nominating members to the Board that will touch on those points, at least not from a GNSO perspective.

So, I don't know, perhaps we could do a message or a letter to NomCom or say something at the open mic this week about this point of diversity, because it is a concerning point that we're getting into a Board that's basically white male and from a non-diverse background and from a non-GNSO concerned perspective. So, a plus one on this point in general, but also, I do believe we do have to have a high-level message on that point.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Bruno. I encourage you to bring that back up when it's time to approach the community about our desired outcome. Any other hands, please, for the queue on this item? Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Mason. Yeah, just further to what Susan just said and three observations, I'll be stating the obvious, but A, that's a change in the bylaws. B, the more dependencies we will have between this and other aspects, like a structural review, for instance, the less likely this is going to be. Because we're going to have to address the whole spectrum of, for example, the structural review of ICANN, which is a contentious point. And one last point. Indeed, from what

we're hearing, the PHR doesn't go anywhere because there's no agreement there. So, there's a way to sort of dissociate this issue if people would like to push it with the PHR, then that's more likely to happen.

MASON COLE

Okay, thank you, Philippe. Anyone else? Yeah, go ahead, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay, thanks, Mason. Okay. From what I hear, there is some support to move on in this topic, but as Philippe listed, there are several challenges to go through. So, my question here and to check our desire is really, how much effort should we put on this and are we ready for it? Because that's not going to happen quickly, but it will be a long-term effort. So just to check if we are ready for that, if we get all the support to go on that path and how we can coordinate and work on this. So, that's kind of my question here to see from there so we can build for next steps.

PAUL MCGRADY

I think Susan's point's terrific. And we should be, yeah, about the terms of reference and getting this on the holistic review and just saying, listen this has been going on forever, here's the math. And this is the big chance. If we don't make it into that, it's going to be 15 years before we get another chance. So, I think in terms of what's next, we have to start talking loudly about that process and then we should also have a backup where we say, and if we don't

make it in the holistic review, we're going to force some other community process to deal with this.

But the best thing is just to put us in there and get this taken care of. So, I think there's a great opportunity and I think it was really smart for Susan to raise it because I think until she said that, I think I was just assuming that holistic meant holistic and apparently, it means that people are going to pick and choose their issues, which is not holistic. It's just another review. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Paul. And thanks for your note in the chat. Everybody's good wishes to your family.

PAUL MCGRADY

I mean, I'm getting texts and calls and somebody got put on do something. I have a niece that's unhappy because somebody she doesn't likes on a family chat. I don't know. And I swear my family always, they look at the ICANN calendar and they're like, okay, who can get sick? Who can run away? Who can get their bank account hacked? It's incredible to me how the family drama lines up almost exactly with ICANN meetings. And this one's especially wild, but thank you.

MASON COLE

Oh yeah. Everybody here is behind you and your family. So good luck. All right. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks. I'm here with my family until Tuesday. So, I appreciate all that, the well-wishing for families. My question on the Pilot Holistic Review and the Board structure relates to the fact that I think the Board voted that ATRT4 would only be delayed until April of this year. But now that the pilot holistic review, and I think the continuous improvement these things aren't happening in time. And what is Non-Contracted Party House point of view on ATRT4? Because the Board will have to review that again. And I don't know if Board structure is part of ATRT4 or not, or if it's out of scope.

MASON COLE

Thanks for raising that, Anne. Everybody in the room is kind of staring straight ahead. I'm not sure we have a grip on that yet. So Julf, you're shaking your head on that. Do you have knowledge? No. Okay. All right. That's going to be something that'll be captured in notes for us to follow up on. So, and Andrea is taking notes. So, Andrea, thank you. Everybody give Andrea a hand, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks. Thanks a lot, Mason. I think we need to think about how we're going to approach that particular matter.

MASON COLE

Indeed. Thank you, Ann. All right. Manju.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Mason. So now that we're talking about ATRT, I thought I'll bring it to everyone's attention that there's a public comment going on about the updated operating. Let me check the exact wording. Proposed Updates to the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews. So ATRT is one of those specific reviews, therefore, according to ICANN bylaw. And then this proposed updates by the org, it says that in the future, ICANN org will decide the scope of the specific reviews, and then they'll publish it for public comments. And then after that, they will start a team according to the scope.

