

Transcription ICANN Dublin
Tuesday 20 October 2015
NPOC Meeting

Rudi Vansnick: So we can start our meeting. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. This is the NPOC Constituency Day meeting on Tuesday October 20. I would like to welcome all of you to our meeting. We will go around the table to do the roll call, that's the easiest way to do so. I will start on my left.

Joan Kerr: Joan Kerr, Member Chair.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus Stoll, Vice Chair.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco, Policy Committee.

Man: (Unintelligible) ICANN staff.

Tapani Tarvainen: Tapani Tarvainen, NCSG incoming Chair.

(Augustina Calavelli): Sorry, (Augustina Calavelli), new member.

Martin Silva: Martin Silva, Secretariat.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. With this we've done the regular stuff, we can start our agenda. I'm happy to welcome Tapani Tarvainen, the incoming NCSG Chair. It's the first time that NPOC has the favor of having the visit of the NCSG Chair. We're looking forward to have more closer discussions further on the road. And we are looking really forward in improving the work we have to do together in the next 12 months.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, thank you Rudi. I want to tell you a little about one small tradition in Finnish politics that whenever the president is elected the tradition is that he or she hands down the party membership card, whatever that is, (unintelligible). So I will try to at least act as if I did stand above this constituency divisions and work with you and NCUC equally rather than representing NCUC as may have been the case in the past.

Now I – from that I'll be splitting my time today between the constituencies. I'll be leaving you now but I come back again later.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Tapani. And you're welcome as an NPOC member. We have some space in our membership. Thank you and see you later. So I would like to hand over the floor to Joan Kerr, our Membership Committee Chair to welcome our new members in NPOC.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Rudi. It's Joan Kerr for the record. So we have a new member with us today in the room. Welcome, (Augustina), to NPOC. And we hope that you become more involved. And we look forward to working with you.

And also we have another member, (Samuel) – let me see if I can pronounce this – (Samuel Cowako). Yes. So we welcome him. If you're online hopefully you'll tune in and we hope – we're looking forward to working with both of you. And if you would like to say a couple of words that would be great.

(Augustina Calavelli): Thank you very much. I'm (Augustina Calavelli) from Argentina. I'm here representing – how you say in English (ADC), a civil right association in Argentina. It's based in Buenos Aires but (ADC) has presence in all the country. It's a NGO related to privacy issues, access to information and freedom of expression. And now is concerning about the digital world what is happening with human rights on the Internet.

I have a degree in communications so I hope that will help here. And I think that could be useful. We are planning to maybe to build a relationship with other NGOs in Argentina to help them to get more about domain names and how they can get involved with ICANN. So we want to do something related with that.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you. We look forward to working with you and welcome again. Over to you, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Joan. Rudi for the transcript. But I think that in a few minutes they will know and recognize my voice. Coming back to what you told us, indeed, there is a lot of discussions going on on privacy and human rights. I think it would be good if in the future maybe for Marrakesh we could call on you to explain our community, the NGOs, what is important to them in human rights perspective, what is

important to NGOs because NGOs, at the end, are organizations. They cannot call on human rights. They could call on the privacy issues.

But it would be good to have an explanation where NGOs eventually could also help raising the question inside the community so if you could prepare something for Marrakesh next meeting that would be good to have maybe a half hour session trying to figure out where the NGOs and NPOC meet the human rights and privacy discussions.

Because we have some issues with talking about the whole time about human rights and privacy while the NGOs have a lot of other issues that they want to have a discussion on. And it would be good if you could clarify and find a way of where we can combine the efforts and go in the same direction. So it would be quite helpful.

(Augustina Calavelli): Okay. We understand that the point of NPOC is connected with (unintelligible) of domain name and not strictly dealing with privacy or human rights issues. That's why we are -- we want to get involved. Okay sorry. We want to make (bones) with other civil society organizations in Argentina to help them to know about this domain name system, not only human rights organizations, all civil society.

Klaus Stoll: I don't want – Klaus for the record. I don't want to go too much into detail about human rights and ICANN. But basically you can say human rights have to underlie everything what ICANN does. But ICANN doesn't do human rights.

But let me give you very straightforward example. I think everybody will understand the following. If civil society organizations can't use Internet, can't use their websites, if they can't use it for whatever

reason, if they can't make their voice heard, if they can't raise funds on the Internet and things like that they can't exercise their human rights. And that's where the connection is. It's even lower than saying okay we have to stand up for human rights. We have to make sure that people actually can stand up.

(Augustina Calavelli): Yeah, I understand that. I'm aware of that. Maybe I wasn't clear because...

((Crosstalk))

(Augustina Calavelli): Okay now. Yeah.

Rudi Vansnick: So I have Joan in the queue.

Joan Kerr: Yes it's Joan Kerr for the record. I was thinking more in sort of the human rights privacy issues may be is (Augustina) could do an overview of her organization but maybe more presentation on how you plan or will engage your not-for-profit in your area. I think that's probably more along the lines of what we should be talking about. And so maybe your plan and how we can help you with that.

(Augustina Calavelli): We don't have a plan for now because this is just the beginning. I am here to listen and to learn and to know how can we contribute with NPOC and how we can get involved in these issues. So we don't have already a plan but we wanted to have it and that's why I'm here and we can start building it.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. Sam. Oh so, Joan.

Joan Kerr: Just a follow-up on that, that's what we're trying to do so maybe that's something we can start to work on and do a pilot project or something like that on how it works. I just want to, you know, push that that's all.

(Augustina Calavelli): Yesterday we were talking about an event you are planning to hold or something like that in Latin America, maybe that could be the first step.

Klaus Stoll: Just for your information, it's actually very very timely because we are now starting the survey on NGOs - on the NGO use of the DNS in Latin America in the next few weeks. And basically without survey we will know exactly what they need is of the NGOs. And based on that survey the plan is to do events, targeted events responding to that need and really fulfill.

It can be, for example in Africa sometimes it's connectivity is a problem. Who tells us is that the same problem in Argentina, maybe not. So if this is security being you understand what I mean. So I think if we cooperate very closely for example, also on the survey that it's ideal start.

(Augustina Calavelli): Okay. I will.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Turn off your mic please Klaus. Sam, you have the floor now.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, Sam Lanfranco for the record. And I would speak with two hats on here. One is the chair of the Policy Committee and the other is a social scientist. One of the challenges within the NPOC community - constituency is that the constituent organizations have missions and visions that are not primarily focused on the Internet and they're not

like ISOC or Internet Society chapters. And so there's a challenge -- there are challenges for us with respect to the constituency.

I'll give you an example of one. The reason it for most of the NGOs are around social justice, equity, women, and the environment and so forth. So they really don't even have a budget to consider coming to events like this. Our constituency cannot get here.

The way they can get here is if they get recruited to put a lot of effort into the work agenda of ICANN itself which is quite peripheral to the concerns that they should be having with respect to the DNS system and with respect to their presence on the Internet ecosystem. As an economist I look at the social media areas, and as a social scientist there are two big problems there.

One is the ethics of social justice organizations using social media websites where their members, their supporters, their clients all have their data mined every time they come to the website to interact with the NGO, with the agency. There's an ethical issue there that has not been cultivated and explored within our constituency. That's one.

The other is the approach that has been used within ICANN has been an outreach approach saying, we want to talk to you and get you involved in ICANN's policy issues with respect to the DNS. It hasn't been to go to the community and say, let's talk about the DNS and see what your issues are with respect to it. Klaus has mentioned access, maintaining ownership of a domain name and so forth.

But there is a whole other dialogue among -- within the constituency that needs to take place to raise everybody's level of awareness,

ICANN's level of awareness, our level of awareness as to what are the really important issues at that level of the Internet. This is separate from content. This is separate from other things. That need to be the policy issues that the community brings forward with respect to the DNS, not the policy issues that ICANN brings to the community.

And so how we turned that around, one, is going to be the events, the surveys that Klaus has talked about and the events that we intend to hold. I want to drill in a lot more deeper beyond those surveys to hear the voices of the constituency saying these are the things that have got us in a corner or we don't know about or confused with respect to how we operate in this electronic space to carry on our mission and vision, not to advance the interests of ICANN.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. Rudi for the transcript. I recognize some new faces in the room and I would like you to present yourself so that we can keep track in our recordings also.

Glen McKnight: Glen McKnight.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you. Sorry for arriving late. Carlos Gutierrez.

Jason Hynds: Hello, Jason Hynds.

(Tom McKinesey): Hello. (Tom McKinesey).

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. And I recognize a new participant in the remote. Ahmed Almarwani, welcome. So I would conclude the second part of our agenda, welcoming new members, and that's been quite interesting. We have already a lot of exchanges now on future plans.

I would like to move on with our agenda and go to the third point on the agenda, the general overview of the work that has been done by NPOC members in the working groups. And I will start with myself in my capacity as a member of a few working groups.

Actually the first one that I would like to announce and have been seen now publicly is that the work I have been doing as a cochair of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information in the Whois Database, my goodness, the TNT PDP Working Group, the board has resolved the resolution of implementation of that PDP.

So the next phase will be to start the implementation review team of that PDP which has been successful. I think that that's a good sample of NPOC being able to work in a PDP and have a successful outcome. So that's work that's coming up quite soon which means that I will call on our NPOC members to participate in that working group in the future.

Another one I am active in is the Proxy and Privacy Services, PPSIA PDP WG, that's the full abbreviation. Touching upon all the privacy and proxy issues related to the registration of a domain name. It's a very intensive work that has been done yet there. We are coming up to -- close to a final report that probably will be proposed at the ICANN meeting in Marrakesh.

Another working group is the -- it's not a working group it's a standing committee of improvement of implementation of policy. And it's a quite interesting one. It's a quite small group, we have two representatives of each constituency and stakeholder groups in that committee. And we

have been dropping the question or giving an answer to the question we got from the Council. Standing committee is operating based on what the GNSO Council is asking the standing committee to look into eventual issues with procedures.

And one of the procedures or one of the issues that we had to handle was that 10 day waiver on a resubmission of a motion. It's very complex, it's all about procedures. And the second item in it was about the friendly amendment which is again a lot of procedures and processes. And we dropped it on the table at the GNSO and it looks like the GNSO is pushing it back to us again.

We have to look now in a closer way on what the friendly amendment could be. And we are looking to sample cases to see how we are going to do that. And then next call will be in a few weeks. And there will be also a shift of chairs. I'm actually the vice chair and I asked if I'm going to stand as the next chair for 2016. I will have some discussions with my colleagues in the NPOC ExComm to see if it's allowable to engage myself furthermore.

But again it proves that NPOC can take - leadership can take responsibilities in quite important discussions inside the policy world of GNSO. And we have other colleagues also in working groups. I'm just forgetting the other ones I'm actually involved in. There is the DMPM that I'm a member of. There are several other ones that I'm really following but not actively really taking the position.

But we need to have at least one or two members of NPOC in the important working groups. And I'm looking around the table and I know Sam is in - Sam, you want to speak?

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, well I'm -- I'm finishing here with my overview and report what we are doing -- what I am doing as an NPOC member in the GNSO.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. Sam Lanfranco for the record. This is as much for -- it's a reflection but it's for that new NPOC members as well. I got involved with ICANN a little over three years ago. I had other work to clear off my plate but it took me at least two years or 2.5 years to figure out operationally what was going on inside ICANN. Not just the politics and all of that but just to understand processes and how things work.

And so for the last year I've been commenting on working groups. I've not participated in working groups. And so the two lessons that I've learned from that if it takes a while to figure out this fairly complicated organization, to figure out where you can best deploy your resources. I think I'm there now so I will be heeding Rudi's call for us to be on more working groups and I will be starting after this meeting.

But the other thing that I'm offering, and I've offered to a couple of people, is I now know enough about this that if people who are more neophyte than me decide they want to get onto working groups I'm prepared to do some mentoring on that specific task so that we've got like a senior and junior member who have equal voices on the same working group or on a different working group. But sort of whatever I've managed to learn I never cared to share.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. I have Klaus in the queue.

Klaus Stoll: I just would like to make some general comments. Yes, I am in several working groups and yes I will not bore you about what's going on in this working group. So I think it's much more important two things, that everybody understands when you are going into a working group there is a long phase of just as the beginning of like Sam just described of listening and learning.

There is nothing wrong with going into a working group and listening on a regular basis and learn to understand until you are confident to deal with it. I just learned last week about a shortcut. One of the shortcut is quite simply the leadership training program from ICANN. And I think that is such a extremely good tool that I really would recommend that, you know, recommend that as NPOC we are trying to get as many members participating in it as possible.

And as a second concrete proposal maybe after the ICANN meeting here we should go and consult with our membership who's actually going and covering which – sorry – which working group and maybe have a monthly call on just quite simply what's going on on the working groups to follow up on this.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. I have also Martin.

Martin Silva: Yes. Just as Klaus mentioned the leadership program was -- it started before. It has helped to create the cross community academic working group which I'm part of. I think this is just -- we may repeat ourselves but since we are just such a new constituency and most of us are really new inside ICANN it's also, I'm going to repeat, a learning process to be part of the working group and to understand how the process worked inside.

In this case it's not a policy development working group but it is capacity building working group which is part of the NPOC missions around. And besides improving and keep developing the leadership program we're also working with universities. Among the many projects that are in there because this is a cross community -- all the communities have their own, even ICANN staff has their own.

One of which – I'm really involved with universities in Latin America as a starting point where civil society NGOs or even business can get together and start like a starting point to the DNS system and ICANN mission. Because as we already talked many many times, and they already (unintelligible) this ICANN seems so far away from normal people or normal businesses and even education institutions, well, this is part of the things that we are working on.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you very much, Martin. Well I know we are also working and participating and essentially listening for the moment in what is going on in the Cross Community Working Group on Stewardship of IANA Transition, which is a quite nervous one. One of the aspects we have been seeing is that there is a lot of talk coming from civil society on several issues where we as NPOC we are not fully agreeing with divisions that are brought up.

I'm rather pointing to the fact that and when you talk to people in the street about the IANA transition almost everybody will say, you know, Internet works, where is the issue? What is the problem? Why should we change things? So you have to explain it. In fact it's the US government who decided that a change was needed to allow them to not be the big brother anymore.

And then you quite often get the reflection of, well, it was not that bad. So why not keeping it? We are a bit more afraid of having other countries taking the lead in it and taking control over the Internet, that would really be bad. Because there could be some situations where they will lock out access to Internet or lock out having organizations being able to show up on the Internet. And I think that's a rather dangerous outcome that could happen if it gets into hands that we don't like.

I see a hand.

Klaus Stoll: Speaking about the transition, he just walked in.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, morning. Yeah, well they are going to have a session at 10:00. I asked the cochairs of the cross community working group to join us and give us some explanations. I see Glen, you have your hand up.

Glen McKnight: I promise you, nothing about the IANA transition – I'll leave that to my colleague at the window. I wanted to ask the committee a question. There is this document on civil engagement that I got circulated in August. And Adam Peake and Jean-Jacques Sahel has been responsible. And each of the regions have had assigned people for it.

If you haven't seen it it's about a four-page document. And it's actually NCUC, NPOC and ALAC is supposed to contribute not only on the document but also on the calendar so there's funds available for outreach. And I'm just curious I want to ask the committee if you guys have seen the document, have you contributed to the document? Have you consulted with the group?

And I see somebody on the other hand is – I'm going to stretch this out a little bit to Klaus. I'm just very curious because I submitted a very, very long list of stuff for North America as the incoming Chair of NARALO, ALAC member. And it took weeks for them to – and finally yesterday I saw my contributions finally. I felt ignored for a while. I felt like I was dealing with my wife.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Are you in transition?

Joan Kerr: He might be.

Glen McKnight: So I'm just very curious because, you know, it's – I'm sort of used to being ignored sometimes but I cannot believe. And I've pounded this home and I think they're sick of seeing me on it because it is a capacity building, you know, outreach. And I know I've shared with you guys my contacts with (NTEN) and I've, you know, probably my friend across the hall here who was with me at PIR advisory remember I brought you guys up like endlessly until they were sick and tired. They thought I was on the payroll for NPOC for a while.

So I just want to ask the committee – and I see Klaus is anxious so I'll shut up now.

Klaus Stoll: Long story. Yes, we been presented with this document. Yes, we made a nine-page replay, very detailed reply. Yes, we got completely ignored. And, yes, it is symptomatic for ICANN and even plays out, sorry I'll use the swear words, in the transition. Because basically we

made the same experience as I sometimes feel that the CCWG group is making.

We making clear straightforward suggestions which are – which are, for example, that outreach of ICANN should not consist of sending staff for 10, 20 minute speech to a conference and then go home.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Klaus Stoll: It doesn't work. We said we need outreach based on needs. We need outreach done by ICANN membership. We need outreach done by in a way that is actually effective. And we at least our contribution, I didn't see any kind of new document – has been completely just ignored and even the whole approach just not even taken serious. And that is for me, a problem. It's the same like in the CCWG if you saying this is what the community says and then the board says, okay, you need something different.

And are we still having the meeting tonight at 7:00?

Glen McKnight: Yeah, we have the outreach and engagement meeting from 7:00 to 8:00. I'm the co chair for North America, yes.

Klaus Stoll: I'm looking forward to go there and to support you in that case because I think we really need to make a huge fight about this one. Because the point is – it goes with the finance, it goes with the principles of multistakeholder engagement. If the only engagement is through staff at conferences we will never create any kind of platform for membership and interest in ICANN.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. Just a short follow up, Glen.

Glen McKnight: One of the things I have to stress to this committee too is the person responsible for the fellowship program is looking for our feedback. I've never understood why you have 743 fellows that have come, many of them have had up to five times they've been here, which is bizarre. But the fact that some countries are way over-represented, some are not at all. North America has a first nation's Indians from Canada and the United States that are under-represented. They're not allowed in so that drives me crazy. But Eastern Europe is there but not Western Europe.

So many of the places that have developed not for profit structures are not eligible to – for fellowship. So you don't have that new blood of people coming into NPOC. So I just want to bring that up as a issue as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. I would like to end this discussion now because it's only our agenda at 11:35 we will talk about how to get NGOs involved and being – collaborating in the ICANN perspective. I would like to welcome one of the cochairs of the Cross Community Working Group on the Accountability, Leon Sanchez, welcome.

We would like to hear from you where NGOs and NPOC could be helping in getting this in a final stage.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Rudi. And thank you for your time and your invitation to be here. It's a privilege to be here. I'm glad that (Jason) is here. I'm glad that Martin is here, Carlos, Glen of course, old friends. And of course you really from our interactions in ISOC.

So well I think that we've made a lot of progress. As you might have heard the LA meeting didn't go quite well. But other than that in this – these last days I think we were able to actually go through the comments that were received in the second public comment period, the working groups were working really hard to go through them, assess them and actually build some recommendations so that we could fairly address the concerns that we heard in the feedback we got from the community.

And we had a pretty long session on Friday. And I think that that was a point when things apparently seemed to begin to flow and to (dis-)entrench) we had some very entrenched conversations like for example which model should we actually be embracing as a governance structure to the future and there is the discussion – well they're having many models on the table. And we have analyzed all of them.

We have gone through analyzing multiple member models, single member model, single designator model, multiple designator and one other model that was based on the MEM model, which was the board's proposal in reaction to the member model.

And well of course one of the requirements from the NTIA in one of their multiple posts was that we should analyze all possible governance structures in order to come to the best possible structure for the future of ICANN and accountability of course.

And one of the premises that we heard when we began working on this from the community was that we needed enforceability. And at that

time it felt to me like it was independence day, we were all writing with our swords and claiming yes, enforceability and everyone was very enthusiastic about enforceability.

But then we began – as we began to analyze the different models that were on the table we came to realize that there were different grades or different stages of enforceability. So I think that through our discussions we have found that there are some powers that we are definitely willing as a community to have enforceability on but there are some other let's call them side effect powers that are not really desirable for the community to have because they would, at a certain stage, endanger the organization because they could bring instability.

So I think that we have all been very careful to go through each of the community's concerns. And I think that would be very useful for us to actually get to know which are NPOC's concerns or NPOC's main contributions or issues with accountability so we are sure that in the course of our work we do address NPOC's concerns.

So we held another meeting yesterday and it was focused on analyzing the different models. We have so far a short list of two different models, one being the membership model. We're still going on analyzing the sole member model. And the sole designator model. So the main difference between one or another is that in the sole member model you would still have those statutory powers that could in fact derive into unintended consequences if implemented.

As opposed – as in the sole designator model in which you wouldn't have these statutory powers but you would be able to vest into the

community as many powers as you wanted to put into the bylaws for the community to actually – to actually enforce.

So we seem to be reaching to a point in which the group is analyzing the different pros and cons of going with either model. And what we did yesterday was to analyze these models in regard to four different points and different criteria. The first point was enforcement. And the criteria for evaluate enforcement or to assess enforcement in the two models was whether we had direct or indirect enforceability, the worst case enforcement delay and the costs of worst case enforcement.

Because we feel that these have been concerns that the community has clearly stated whether we are able to actually have access to enforceability directly or indirectly, whether there could be some kind of delay, let's say, if the board said we don't want to go into an IRP, that could delay the process. And how we could go around that of course.