So, we were talking about how we should include things into the reviews. If this becomes reality, it will be even harder for us to ask for things to be reviewed in Specific Reviews, especially ATRT being one of them. So, I'll definitely encourage every one of us to submit a public comment to comment about this and probably just try to avoid this happen in the future. And the public comment deadline is pretty close. It was extended already. I think it's either-- I don't know, it's very close. We should submit the public comments pretty soon. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON

Just to let you know, the close date for that, the proposed updates is March 21st.

MASON COLE

March 21st, you say? Okay. All right. Right around the corner. Other hands in the queue for this issue, please. Queue looks clear. Okay. Do you want to introduce the next topic?

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah, sure. Okay. Maybe I'm moving to more light topic, I guess. Yeah. So, this is about to prepare for Day 0 event. So here the proposal maybe for Muscat. I think that makes sense. Just to keep the same frequency that we had. So just I believe if we as we heard that we want maybe to discuss more some specific issue and so on. So, we should start preparing for now. And I guess one first action is to see if we can get this Day 0, just to secure it.

But in terms of planning, we didn't start that discussion yet. I think maybe there are some idea how to coordinate for this. As usual, maybe through the leadership. But probably we can also open for the rest to get more feedback and input about what we want to do there and also what we want to see as expected outcome. So just to start this discussion. Mason, do you want to add something?

MASON COLE

Thanks, Rafik. The reason this is on the agenda for now is because org requires six months in advance for a request of this kind. And when we put together the request for Istanbul, you'll find remember how-- We started working on it right about now, this time of year, right? Yeah. So now is the time for us to start planning this if this is something that we would like to do.

And I know this dovetails a bit with the discussion we just had on frequency of NCPH meetings. But Rafik and I wanted to raise this in this forum to see if there's enough interest in the room to proceed with another request. Because we'll have to ask ICANN for the resources, the meeting space, all the logistics, staff support, that kind of thing, in order to get it on the calendar. So, any thoughts on this, please? Okay. Oh, Damon, please.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Yeah, I think we should absolutely ask for it. If we want to continue these, we need to advocate for Day 0 and do it early and often.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Damon. Any other thoughts? Damon raises a good point. We can ask. And if we decide not to do it, we can withdraw the ask. Before, of course, ICANN devotes resources to it. We don't want to be unfair to ICANN. But nonetheless it's something that if we are going to try to do it from Muscat, this is something that Rafik and I need to jump on pretty soon. So, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE-

This is Lawrence from the BC. I also wanted to add that there's been some discussion of late on how-we-meet meetings and all that. And it's only logical that we also put forward proposals such as this, so that there is registered interest, where org gets to consider, I've forgotten the word they use for other meetings

outside the public meetings, where they need to put in a budget, especially since we have another financial year ahead.

It could be the best time to basically put such a presentation forward. If there needs to be a budget, it needs to be put into the budget. There's no argument that our request came at a point where the budget had been finalized and all that. And particularly to also pique that interest, that we have an interest for either a Day 0 event or an intersessional, and it should be put into planning.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Lawrence. Good input. Any other hands, please? Susan.

SUSAN MOHR

Hi, this is Susan Mohr for the record. Thanks. Maybe a question and a comment. Would the intent of the Day 0 event include meeting with the Board? So, that's a question. And then the comment is, maybe just to reinforce some comments that have been made already, leading up to that, it seems to make sense for us to develop a more robust process amongst this group to evaluate policies as they come up and understand where our differences and similarities are and what our priorities are.

And with that robust process, I think we would be in a better position leading up to these Day 0 events to have a really solid agenda in anticipation of those discussions. I think when we first, when we were in Istanbul, there was some discussion about doing intersessional discussions, and we haven't, because of everything

else that's going on, we just haven't established that yet. But that may make sense in order for us to really get to a place where we've got that good understanding.

PAUL MCGRADY

This is just an alternative view, which is maybe the ask is for a year from now, next March, because we will have, either we'll be reappointing our incumbent or we're going to be having serious discussions about that issue. And that'll be premature in Muscat. And it'll also be right before the Next Round is due to open. And so, it's going to be a real interesting time in the community.

And I don't know where that March meeting is going to be. I've never been able-- I typed TBD into Google Maps, it doesn't come up. But I expect it to be less expensive than Muscat. That's going to be a really expensive meeting, I think. Maybe I'm wrong, maybe it's cheap. But anyways, just an alternative view that it may not be the annual.

MASON COLE

That's a constructive suggestion, Paul. Yeah. How does the room feel about what Paul just elucidated? Yeah. Some good ideas? Okay. All right. Then that's something that Rafik and I'll have to carry into our request. Rafik, any thoughts on this?

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay. I'm trying to find the thoughts. Yeah, I think it makes sense. But just to be sure, just in case, should we kind of placeholder make

the request for Muscat, and then also for March next year. And we decide later when, if we want to select one of those date, just to be sure if we should proceed with this.

MASON COLE

Okay. Very good. Other thoughts, please? Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Mason. Philippe here. Just a thought, but I think that by the Muscat meeting, we should be able to say whether the incumbent is in the position to stay or not, according to the procedure. Because as far as I can remember, the point was that starting in January was too late. That was our conclusion. So, I guess, when is it? October, November? We should be able to say where we stand on this.

MASON COLE

Okay. Thank you, Philippe. Okay. We have 15 minutes left. We're not going to get through the entire agenda, obviously. So, we've had a request from Farzi and from Paul now for AOB. But, Rafik, anything else you'd like to cover on that issue from the NCSG side on the Day 0?

RAFIK DAMAK

No.

MASON COLE

Okay. Okay. Okay. Let's move to the next agenda item, which is talking about input on-- There was a town hall with Kurtis, the new ICANN CEO, where we heard about some priorities from ICANN leadership. And we had the opportunity to contribute some thoughts to Kurtis. He also had one-on-one meetings with stakeholder group leadership, individually, or constituency leadership, individually, over the last, I don't know, probably month or so, something like that.

So, I'm looking at John. John, you're nodding your head a little bit longer than that. Yeah. So, we're at a bit of an inflection point here in that we've got a new CEO. We know a little bit about what direction he wants to take in terms of ICANN being more productive and more inclusive and all the things that-- He's saying all the right things, which is a good sign. I think when we provided him some input on the need for more balanced outcomes in the community, the need for a greater representation of non-contracted interests at all levels of ICANN.

I'm not sure, maybe I could call on John and Philippe, if you guys don't mind me putting you on the spot, just for your input from the CSG side on your conversations with Kurtis and whether you consider that productive and where it might've led.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Mason. Philippe here. Well, that we could appreciate that from his perspective, that was very much early days. So, the meeting was essentially to brief him on our priorities. So, that was

just half an hour. So, that was basically get to know each other more than anything else.

JOHN MCELWAIN

I would echo the same thing. John McElwaine for the record. I mean, it was early days, we were providing him our priorities, very pleasant. And as you'd mentioned, he said, he listened and said all the right things. So, I don't have much more to add other than that. Yeah.

RAFIK DAMAK

I think, yeah, probably the same feeling that everyone had that he said that he's going to listen. I guess my take here is just we need to put action to those words and to see how that will work. It was a positive meeting. And again, it was a 30 minutes, so it was more listening than talking. So, personally waiting to see how things will evolve in specific topics and to see how he will react or behave.

Justine thing about the-- Maybe we can move to the town hall. Unfortunately, I could not attend, but I could listen. So, my take there is just to think also we-- again, I guess he repeated the same message that about listening, and maybe he gave some thoughts like about the ICANN multi-stakeholder, how we can maybe to present to the outside. But I just want to be sure here in term if he has, we want like the NCPH, what really we want to input for Kurtis in the future.

And the question here is, because now it's just we give him kind of we introduced ourselves, we give our priority and so on. But for me,

it's just, yeah, it's first contact, first encounter looks fine, but just I'm more concerned about the next six months or one year. And here is how we should really, what we are expecting, what we are supposed to monitor exactly, I guess. Personally, I think it's just we need to see him in some specific situation and see how things go. Just asking here.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Rafik. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Mason. Philippe here. And just recollecting our conversation, what was interesting is that it was just as much an introduction from Kurtis, but also Russ's introduction to the group. And there was an emphasis on his objective as the new policy director to deliver on policies that are being developed by the GNSO. In particular, I found that interesting as something that the CEO would ask the new director. Now we can discuss as to whether that's realistic, but I thought that was an interesting point. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Philippe. Anyone else? Okay. With your agreement, I'm suggesting we go to AOB, because I don't think we have time for everything else on the agenda and AOB as well. Are you okay with that?