And we have also been analyzing the worst case on costs, let's say who going to pay for this so because that can only – that can also be a barrier of entry or access to actually holding accountable whomever you want to hold accountable.

The second point was captured to risk or risk capture. And here we analyze or we proposed four criteria being the first derivative action against board. Let's say that we went through the single versus multiple or the single member versus single designator and we analyzed whether this could bring instability, as I said, because of statutory powers to be exercised by either single or of course multiple SOs and ACs through the (unintelligible) of the single member.

We also said the criteria of the right to dissolve the organization. This is something that was also analyzed and that was a real concern for many. The balance between the various SOs and the ACs in these single body that would actually be the one who would exercise the powers vested in the community.

There's a couple of the issues where board business judgment is applied. And we resumed this as a – or we framed this as the fiduciary duty that the board has to the organization on how they would carry this business. And there was a concern that at a certain point the board would be able to claim exercising fiduciary duties in order to avoid going into an IRP. So we had a long discussion on whether this was actually possible and how, if possible, we could narrow it down to a point in which the risk was really so little that then the community would feel comfortable with actually going either with one model or the other.

Then transparency was the other subject to analyze through our meeting. And for this the criteria was whether we would have access to corporate records or not. The discussion went around that in the single member model statutory rights provide actually the right to go through corporate records whereas in the single designator this power is not a statutory power of course, but it could be provided in the bylaws.

So we have a balance there, it's like – it's really not a matter of the model whether it's member or designator because you would have it – you would be able to have that right either way so that was something that I think it went well.

The complexity the criteria were the necessity to create legal persons for support organizations and advisory committees. The necessity for individuals to act as legal persons. The ease of understanding. And the ability to explain that the change is minimal.

One of the comments we received or exactly many comments that were received through both the first public comment period and the second public comment period were in the sense that we should avoid as much as possible complexity in our proposal.

So we should aim to actually come to a proposal that was not complex, of course very simple to implement and also very easy to understand. Because, you know, when you go through our report you can actually get lost into the many issues that the report addresses. So this was one of the main concerns that we heard that we needed to come to a proposal that was not complex and that was easy to understand to everyone.

And the next criteria, as I said, was whether we needed to create legal persons for the SOs and ACs. This was something that was discussed long ago. I believe that we discussed this in March. And we were – we came to the conclusion that creating legal persons for the different SOs and ACs wouldn't be of course easy. And in many cases it wouldn't even be feasible when you think of the GAC, for example, the GAC wouldn't be able to actually have a legal standing or legal persona to actually enforce the rights. So – but we also didn't want to exclude the GAC from actually the decision making process.

So what we came up to or what the solution that we came up with was that with this sole designator model or through the sole member model,

then we would have this legal persona that would be – that would include all the SOs and ACs in the decision making process. But when it came to actually triggering the process of enforcing a right then this would be the sole member or the sole designator.

And another thing that is very important to emphasize is that when we speak about enforcement we see enforcement as the last resource in the change of – in the chain of events that would actually be an escalating lever that we put in – we set up a sliding screen and this would of course be a processing which each of the stages would privilege dialogue in order to come to a common solution.

And only if that common solution wasn't reached through this dialogue between the board and the community then we would escalate to the next step of the process. And so on and so forth. And as I said, going to a court would be the last resource and we do see it like complete failure to our community in reaching consensus. So it is highly unlikely that we would actually need to go into court.

And this is also one issues that I think brought balance into the equation in our discussion of the models yesterday because now the group seems to be realizing that we actually don't need to rush into courts. Actually it's completely the opposite. We don't want to go into courts.

So that is where we're standing now. And I would be very grateful to listen to your thoughts and of course your feedback on whether you have followed the discussion and whether you see or you feel like we're going in the right direction and of course to collect any concerns that might be outstanding in regards to the NPOC activities.

Thank you, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, Leon, for this summary. Because this is really helpful for the NGO community not having the ability to understand everything that's going on at the level of ICANN's accountability and transparency issues. And you have highlighted a few things that are of concern of NGOs as NPOC stands for the Not for Profit Operational Concerns. That's where we enter into the operational concerns is when you operate the DNS that we could have issues to handle.

And one of the elements that you mentioned is about creating the legal entity. Where I see eventually a possibility because it's a discussion that is on the table of NPOC and I know on the table of NCUC is also because we need to survive, we need resources to do our work because it's essentially volunteering so that makes our work difficult.

Indeed for the advisory committees I don't see an immediate need to have this legal definition as an entity that is recognized by court. While for the SOs – SOs are, when I compare to government structures the SOs are writing the laws in fact. We are writing the policy. And when you write laws you have to be considered – being a legal entity to have the ability to enforce your law to be implemented. So I think that's one of the issues that is still on the table and is probably one of the most difficult ones to give it a right answer.

But as we say, NPOC is in fact inside ICANN today. If we want to get some funds we have to identify ourselves while we identify ourselves as being located at the address of ICANN. But last week I had a discussion about eventual sponsorship and that's where the issue

came up. Well, you cannot use the address of ICANN because you're not a legal entity of ICANN, you're a constituency. So I had to use my personal address to be able to fill in the gap.

And that's where, I think, for the whole issue that is on the table about accountability is it's not ICANN in itself that has the biggest issue, I think it's all the SOs and ACs that are in fact feeding what happens in ICANN that is bringing issues to the table. And as an NGO most of the NGOs will want to stay away from all these legal procedures because that's not their concern at the end. What their concern is can I have my domain name? Can I maintain it? Can I use it? That's the initial issue they have.

And in the discussion that I've heard yesterday during your meeting we are often sitting in the background because we want to listen and see where things are going wrong and say, oh, sorry. And one of the issues that I saw popping up, and I see it also in the CCWG on the IANA Transition Stewardship, is the fact that for the civil society there are a lot of comments, remarks, objections.

And where we feel that we have some difficulties is in the definition of civil society is that one group, one body, or are there different bodies. And especially in the NGO community we see us as part of the civil society but we have completely different views on a lot of the issues. And we are not feeling very happy with the negative comments that are coming in from civil society. We don't really agree with saying that everything is bad. We have to accept that today we can use the Internet so it doesn't look that bad at all.

What we need to avoid is that we are going in a position where it would become bad and that's where I would ask you what is your feeling about the input that comes on the different levels of the discussions and essentially also where they want to have the board being removed when they were asked for, which I would consider being crazy. It doesn't make sense to remove a board because that's destroying your organization.

So I would like to know if you feel that as NPOC we need to raise this issue or if it's already taken care of we don't want to take away air space from the debate if you consider that you know it's okay we can handle. So it's rather in two directions that I want to ask.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Rudi. And I think that in my view I cannot speak for the group at this stage of course. But taking a helicopter view of what we've done in the CCWG I would say that NPOC's concerns are already addressed because one of the things that we are trying to do in our proposal is to make literally no change to how things work. So the way we work today, the way we make decisions today, would not change at all.

The only thing that would change is that of course all SOs and ACs would now have a set of powers that if the time came to actually need and enforce those rights then we would be able to enforce those rights. And in regard to removing the board, I completely agree with you and I think that the CCWG also agrees that is not something that we wish to do but it something that we want to be able to do if we need to.

So I think that the views of the CCWG in a way are pretty much aligned with what you just said. You know, we also see that not only going into

court would be a failure but also removing the board would be a failure because the board as it has been discussed and highlighted by many members and participants in the CCWG is also part of the community. Some may not agree with this. But they are also part of the community because they in a way represent the community, they are appointed by the community.

So I too think that getting to the extreme of actually removing the board would be a failure in our process of trying to fix things by dial up or through dial up. But we do or the community has stated that having the ability to actually remove the whole board or individual members of the board through different criteria of course and processes would be a power that the community would like to actually have.

And I see that, Bernie, you raised your hand. I don't know if you want to comment on that.

Bernard Turcotte: Just maybe to add on to (unintelligible). Hi, Bernie Turcotte. I'm staff support to the CCWG. Just to add on to Leon's point, I think that our liaison from the board, Bruce Tonkin, presented it this way. The various processes we've developed are now quite comprehensive. And the board would take it as we go through all these processes as confirming consensus from the community that there's a problem. And he could not understand that if we got to the end of those consensus building processes that the board would not react.

So I thought that was a very telling thing which complemented Leon's point.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Bernie. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. I have two people in the queue. I have Klaus and then Carlos.

Klaus Stoll: As a lurker, somebody who listened many, many hours to the CCWG I just want to say first of all I admire those who are part of it and who – doing a lot of the work, staff, volunteers from all sectors. I think you doing a tremendous work on the various different circumstances so first of all thank you.

The second thing is I would like to point something out from our perspective. We are here as a civil society constituency. I think it is more or less fair to say that all other sectors of society like business sector, like end users, like governmental sectors and so on, are fairly represented in ICANN.

Except civil society. We only have two constituencies and one of them is very focused on academia and other things and our constituency is actually very small. And as some people from the Indian government and so already pointed out, and other governments in the business process, they are basically using this fact against ICANN and saying, look, there you bring the best proposal of the world but you don't have any representation.

I think there is a – I would like to make a proposal not only for about what's going on here now. I think what we should do first of all is to agree that we should, as constituencies, not think about how can we tweak and what can we tweak there but thinking about the process what can we actually do to make it happen?

And to change a little bit the thought from okay what – how can we get the most out of it for us but how can we actually make it have more levels of support. The second thing is I think the moment – the moment we have a proposal going to the – to NTIA. We should plan three or four consultations with civil society organizations who never heard about ICANN. And not preach to them about ICANN or preach to them about anything to say this is what happened, this is what's going to happen, this is what you've proposed.

What (unintelligible) that we can feed that in and if somebody comes and says you haven't consulted we have to consult. We have – I know I'm saying all the wrong words now but I really mean it. We have a wonderful format with the NETmundial. If we reduce the NETmundial format to less of a (day) to four or five with all the hubs and doing that in four or five continents it's – compared to the lawyer costs it will be dirt cheap.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Klaus. And I hope we really didn't get – we really don't get to that. And we have tried to be as inclusive as possible. We have tried to of course reach out to the different communities and get their feedback because we do acknowledge that this is something that goes beyond the ICANN community. And at some point the discussion of actually having ICANN accountable to the outside ICANN community is also a discussion that we are undertaking very seriously. And I think it kind of addresses what you just said.

And I have to apologize because we have another meeting with the RSAC to do exactly this same thing. And, Carlos, if you have a question that I can address really quick, I'm happy to do so.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you very much. And sorry, staff, but I really don't agree with your statement that we don't expect any change. And I have to mention two things where I think the community expect changes. Since ATRT 1, and after ATRT 2, there have been permanent complaints that the community doesn't get the rationale for the board decisions. I think this discussion on the powers on the board is a result of a very, very long discussion. And the CCWG has put the discussions of the rationale in the back burner in the WAS 2. So I think we expect change.

And the second point where we expect change and we see – I see a lot of progress is in the budget process. Luckily in the budget process there have been very positive developments and we seen (Shareen) joined the group on making the budget more transparent so that the budget veto is not an issue anymore.

But the whole story for the people who have been looking at accountability reviews is that we expect change particularly if I have to summarize because you have to leave is because we need a better rationale for board decisions. Thank you very much Leon for coming. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: No thank you Carlos. And I just want to clarify that when I said that we wouldn't have any change I meant the corporate structure. I didn't mean the way we actually provide - exactly.

So the way we do decisions and the way, you know, binds together in the corporate structure that is a requirement that we said to be the simplest and less invasive or inclusive as possible.

So that is where we explained that where we expect no or very little change too.

But I do agree that I mean the whole point of vesting powers into the community is to achieve what you just said.

There is clearly something that is not working right and that the community has flagged as needs to be address. And that is what we are actually focusing into providing the committee with those powers to get those things back on track and to see that change that you have rightly pointed out.

Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Leon for a clarification on the issues that - I'm feeling much better now. Because I had some doubts yesterday going out of that meeting and I felt that some people were really upset while there is a lot of progress made in a couple days.

And we are happy that in fact we agreed to cancel our event to allow more participation in the sessions.

We canceled our event yesterday talking to NGOs and about NGOs. So it was very good that we canceled it made possible to have a really good debate.

And call on us if you feel that NGOs are not really touching on the issue that you want to have raised by us. Send us a mail, we pop up.
Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Rudi. And thank you all for the time and for your feedback. I will take this back to the group of course.

And we are also available anytime for reaching out to us and have your concerns heard and addressed. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: So we have still ten minutes before we have the visit of the ICANN CEO, Fadi Chehade. Maybe I would like to go around the table and see if we have some elements that we would like to discuss based on what we heard from Leon.

As I said I have quite a good feeling that the progress that is made is not going to hurt the NGOs on the level of their operations and their activities. It looks quite good.

Oh there is - yes I have to mention - I didn't want to interrupt. We have our Communication Committee Chair (Olivier) who is online and he raised his hand but disappeared again.

Man: Yes...

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. So (Olivier) if you want to speak you have the floor.

Yes (Olivier) you have the floor. You can speak.

Yes well I know that (Olivier) is from the African region and that's one of the issues that we need also to take care of. That's where we need changes but that's not the duty of ICANN.

There are other organizations that need to help to enable in the African region to participate in meetings like this.

Olivier gets disconnected at almost at every call we have because his connection is not stable. I see another hand. Martin?

Martin Silva: Yes we can ask - so we can ask (Olivier) to write it down in the chat and we can read out all the - his comments and we can try to fill in the gaps that way.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Martin. But I think that staff support is taking care of that one. I see also that we have another member a new member from NPOC joining us, (Shakeel Lamett). Welcome from Pakistan. He promised me that he would join the meeting so thanks for joining us.

Well I'm just wondering if there is anything we should bring up in the discussion about the accountability.

As we already in the ExCom have been discussing about having a legal entity to be able to raise some questions some requirements it's quite difficult.

And at the end if we become a legal entity in a certain way we're separating ourselves from ICANN. At least that's my perception. If you become a legal entity you're stepping out of ICANN and join as a legal body in it which is actually not the case.

None of the stakeholder groups, none of the constituencies are actually legal entity.

So that's the point. But if we want to raise some funds to be able to operate even better and bring in more participants in our meetings we need funds.

And when you need funds you need to be a legal entity. It's very difficult to get funds without being a legal body.

So it's an issue that I would like to see how the Cross Community Working Group on accountability is going to handle that issue in the future. It's I think something that is not easy.

I see Sam you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Oh, (Olivier) are you ready to speak? You have the floor.

Yes (Olivier) we don't hear you. Can you speak up? We know that this is a regular issue we have and it's painful as an ExCom if you have to try to get your member and it's due to technical issues.

And I know there is somebody in the room here who probably will be able to help developing some spaces where it could work. But we come to that later in the session on how to get NGOs involved and better involved. (Olivier) can you speak?

And so silence is not an approval.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: I recognize Adam Peak has joined us now who is a member of the ICANN staff working essentially on civil society. Adam you want to address something?

Adam Peak: Yes. Just good morning everybody. My name is Adam Peak and I work on civil society engagement. I just wanted to follow-up on the notion of legal entity and becoming a legal entity.

I believe some of the other constituencies have incorporated in some form or other they are able to take funds and they hold back accounts.

I will take it upon myself to find out how they've done that and report back to you. so I can't promise one way or another whether they have but I will find out how they go about that and see if it's helpful for you. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Adam. Indeed that would help. And again one of the questions that I have in that context and that I think it's also an issue that NGOs most of the time have where are you going to locate it?

Because if you say we locate it as a legal body in the US knowing the privacy issues coming up now with the Safe Harbor being taken down what do we do we have the members from Europe? Can we have them as a member in the legal body? At the end that's one of the issues we need to solve.

I see Carlos you're raising your hand about this. You want to comment?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Sorry. If that's on the agenda I want to comment. I've been for five years in an idle chapter which traveled to incorporate in our country.

And finally it was not worth to incorporate because the funds that (SSAC) would make available per year was not interesting frankly until (SSAC) changed the policies. And now they have bigger projects over many years over 18 months or 24 months with sizable amounts \$10,000 and \$25,000 respectively. And so we decided to finish the incorporation work. So I think I look forward to what Adam Peak will provide.

But there is a big difference between having support which we have here. We have support for GAC. We have support for non-commercial stakeholders, we have support for ALAC.

We have fantastic staff supporting these groups and getting access to funds. Because getting access to funds puts the question forward how these funds are going to be managed.

And for me this fantastic discussion about capture that floats around the accountability and nobody has been able to pin down what those capture mean.

For me capture is very closely related to giving funds to somebody else. Thank you very much.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Carlos, Rudi for the transcript. Well when you say we have support indeed we have support.

But as we are a small constituency and maybe you don't know but we only have three travel slots. e have six offices. We have three travel slots. We have one extra slot on the and CSG for travel. So we can bring in four NPOC people.

That to us is not enough to be able to really operate especially in the physical meetings. Because imagine you have to split up your constituency over four people going to all the meetings that we have. It's impossible.

We have to work – and I'm starting every day at 7:00 or 7:30 and today it's nonstop, really nonstop. So at the end it's great to have support but we are volunteers.

We are taking away our day job to be here. So I think that's there is still a little bit more effort to be done. Yes Carlos you have the floor.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Carlos. I want to respond to that. We had a similar discussion in the higher group in the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group when we were discussing policy when we were interviewing the candidates for the GNSO chair.

And of course Rudi you are an exception. I mean you are working on so many PDPs and you're producing so much stuff. I mean you're a vital person in these activity. And I know others have done so before.

But I have to tell you what I feel and this is a hard voluntary job. And you can measure it not in the hours that you are connected because I think this is not a fair measure.

But you have to measure of effectiveness of these participation in terms of using the comment periods and in terms of producing ideas and in terms of writing, more writing more commenting more traveling. I mean you are a highly productive person.

I mean I'm only in one PDP and I already cannot imagine. But the only justification for getting support is participating in the procedures in the procedures of producing policy and procedures and commenting on policy. And even if you cannot comment then ask.

But if we don't produce like I have learned from you guys to produce and participate in comments or put questions we are shooting ourselves in our foot. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Carlos for this comment and suggestion. And you will probably have seen the we are starting doing this.

Don't forget NPOC has been created in 2011 it's a very young baby. The first thing I tried when I became the chair is to align the group and say okay what is our mission, what is what are the objectives and get the hats around the table that are able to execute the mission. That's the first objective. That's something that we did last year.

This year we started commenting. We have made public comments on several reports. But as I said if you're just a few people it's hard to do all this work if you have also a day job.

And we are trying. We are bringing up. As you see we are now engaging with the Cross Community Working Groups. But as I said we are limited group and we are happy that we are that we are now extending seeing more people coming into NPOC and willing to also do the job.

I indeed I'm engaged in quite a lot of them to be - I try to be the sample say, "Look we can get results but you have to do the work also."

And I agree and you will see we are increasing the level of comments we are bringing the level of participation that inviting but it takes time.

So I see Klaus you have your hand up.

Klaus Stoll: Carlos I'm sorry I have to disagree with you to a large extent. I fully agree with you the measure is participation in the policy process and the input and the things you're right.

But there is a step before. And the step before is that you actually engage with other communities, learn to understand. And you know how long it takes in ICANN to do that.

And even before that step there is another step that civil society organizations have to - and people have to learn that it's actually relevant and important for them to do so.

So I think just to go straight into measuring impacts by the amount of comments on what's been done is basically wrong and it's also wrong in the ICANN outreach.

The second point which I would like to make there are volunteers and there are volunteers.

If I'm working in an organization which basically is a professional civil society organization it's my work to participate in ICANN. I'm not a volunteer. It's part of my work even if I'm not doing this.

This by design is not the case in NPOC because we are provisional concerns. So to - we have to look at the (analysis) and we have to react to this new (analysis).

We can't expect NPOC to struggle along and along and along and then say okay it didn't work or it works. No, I think we really have to think and look at these things much deeper.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. As we are waiting for the arrival of ICANN CEO Fadi Chehade I see that actually Olivier is raising his hand again and it looks like he is going to be able to speak so third time good time. Try now (Olivier).

And we don't hear you (Olivier). Can you try again?

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Yes well again as I said this is a real issue of participation. One of the efforts we need to do is to get our members really connected.

And I know it's not due to ICANN. It's due to the technical platforms that are not really operating in...

Man: We can talk to (Olivier) (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Can you try again (Olivier)?

Man: So just to clarify the only audio that can be played over the room with our current set up is a phone Skype and...

Rudi Vansnick: Well if you want to use Skype I sometimes also join if there is no dial-up that I would like to use. I am using Skype and you can call the number that is the US number, the green number and that works.

So if you want to call in to the Skype you can do that.

And so it's a pity but again as I said it illustrates the difficulties that we encounter when we want to work with our colleagues on a weekly basis. It's almost impossible to have everybody connected in a decent way and it's something we need to work on.

And I know ICANN tries to do as much as they can but we're still in the same situation for almost two years now. Yes Sam you have...

Man: Sam just a question. Is Adam coming back?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Adam will be back yes. It's an issue that we need to raise and at the level that they can help us to get it into an operational way.