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah.

MASON COLE

Okay. All right. Let's move to all other business, please. Farzi, you were first in the queue.

FARZANEH BADIEI

I'm going to be really short, but if we get time, we can talk a little bit about DNS Abuse positions too. It's a light topic. So, WSIS+20. I just wanted to tell you that we are gathering community ideas on how the multi-stakeholder model is effectively contributing to policymaking and keeping the internet global.

For example, the GNSO approved several recommendations that provides this kind of participation in the internet policymaking and facilitates it. So, I wanted to know if you have any examples of how multi-stakeholder model has helped as opposed to other multilateral models has helped with contributing to internet governance in different ways. Just let me know. Yeah, that's it.

MASON COLE

Is that everything for AOB for you there? Okay. Any input for Farzi on that? Okay. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks. Just a commercial to apply for my job. So, I am term limited out, and the NomCom process ends soon. So, if anybody wants to talk about what it's like to be in this role, I'm happy to

speak with them privately without telling the world that you've expressed interest. But I don't think we should--

I think we should put forward good people from the folks in this house that actually participate so that we can at least compete with people who want the gig, even though they may not know us. I'm trying to say that in a kind way. We can work with anybody. But I think that actually understanding the dynamic and where we came from three and a half years ago and where we are now is really vitally important. So, reach out if anybody would like to talk. I'm happy to do it. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Can you talk just briefly about some of the duties of the role as you see it and how you took on helping to sort of broker a new piece between the two houses?

PAUL MCGRADY

That sounds, I think that gives me more credit than I deserve. But no, I think that there was an obvious theme going into this three and a half years ago those in the community who want to mute our voice had our number. They had us figured out. They found ways like the false scarcity of seats to get us always at each other's throats.

And just early days pushing back on that. So, we would be in Council and there would magically be just one too few seats on a working team, so that we're mad at each other in public. And we basically identifying pain points like that was the theme of my

candidacy. I actually wrote and talked about how we needed peace in the house. And then for the reappointment, talked about essentially where we were and how we were getting along and doing better and what the plans were.

And so, I think that continuing the progress we've made, whoever's in this role, I'd love for them to be fully committed to continuing the progress that we've made. This role also, yeah, it's more than just being on Council and trying to cast your votes correctly. For me, it was also about being the person who picked up the pen when nobody else wanted to or something that's really important to the house. Because I found that if you are willing to pick up the pen, 80% of the challenge is eliminated, but that takes work. And so, this person will need to be willing to roll up their sleeves and help Council leadership get things done. And so, again, it's more than just having a vote to cast.

And then lastly, yeah, you guys have asked me to get involved with the resolution of the last time around with Board Seat 14 and helping with this thing in terms of the other process. And so, the new person may be called upon to do those things as well. But I did my best to have an activist role and not a passive role, but in a way that didn't overflow the banks of the remit. Does that make sense? So, I hope I accomplished that.

And there are a lot of good people around this table. There are a lot of good people who couldn't come to this meeting but are listening in. And I would encourage anybody who has an interest to reach out. It really is very, this has been my favorite thing. It's

been very, very rewarding. And I'm looking forward to my past year. Thank you.

MASON COLE

All right. Thanks, Paul. Thanks for all your good work on behalf of the Non-Commercial Party House. Let's give Paul a quick hand. Yeah. Thank you, Paul. Good job. Excellent work. Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

I was just going to thank Paul. We just did that. But no, Paul, I'm not looking forward to you going out to pastor, as you say. You've done a phenomenal job. And it's been a pleasure to serve on Council with you. And I'm going to propose an amendment to keep you on forever, but won't win. So, thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, Damon. And Aubrey just whispered, there is no pastor. So, I think the pastor is a lie, but thanks.

MASON COLE

Call that the holistic Paul review. How about that? Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

The application for NomCom closes on 28th March. So, if there's still somebody who was moved by Paul's description, you can still apply. And please do. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Vivek. 28th March, you said? Okay. Very good. Okay. All right. We're almost at time. Any other business for the Non-Contracted Party House? All right. Then three minutes back to your day. Thanks, everybody. We're adjourned.

ANDREA GLANDON

Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]