You see its operational concerns. It's an issue that we cannot solve which means we have really our mission still on the table to get people connected.

It's the only way they can participate in ICANN is being connected. If you're not so last try (Olivier) can you speak?

So we are waiting for Fadi to arrive. Meanwhile for those who were not here earlier and at my right side is sitting the incoming NCSG Chair Tapani Tarvainen. And we have in fact the pleasure to have the NCSG chair for the first time ever in NPOC meeting. Welcome.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I know that I'm not yet the NCSG chair, only chair-elect. But I will be in ask a chair in your next meeting in Marrakesh.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. And we know you're incoming, you're not outgoing. We hope you're staying. You're not going to say I'm going out again. We want you to stay and help us in doing the work we have to do.

And perhaps before we have the pleasure of having Fadi here we have three questions that we want to raise to Fadi. But I see Sam you have your hand up?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. I want just wanted to raise one more thing with Adam, you know, okay. It's on the outreach strategy.

I do other work and I deal with ethical issues in multi-stakeholder participation in outreach and so forth.

And in that literature they use a term called an extractive relationship to stakeholders. And what they mean by an extractive relationship is that you reach out to stakeholders for two reasons.

One is to get legitimacy for your organization and the other is to get something from them that you can use. In the case of ICANN that may be free labor.

What they talk about is the need for a win-win relationship in which there has to be something that the stakeholders are receiving as well.

One of the particular challenges for NPOC and the NGO portion, civil - organized civil side society constituency is that their primary focus of their work is not Internet governance or ICANN issues. It's dealing with women, children and health, social justice, the aged, the environment - - the standard list.

So one of the perceptions that I have picked up from others is that a bit of the ICANN outreach is almost like those religious missionaries who go out and say this is our church, come to our church and you will be saved and in the meantime we'd like you to donate 10% of your income or come and run bake sales and so forth for us.

And we need ICANN to understand that if individuals come from their constituencies they are from but not of their constituencies. They don't represent their constituencies. They are voices from those constituencies. That's very good. The volunteer labor is very good. The expertise is very good.

But we don't have a kind of federated structure in which if I say I am speaking for the International Health Constituency in Canada since that's the NGO I represent is in there I am not accountable to them.

I am - so the way I should be accountable to them is to be able to go back to them and bring something from ICANN to them, not just ask them to bring something to ICANN.

And I think that this is a weakness in the outreach strategy that we use now.

It's one that some of us are trying to repair outside ICANN because the, you know, civil society NGO organized civil society area has a deep stake in its own work with respect to how the Internet behaves around organizational DNS issues not just all those other things that Fadi had in the top of his diagram, the human rights and so forth.

So I find it difficult at this point in time sort of selling the idea of the kind of outreach that ICANN has been doing. I know it's well intended but it may be misdirected. So I just want to record that as my individual discomfort with how things have been going.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. Adam do you want to...

Adam Peak: I'll make a quick response. It's and I recognize that a lot of the topics you're talking about and I agree with you.

But one of the things that we begin within ICANN is that the model is of bottom-up multi-stakeholder policymaking. That's the basis of what ICANN does and how it exists.

So bringing organizations in with diversity of voices is important to the organization. It's not that I suppose that is one part of your extractive relationship. But it's a little bit more nuanced than the very, you know, the simplistic structure.

We ask organizations of all different types to come because that is the nature of ICANN. That's how we work and that's our existence in the model we follow and attempting to be globally representative as we do that.

And touching on some of the other things when I do outreach and speak to organizations about what ICANN is I can give you an example. I was with some very large NGOs not too long ago, one in particular dealing with transparency and accountability itself and particularly organizations that take money, charitable type of organizations.

And they find ICANN relevant because they themselves are changing as they respond to the Internet.

Many large charitable types of NGOs take money as their basic function. They take money and then they provided it to the - well that might be - the well I'll give an example of an organization but not the one I was talking to -- World Wildlife Fund or (Ogs) Fund.

You have members because you want their money and you - then you do your good work with them.

What the Internet is doing is on one hand is shining a brighter light on how they allocate that money and use that money. But at the same time they want to use the Internet for a better membership relationship to improve that money flow.

And they actually find ICANN a very interesting organization because we have that very transparent accountability with our organization.

So they were interested in how ICANN works. So what they're getting hopefully they may come in and provide some expertise and knowledge to us. I haven't - they haven't joined anything.

But hopefully we will be able to provide knowledge to them so it's - that is a bit of a two-way street.

At the moment it may be a single way street in the fact that they learn simply from how a multi-stakeholder body works and they can look at how ICANN operates and hopefully gain something from that. But anyway could go on for hours about this.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Adam. I have in the queue first Joan, Klaus and then Kavouss.

Joan Kerr: Joan Kerr for the record. I hear what you're saying and it's a long the same line as some alluded to.

But what you just answered to me is just validation of what you're doing.

In the world of civil society what they found especially specifically probably American organizations not-for-profits and charities have found was going out and providing solutions and telling the developing world as everybody calls them - I call them the old world wisdom but anyway is that it didn't work coming in and telling someone what they needed that from a sustainable development point of view to engage those organizations it was better to use on the ground grassroots organizations to contact the people and other not for profits and that was more effective and more cost-effective. So that's what's been happening on the ground.

What I'm actually disappointed with ICANN is that the word multi-stakeholder seems to be a word.

I mean if we're here to represent a stakeholder we should be able to work with you to engage those not-for-profits with your support, not you doing the work but we're helping and supporting you in doing that.

So that's why I'm really displeased with the outreach strategy and I think it should change.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Joan. Klaus you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: I just want to follow-up on what Joan says and Adam you know my position (unintelligible) it is what you try just described of the outreach approach was basically ICANN corporate speaking to civil society corporate.

And that is valid and that should be done. But you're forgetting the 99% of other NGOs, other civil society organizations which don't have corporate interests.

And I think it's absolutely vital for the survival and for the credibility of ICANN that we establish that reach is done from the stakeholder for the stakeholder with the stakeholders and not by (agra) corporate to something. And I find it very, very unfortunate that for example we are still working on lists of which conferences to go and who's speaking and so on. We all know it works for corporate.

But what we are talking about, what we are concerned it's not about corporate.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. And I have some other people in the queue now. And Carlos you first and then to you.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you. Thank you very much. And I'm fascinated about the bag of terms that we tend to be – to mix together.

And I – but I want to comment Adam on two very specific issues. I mean we are starting to discuss what to do with the auction proceeds. And a paper was circulated. I mean we the community there has been an exchange between the chair of the GSO and the chair of the board on this.

And I was surprise by the paper that was circulated with some ideas what to do with this money because they don't seem to realize that in the case of the auction proceeds we are talking accounting-wise in terms of an exceptional income is a non-recurrent income.

And every time I get into these discussions I see there is a mixture.

Of course everything that is nongovernment is not only for profit. There is nongovernment non-for profit.

But there is a big difference in the mentality in the northern countries about in doubt nonprofit purpose organizations.

That means they really are managing wealth for some solutions and like the university sense so one while we have a lot of NGOs in our country that are not sustainable financially just because they don't have any source of cash flow.

And I don't want to go very far but we have a mixed case very close to us that has meetings in the Clayton Hotel this afternoon which I represent as an organization which is ISOC.

I mean ISOC is also a non-for profit. They have a very clear purpose which is sustain the intellectual property of the ATF which in itself justifies its existing. But on the other hand is a very profitable registrar. And that creates a great sort of conflict.

So for me the discussion of NGOs or for NPOC should be should be focused less on the money and more on what you introduce and sustain. Those are NGOs whose main activity's not Internet. And that's where the conflict is at the moment.

We start discussing about funds and moneys and endowments and sustain and participation, gets more difficult.

I accept your comment. You are an NGO and that's your responsibility to participate here. So you are not dependent on getting money for being here. That's your job.

But there are a lot of NGOs who don't have a steady cash flow. And the moment they start asking for money the question is how independent they will remain. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Carlos. Yes well I agree and disagree a little bit. The danger exists if you start paying volunteers to do something that or an organization that it turn into another body.

And I agree it's something that we have seen in ISOC community that sometimes in NGOs when you get – give them money they start doing things but they are not fulfilling the mission anymore. They are doing what they think they should do.

So I see the hands of Klaus just as a short comment then I won't go to the other.

Klaus Stoll: Carlos I don't recognize myself in your reply. What I was talking about is that NGOs need - are relying on the DNS. And the DNS is failing them for several problems from legal and so on and then – and that in (unintelligible) for example by fundraising.

And for them – for example one of the shortcuts reaction is they're going to social media. And the gentleman here to my right (Sevara Franco) has very well proved that that is to the detriment and of this organization.

So I should – I'm not talking about raising funds. I'm talking about for the NGOs being able to use a DNS for the full (unintelligible) advantage.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Then the discussion should take place at the Public Interest Registry not here Klaus with full respect.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you. I have another question in the queue. (Tom) you want to...

(Tom McKinesey): Yes. What you just mentioned the Public Interest Registry and I was going to – all I was going to add really is that I'm on the – as a member of the Advisory Council of the Public Interest Registry there was some discussion a couple of weeks ago about engagement with this NGO community because they've launched this .ngoong as you must be aware TLD.

And I think what they found is that for a while there was some kind of idea about the best way that you could go out and engage with NGOs and that turned out not to be entirely kind of consistent with the realities of NGOs in different parts of the world.

And one thing which has worked quite well we have found at least what was – what came out of our last meeting was that it's the fact that we are a very sort of diverse and diffuse group around the world.

And that for example I'm based in Paris and that, you know, I'm in regular contact with people at UNESCO who are running all these sort

of NGO activities from there. But we have other people in Australia, in Africa.

And that is really been the – how we have been able as a group to get the word out most effectively about what the aims of the – of this particular TLD are.

Now I understand that this is very different to what the objectives of the NPOC are. But perhaps there is something that we can sort of, you know, learn from these shared objectives.

Man:

Yes I agree. But NPOC's mission is essentially trying to handle the concerns that NGOs have related to the domain name space but not about the contact. That's another issue, but a domain name space.

And when we discovered during the first survey that we did in Europe on the EU (Acosoc) list which should be an updated list at the end we addressed 1600 NGOs, 60%, six zero bounced when we sent out the mails which means you cannot communicate with them.

And one of the issues we discovered is that it's not only because people in NGOs are moving that you're learning the contact. But when you discover and we had a case approving recently or trying to approve a new member in NPOC who discovered that the .org was captured by a corporation. The corporation should not have an .org. There is an issue.

And as we see that the Public Interest Registry is not taking care of that it's not the only case. I can mention you at least 20, 30 domains

that have been captured by corporations because they want to use it for their marketing.

And if the Public Interest Registry is not taking care of it is our duty, it's our mission here to say this is an operational concern. It doesn't work.

The policy should be adopted because as it is today we don't have power to change anything because they have money. Corporations have money and the NGO doesn't have money.

So there is a critical issue that we need to take care of. That's one of the missions we have. And that's I wanted to try to get into a debate at the higher level say look, we have probably to review how the Public Interest Registry and their registrars are taking care of their domain extension about the TLD.

And if they are going to do the same at the ngo.org level then I'm going to be crazy. Then I will really shout from every tower I can find in the world that this is bad, that this is not helping the NGOs.

And I – all I see is that nothing has been done. If the registry allows it to do I can even give you a more critical sample. GKPF we have gkppartnership.org. I tried to transfer from registrar A to registrar B and it has been blocked all the time. I got the authorization code to transfer it. But the registrar didn't accept it.

I'm not going to mention the name yet. You have to just figure out. Actually that domain name is now in the hands of the Japanese company. And that's bad because we are losing all the investment we have been doing.

But just trying to transfer at the – just before the expiration date to avoid it we have to pay twice or three times you do it at the expiration date. The reflection that I got and the answer that I got was well 60 days before expiration we can decide as a registrant not allowing the transfer and 30 days after the expiration.

That really doesn't happen in (unintelligible). And NGO was not aware that. And that's how they lose their domain name. And at the end all the investment they have been doing in their domain name, their Web site linked to their domain name is lost. And nobody takes care of that – nobody -- even another registry.

So I think that we have a real issue on the table that needs to be solved in order to be able to say the IANA transition can only be successful if you respect your communities to the TLDs which is not happening today. I'm very sorry.

I don't know if Tapani you have any feeling on that?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I have a feeling but I have no solution I'm afraid.

Rudi Vansnick: Klaus you have a...

Klaus Stoll: The solution is straightforward. We need to be, do awareness and capacity building. We do need to go back to the absolute basics. We have to explain - I know you laugh at me but we have to explain for example if you register a domain the NGO technician has all the technical data you have to renew the domain.

Because what Rudi didn't say is I phoned up or tried to phone up most of these organizations where the email bounced. And I asked why don't you have it anymore what happened and so on, things like we wanted to renew the domain, the guy who did the registration and so on the technician just disappeared. We don't know where he is. We have no idea. We have no proof.

We didn't even know = knew that we have to do Whois information and actual (arise) these things we sorted was by mail.

Our Web page went off like a rocket two years later. Somebody from China ordered \$3500 for it. And it was frightening.

And believe me look I'm in running an NGO in – and the telephone the network in Latin America and so on.

I thought I knew how NGOs use the Web pages. I have no idea about that. And this is just the example for Europe. Just imagine how it will look like in Africa and other regions.

And on the other hand look at this on a positive side. That means there are still a huge, a huge potential number of NGOs which can be brought back into the DNS as it makes – takes further advantage of this (unintelligible). It's a huge market. There's a lot of money for registrars and registrants and everybody in there still.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. I recognized Jason has been putting his hand up for a while. Jason you the floor and then Adam.

Jason Hynds: Thank you Jason Hynds here.

Okay so I'm a little new to this particular community. So I hope I'm – and I'm not - just saying (unintelligible).

But in terms of what was just said I really agree with the getting back to basics in terms of the outreach and empowering the nonprofits and so on a lot more.

I think that they capacity building is so important and having them have direct tools and the right guidelines of how to interact with the technology, how to interact with the DNS is so important.

And I feel like – well I see locally problems in terms of what, you know, see you all have discussed here. I even see problems similar to what Sam mentioned in terms of how do you really represent your community when you come to a meeting like this?

And I think in some cases that problem can be solved by some of the electronic tools too that we may have (unintelligible) in a large space like ICANN and with which we use to advance the policy work.

But it needs to reach down to the grassroots organizations. They need to use mailing lists more effectively for their communications. They need to keep them up to date and so on.

So as we do outreach and try to empower them we have to like, you know, help guide them to their structure well they have useful and current mailing lists and contacts and that they're engaging with the electronic tools the right way and stuff is always up to date and we might be failing in that.

And then finally on that one too in terms of communicating like what Adam said about ICANN having I guess good examples in his accountability and transparency and stuff for them to follow I still think that we need to help translate some of the information so that in very tight summary form and be no way why you should be thinking about human rights and ICANN or Internet governance and law and so on. And I don't feel that after is - that has helped enough.

So like me coming from Barbados and trying to think how do I engage other community groups in ICANN stuff I feel challenge like how do I speak to the lawyers, how do I speak to the (other) in your communities to pass about what I learned here at ICANN but say it in the right language that reaches them at their level.

And I'm not always capable to do that across the breadth of NGOs.

And I feel as I can get more help from the community and get in that summary so that I can just deliver it but not have to compose it and be challenging something I'm not fully competent in.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Jason, very good comments. And we picked that up because it's part of the mission that NPOC should take up also in ICANN community where we are. We have to address that issue too.

But we have some solutions already that we are trying to implement now to what we call the Pathfinder program that allows to create awareness on what the domain name space is, what the Internet governance is and where we try also to help organizations

understanding the use of Internet in the sense of using mailing lists, using Web pages and so on.

But they're touching a little bit more on the content already. We want to first be able to solve the more critical one having ability to have a Web page, to have a domain name on which you can start having your communication.

And that's I think criteria number one and priority number one. If they don't have it they will have to use Gmail or what else. But that's not a trustable domain.

Everybody can have Gmail. So how are you going to trust receiving a mail with a Gmail or (og.mail) address? And that's one of the issues that we see.

And as – (Olivier) was not able to speak up due to audio difficulties he raised an issue in Africa that in fact in Africa - and we are going to address this topic anyway (Olivier) at the end of our session today about our events and activities that we want to do in Marrakesh in March.

The African region is a region where a lot of technical issues are still not solved and where we need to help as much as we can by addressing that as also an operational concern.

I've seen Adam you wanted to respond to...

Adam Peak: I...

Rudi Vansnick: ...a few proposals?

Adam Peak: Yes, Adam Peak for the record. I will try and follow up on some of these registrar problems that are obviously ongoing.

One of the first working groups that I joined many, many years ago when ICANN had the DNSO before the GNSO was a program that looked at how domain names were deleted and the policies that were around that.

And but I don't know enough to give you answer that I'd confident in right now. So I'll go away and try and find some answers and we can see what we can do.

It may be that we need some Webinars on this that you can then use to sort of build some outreach strategies about or whatever it may be. I'll take some action away to try and provide some information.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. I see a lot of hands being raised. (Tony) you want the first to reply to what Jason was saying?

(Tony): Yes, perhaps just very quickly I can't actually speak for the PII. I have to sort of make insist on that point. I'm just on their advisory council.

But I think as one thing that they have become very much aware of is that when it comes to the DNS it's a wild sort of marketplace out there and where price is going to be potentially a barrier to entry.

And so I think there's a fierce battle that's being forced out there to make sure that people stay with the .org. And that, you know,

invariably means to say that sometimes there are people who get on board on .org who don't necessarily have all the sort of values and things which some of the – many of the other organizations have.

And when it comes to the .ngo there they really do have quite a high barrier to entry. There's a validation process and all the rest and as many other gTLDs have.

And I – and that I'm – I think I can reassure you will be maintained and so that the people under the .ngo really will be a sort of recognized and validated community.

But I guess what might be the problem with that is that it's going to cost people €50 or more due to acquire one of these gTLDs.

And, you know, in a marketplace where it's possible to buy an Internet extension for, you know, less than €10 why are people, you know, lots of NGOs out there are going to want to get the cheaper option or maybe stick with .org or go for something even cheaper, you know?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Tony). And I would like just to add to what you said about .ngo and .ong because I have quite a lot of involvement because I've been on the ISO board the last two years.

And I feel as maybe being a mistake from on good and (and set) in addressing the NGO community is saying that they are going to certify that those having a .ngo are really an NGO. Certifying is impossible. It's something that you cannot say even because you cannot certify especially in countries where there is no legal structure that allows you

to register an NGO. How are you going to validate it? So that's perhaps one of the issues.

What comes to me is where we're not able to solve it is trust. What I see is people are losing trust in the .org because they see so many corporations having at .org that in the end they say well .org should be for organizations.

And what we see when we go to sites we see commercial bodies popping up. Well do we still trust that .org?

And that's one of the issues that we need to really addressing get answer for it. And that's hard work.

And as Adam was mentioning there has been some talks and discussions in the past but actually it's not on the agenda. What we see there is lots of human rights and privacy's on the agenda. But this issue is not on the agenda. And we want to get it on the agenda for broader discussions.

May I ask to turn off your mic in order not to have too much echoes?

I have Joan, Klaus, Sam.

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. Adam I have a straight question for you please.

You've heard all of the issues of what not-for-profits. We're discussing and not all of them but we're discussing some of the issues.

And you have or ICANN has a strategy for the civil society.

Are you – are your team going to go back and revisit your outreach strategy and incorporate a constituency such as NPOC and others to assist you rather than dictate how the process works, just a straight question.

Adam Peak: Well the intention has always been to try and listen to what your proposals were only. The NPOC statement that came through which was I don't know, seven, eight, nine pages was incorporated and listened to Sam's email which went through.

We didn't write in the whole of that 709 whatever pages because it was the NPOC strategy. It was a strategy for your group. It wasn't necessarily a strategy that was overall.

It was – but certainly quite large parts of your comments were incorporated. And I'm thinking about the re-emphasis on the sort of beginning with awareness raising and moving through I can't - I'm losing specifics at the moment. I feel like I smoked about 20 boxes of cigarettes last night which is a problem because I don't smoke. As you can probably hear it's not much fun.

So yes we are trying to incorporate it. And I'm disappointed that you feel that we're not.

But, you know, you did put forward a document that was very much the NPOC strategy of work as I saw it and not necessarily ICANN staff supported way of looking at outreach.

We also have many of the issues that you're talking about are GNSO policy development issues. They're not necessarily global stakeholder engagement issues. For example the registrar work and education work around that.

So it's find trying to find that right balance within the ICANN organization. And that's why I'd like to take some of this registrar transfer stuff away and try to find out what, you know, how we can answer that correctly.

But yes the whole point being here is to try and listen to you and think about what the strategy should be reflecting your interest.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Adam. And I have to say it's my personal opinion that I don't know if my colleagues will follow but I see an improvement that in fact ICANN is putting a little bit more attention to what we are claiming having the ability to address the community.

And as we have been repeating quite often NGOs are structures that have a certain fear of big organizations and corporations. And they will very often step down step away, go away, not come, if they feel that who is going to talk to them is a large corporation.

And I think that's one of the biggest issues to solve. And that's where NPOC is there. That's our – that's the other part of our mission of going out outside of ICANN meetings to address the issues.

As I said I have been in (job work) in August at the third summit of (Africta) as we have GKPF and NPOC members signing an MOU

recently with (Africta). That's one of the efforts that we already are putting in place.

We go to community, we address the issues in the community not as ICANN but as an NGO because that's where the trust comes and especially in developing regions that's one of the critical items.

If they don't trust you can't get the message through -- impossible because you're talking to humans, not to corporations with money. You have to talk to humans. And that's a big difference that I want to raise is where we are different from the other constituencies. We are humans. We have human rights but we cannot even execute them because we were not allowed to speak up and to go out for our mission.

Klaus, you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: You might've noticed I'm getting more and more frustrated. So let me try to explain it in humorous terms.

What I'm trying to explain to you is that you can't be half pregnant but that you can actually -- but that you can have triplets.

What I mean by that is very simple. You can't just take one part of the outreach brand and discard the others meaning you can't just say okay we need to do going back to basics and then saying ICANN will do that. No.

Going back to basic means that if this outreach that's that Internet literacy has to be done by the NGOs and by these people by people --

groups like NPOC and so on themselves in partnership with ICANN. It can't be done by ICANN itself.

If that is done if you just accept the fact and then do it as ICANN forget it. Then it's better not to acknowledge the whole concept as a whole.

So let's come to the triplets. That means – that does not mean that you cannot have different strategy side-by-side so that you can have a strategy okay let's go to conferences, let's have a strategy doing that outreach, let's use different ways of outreach at the same time.

But don't inter-mingle concepts and concepts and basically none of them will work.

And it's a heartfelt plea. I think we really have to also do a little bit of a paradigm change in the thinking of ICANN and ICANN staff what their role is and what their – you can't have the multi-stakeholder bottom-up model when the outreach and all that stuff, that basic stuff is done by staff or as ICANN, ICANN. It doesn't work.

Joan Kerr: But it's like using the word outreach and you should be using the word promotion. That's really what it says to me. You're going to corporation to corporation. And outreach is to engage people to have them do something. It's not just to promote who you are and what you're good for what your services are. I think that's what makes it so maddening for me.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Joan. I have Sam then I have – I'm sorry, I forgot your first name.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Sam Lanfranco: Okay Sam Lanfranco for the record. I have three quick comments. One is for Adam.

And that's that we've been talking about what NPOC would like – is trying to achieve. Let me talk about my fear.

The contract and noncontract business constituencies represent themselves very well in the multi-stakeholder model here. They have the money to do it, the intellectual property constituency has – they claim they have little money but I don't believe them.

The weak legs on the multi-stakeholder model are from civil society and the NGO sector. And in particular the vast portion of that which is a big portion of that – of several billion people that are the more dispossessed and marginal in society and the organizations that work with them and represent them.

And my fear is that the multi-stakeholder model looks a bit like some – an organization that has experienced a bad case of polio. It's strong on one leg and weak on the other leg. But it is weak on the not-for-profit civil society sector.

We have voices. We have loud voices in that sector but they are really individual voices. They – there's not a federated structure like there is in the IPC or somewhere where you kind of have they're not really a federated there at but you kind of have an hierarchy. And when they speak they speak for their constituency.

We speak from our constituencies but we don't have that kind of representation.

So we need broader involvement and engagement. So that's my fear is that we're weak on that side. And if somebody wants to attack ICANN and attack ICANN's multi-stakeholder model we're the weak side, you know, in terms of how much of us are there. That's my first point.

The second point is basically on .ngo and its a comment to PIR and a comment to ourselves. And that's the evidence is overwhelming that if you get people signed up and like with .org if they – if that awareness raising and consciousness around what to use it for and how to protect it and how to just renew it and record somewhere what the password is to get to your Web hosting site so you can go in or get to your registrar and renew it, if that education doesn't take place then they'll sign up but at the end of the year or at the end of their registration period they're gone because they didn't have the awareness and capacity that Rudi was talking about.

The last point I wanted to make was just a clarification Rudi talked about our efforts to reach out into the community. And he made reference to Pathfinder.

Pathfinder is an initiative that NPOC is working with. It's separate from NPOC pock. It's among other organizations that some of us work with and occasionally NPOC pock will work with to help carry forward the mission that we share with them and they share with us.

So I didn't want anybody to think that there's some kind of corporate relationship there. There's a collaborative relationship.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. You have a question from (Olivier) yes. Then I will come to you.

(Olan Shiam): (Olan Shiam) ICANN staff for the record. And (Olivier) has a question. I'm going to read it.

He says that's what GKPF is doing with the Pathfinder initiative. But which kind of importance to the ICANN ecosystem is reserved for that initiative and do we consider that the NS issues are (unintelligible) money issues? Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Olivier) for those two questions because in fact you have raised two questions. So the first one is how ICANN is looking at the Pathfinder initiative.

I can say from my side that there is a lot of attention going. And I think that the fact that Adam Peak has been asked to join the civil society team is already an expression of that. They felt that something has to be done. How it's going to be done is still something we need to work on. It's not something that we will resolve now.

And indeed the DNS issue but if you have money you come by a domain and that's a fact. But that's with a lot of things in the world. If you have money you get things done. You can go and travel. You can go on holiday. If you don't have you can't go.

So that's an issue that indeed will always be raised. And I think that none of us can resolve that issue today except if tomorrow we will find

an organization that has so much money that they can pay the domain for every organization.

But that would be indeed a good factor, a good outcome having an organization or a corporation that says well I'll cover the cost of every .org or .ngo for each NGO if you're an NGO and you work with us.

Maybe that's a good idea and a good initiative to try to put into all our Pathfinder discussions and say could we find somebody who if an NGO is not able we cover, so good idea. I'm going back to the room here and...

(Watina): (Watina) from (Abesay), Argentina. And I have to apologize because I have to leave now. I'm part of the next ICANN program. I have to be in another room.

But before leaving I would like to say that I'm looking forward to work with all of you. I have here Klaus gave me the Pathfinder initiative to take into account to make activities in Argentina.

I will like to highlight that we are working on these issues in a team. So maybe next time you won't see me you are going to see other colleagues and nothing else. Thank you very much.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much for your participation and being with us. And we are sure that you heard things that you're going to take back to your community.

And we are looking forward to see responses or even proposals that could come from your community and your region. Thank you very much for your participation.

As Tapani is sitting right to me and I can't always see if he is raising his hand I don't know if you have some comments or in the debate we have some ideas that we need to consider?

Tapani Tarvainen: Oh, I at this point I've been just listening. I have not been deep enough in these issues to really offer you any solutions.

And in general I usually like to listen and think for a while before I butt in. I don't like to talk just for the sake of hearing my own voice. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you. I see Martin but I see another question as a follow-up from (Olivier) where he is asking but in that precise case of DNS interest for least developed capabilities.

Well indeed as I said if we find money we could help the developing regions much more. The question is how can we convince organizations such as the UN or the World Bank to invest in money in projects that needs to be sustainable? And that's one of the questions.

If we cannot resolve the policy on for instance the sample that I raised of the .org or .ngo if we cannot solve that it definitely will end up and having the .ogr going back to corporations again. And all the investment that the World Bank or the UN would do in helping them having a .org would be lost after a few years if it's not maintained. That's one of the issues. We have to consider it. It's not that easy.

And we're discovering that every day. As I said we had a sample when we were validating the applications last month on new applicants for NPOC.

There was one organization (Sabero) who had .org in the past had the .org and had in fact also .PK, Pakistan. They were from Pakistan.

And during the validation of the application we had to say well (Sabero.org) because they mentioned also (Sabero.org) as a domain name as we discovered that is in hands of corporation we had to say well we cannot accept because it looks like it's a corporation in the US which is not the case. It's then the domain name has been really hijacked.

If you go to (Sabero.org) you will see it's in a space that has nothing to do with that corporation even. It's just mentioning that it is hosted at whateverhosting.com. And that's really bad because we're not allowing a member to step in based on the issue that they lost their domain name.

So we really have a lot of work that we need to accomplish to avoid that this happens.

And I'm really unhappy with the situation. The more I'm getting into this research the more I'm getting frustrated that we don't have an answer for these cases and that we have to excuse ourselves to this candidate members that sorry it's you're raising an issue while you want to become a member. And that's quite important interesting to work on.

So we are at 11:43. I'm just wondering if Fade just forgot or was in another room or got stuck in traffic in this building.

Woman: I think he's in a board meeting. I'm (unintelligible) no...

Rudi Vansnick: Yes because we are lucky to have an incoming NCIG chair. We're very happy. We have a GNSO councilor among us. So we are very happy because this is also the first time it happens. So we are improving.

And then we have – yes we have Adam but we are always having good support from staff. That was not the issue.

And now that I wanted to have the cherries on the tart as we say with having Fade here that's the only thing that failed. So it's bit – it's a pity.

But I'm quite happy with the discussion that's going on because we see that we are nailing down and we are coming to the conclusion that we found a real big, big issue to solve and that it's related to the immediate mission that we have and it's also an issue that is an issue not only for NPOC but for NCSG.

Because at the end individuals could eventually have on .org also if they can say that they are the person that is in fact creating an organization.

And don't forget if you're not a registered organization already you have the issue of how to get it. But it could be that individuals eventually have a .org. I've seen cases where it happened and I'm not against it, not at all if they at least are not selling stuff and helping community. I'm not opposed to it.

But it's clear that in the GNSO there's work to be done to maybe launch a PDP that has to look into the validation of transfer of domain names in the .org space and in the future .ngo and .ong.

We need a kind of process that allows us to have a crosscheck on the transfer domain name from one circuit to another to be sure that the new one, the receiving one is not a commercial body.

Because what I felt in Africa when I was in I was in (Jorberg) I was speaking to 70 ITC organizations from Africa in the room. I did a DNS workshop to explain on what a domain name was.

Surprisingly most of them didn't really know it. They didn't know the value of it. They all thought yes well you go to Facebook and you have it all. Why should we be concerned about a domain name?

That's the wrong space I told them. They are feeding an American engine. That's not the goal. Feed your own economy first.

And that's where they immediately came up with wow, we can have our own economy. I said yes, why not? You just need to invest in the stuff that allows you to do it. And you have to create registrars.

For instance in Africa there are in total nine accredited registrars. Four of them are in South Africa. Two others are in Nigeria and three others in the rest of the African region.

You imagine that's – there is a future for the DNS business in Africa. There should be a registrar in each country.

And after my DNS workshop many came to me and I have to say we have still two pending applicants in NPOC that are the result of my work that I did over there because they started understanding wow we have to join you to create more efforts and more power to have that debate on how to invest in the business itself.

And one of the ideas that I have already raised earlier and I think I will come back with this that question if it's sitting 100% in NPOC it's another issue.

But if we want to help the African region for example to help them creating registrars the only way we could do it is by as a sample that I did is creating a consortium of potential registrars because most of them they don't have the money. Fifty-thousand dollars is a huge amount for them. They – if they do they kill themselves.

So if we could create the consortium with a spinoff idea. We have potential registrars join and bring in a little fee. we bring in the knowledge, we bring in potential structures and we help them becoming a sustainable registrar then they could help that local NGOs also.

And then you create local economy which will again bring eventually funding for regional and very local NGOs.

So I consider that that is part of our business, our mission as NPOC to to try to help putting in place and helping the operational domain to be really operational which is not the case today.

So I don't know if someone wants to pick up on this. Oh sorry yes?

(Olan Shiam): Let me (unintelligible) that.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes okay go ahead.

(Olan Shiam): (Olan Shiam) ICANN staff. I am reading (Olivier)'s question for charity. I'm to figure out how to enable groups to own and maintain and if the minimal DNS presence domain name Web site. That's another conflict to be sorted out, conflict between Whois NCSG and Whois NCUC and who is NCUC again.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Olan Shiam): The NCG membership concern, how are you doing with this concern at Dublin?

Rudi Vansnick: Well (Olivier) to be quite short we are taking care of that. I know that you are not able to follow all the discussions we have. But we are making progress, solution not yet but it's improving.

And I think we have made quite a lot of statements that are defining that we need our own space in such a way that we can bring up our discussions at higher levels.

But I'm quite happy with this fact that I see that the councilor's really interested in our discussion. So it is improving and I'm looking forward to get this in a better way.

I saw Joan and then Sam.

Joan Kerr: Just on the issue of local economies, developing local economies there is a project that IEEE is involved with. And you know we're involved with it heavily called Smart Villages. And this is where reliable electricity as an initiative and connectivity is developed with the local community.

And so one of the things that we probably could do is capacity build on that project to create another local business for villages in Africa or in the developing world like what you were saying because it would make it then more cost-effective because they would have the infrastructure that's already there.

And we're already working with them both (Ben) and I. So it would be a good way to encourage local not-for-profits to one with their financing in terms of connectivity and also to have local economic development. I just wanted to put that out there.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Joan, very good idea. And I would even propose the following that we create in our NPOC Web space a place where such examples could be dropped to give NGOs ideas of how they could eventually also do so to share really the knowledge of our community inside our Web space first and then see how we can elaborate eventually and having Webinars concentrating on how this is done.

Joan Kerr: Then to build on that there is our conference, a humanitarian conference that we could showcase that we're doing work like this. And these are engineers who are dedicated to doing this work.

So, you know, again this is the engagement and outreach strategy
so...

Rudi Vansnick: Yes see Adam that we are really trying to do outreach out of ICANN as much as we can. With the members we have they are really doing great work outside. And it's not always seen. Maybe that's something we have to say mea culpa which NPOC's fault that we didn't show these cases on our Web sites.

It's a duty that I'm taking to myself now that it will be done in the next few weeks.

Joan Kerr: Well a self acclamation. I did when the Civil Society Award from (Wasis) just so you know.

Rudi Vansnick: Congratulations. Next in the queue is Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay three quick points, in talking about registrars in developing companies I think we do have to give a small flower to ICANN because they did recently change the insurance requirements. So that was a thorn in the side of especially registrars and aspiring registrars in Africa.

The second point was I was at the Indian Constituency Day earlier in the week when they were discussing among themselves various issues.

And one of the ones that they put on the table -- and we don't need to respond to it here but just recognize it's on the table -- was they were saying that the existing structure of ICANN very much reflects a North

American Western European notion of structure including who the constituency groups are.

And they said for example India has 80,000 telecenters or Internet café telecenters. They are a constituency with another group of interest. And they did not feel that that group could be represented at within ICANN's multi-stakeholder model by simply being absorbed into one of the existing constituencies whereas some of the discussion here had been talking say well you could be absorbed here, you could be absorbed there.

But there are those kinds of issues as ICANN reaches out to the rest of the world where you have different traditions a (Panchia) summit which is kind of like a multi-stakeholder village operation when it works correctly, terrible when it doesn't.

So we have to keep our ears open as we're dealing with the so-called rest of the world that's not connected now because they're not just trying to join the club. They're going to help reshape the club.

And the third thing is not to blow my own horn but Joan blew her own horn. I just remembered that I too am the owner of a one person .org with a domain name. It belongs to me and me alone. I just realized I haven't used it since 2005.

Rudi Vansnick: Mea culpa, shame on you Sam.

(Stephane) you want to comment?

(Stephane): Yes I'd like to just a few points. They.org situation was running historically had had was one time no people have individual .org or .com or .net domains. Simply because at the time they registered those there was no other alternative before even .name or .info existed.

And I rather feel here that that was lost for reclaim that work for organizations only there are way too many using that.

Another issue I want to touch is what (Olivier) brought up that the membership management (unintelligible) and that's something I'm going to tackle head-on as one of our highest priorities as the incoming (SGIT) chair.

And I've been talking this with Sam and with ICANN staff. And I think we are well on the way at solving the (unintelligible) or at least ideas and working in a way that I will invert all the - both constituencies and everybody involved instead of just trying to come up with a solution take it or leave it of what we do to get things done.

And finally I have to comment that this has been a very nice discussion and you have been doing great work and I'm afraid I'll have to leave in about five minutes but it's been very nice being here. Thank you

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Tapani. And we are looking forward to work closely together with you on the many issues that are on the table today. As one of them is indeed the membership where actually we discovered and discovered that there are problems for people to become a member in the sense that the way we are presenting the forms seems not being clear enough to them.

I had one that I - is a fellow. He was a fellow in Singapore. And I was talking to him. He was remotely connected in Buenos Aires. And he said yes I want to join NPOC.

He a month ago finally decided to go to the foreman and register. And he made the mistake that he selected the first NC- sorry, individual and not organization because said yes I'm an individual as such. And at the end he was not able to change. The only option was NCUC being a member of NCUC.

So what I want to raise also that we are somehow forgetting and touching up on this because I'm not a native English speaker.

One of the issues that we are forgetting is that the community we are addressing especially NGOs well I can tell you 70% are not native English speakers.

African regions, Latin America, Asia, we start from the point that they all understand English and they can read the difficult stuff because we are presenting quite difficult text to them in the forms. They have to read the charters.

My goodness even I have difficulties to read our charter. Imagine those who want to join us.

So I think we have quite a lot of work. It's not only the two but I think we have also and that's part of the outreach also that it's not just in English. We need to address them in a way they are unable to really participate.

We don't have translation like (Alacast) today and I'm not unhappy that we don't have it. It will evolve when we grow but it's putting a burden.

And again if you want to engage with NGOs if they don't speak English quite often they just shut up. And I see new faces around the table I didn't hear about what you are thinking about all these discussions we're having.

It is helping you? Is this - do you understand the issue that we are bringing to the table? Maybe you can give some short reflections. May I ask you to pick up on that?

State your name before you...

(Laurali Petis): My name's (Laurali Petis). I'm representing the American Bylaw Society. And the reason I have been silent here is I'm not really sure yet where we fit in as a large nonprofit that's not an NGO.

I – we share some of the same interests.

Rudi Vansnick: But we are quite often using the word NGO because it's easier. Not-for-profit is longer. We are used to use a few characters instead of sentences.

But as you said you're not-for-profit so you have operational concerns about DNS. You – we are happy to have you as a member because I think that it is important that you are raising because if I understood the Bylaws Association?

(Laurali Petis): Yes the American Bylaw Society and we're connected with the United Bylaw Societies.

Rudi Vansnick: So we want.

(Laurali Petis): We do a lot of international work.

Rudi Vansnick: So we want to hear about the issues that you have addressing your community because it's – as I mentioned it's a large organization. So you're welcome. Join us and participate in the debates and bring up the issues that you think we are not addressing.

(Laurali Petis): Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay sort of welcome and I've worked in this area for 30 years. When I got involved with ICANN it took me 2-1/2 years to figure out which way was up. So assume that you're going to have a lot of questions, ask them. Ask them to us. You know, chase me down and ask me.

There are – this is a new area. And a lot of organizations haven't even figured out what are the questions they should be asking themselves much less asking us. And you are here earlier to reach on the part of those communities that go door-to-door and saying, you know, come to us. And once you get there, they, you know, can you bake cakes for us? Can you stuff envelopes for us? You know.

And so we don't want that to be the model. So, you know, look for mentoring, look for answers to hard questions. Look for, you know,

and don't be afraid to say no, we don't do that. So it's okay to be confused at the beginning. The hope is that a little later on we're less confused.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. And I'm looking at the other person.

Rita Eteuati: Hello. I'm Rita Eteuati from Samoa. First time Fellow. First time ICANN. First time everything here. But - thank you. Well I'm not here, you know, representing not for profit but I wanted to come and listen.

I actually work for an ISP in Samoa. But outside of that I deal with a lot of not for profit organizations. We have quite a few women in business. There's an umbrella Samoa - umbrella for non-government organizations.

But me learning about what's going on here, you know, you talk about awareness, I'm all for awareness too and taking it back to Samoa and saying that there's this available. I just see how much ICANN has evolved in the last years. I - this wasn't here a long time ago.

And when I was sitting in the last couple of days I was like oh my gosh, there's just so much. But I know there's been a lot of push to assist not for profit organizations in Samoa. So I'm here to listen and learn and hopefully I can take back some of this information back home and, you know, so forth. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much for your participation. And I would say there is a lady sitting on the other side. You have to talk together because you're in the same domain somehow even if you're having a job that is in the commercial way and (perspectives).

We all have the need to jump; otherwise we cannot survive. So that's not abnormal. I would say talk to Joan because you're going to exchange lot of ideas. And I'm almost sure that in Marrakech we will see your application having been entered in our system. Yes Sam, you have the floor and then Joan.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. And talk to me as well afterward. I'm working with some people who are in - who are there now who have been giving support to the National Park System and are there assessing how that support has gone. So there's some mutuality of interest around what's going on there.

Rudi Vansnick: Joan, you want to comment?

Joan Kerr: Sure. I'll make it short because we can speak later. But maybe you could share with us some of the issues that your clients are bringing up and that you see fit that you would like to address and perhaps that we can help you with.

Rita Eteuati: I guess issues with domain names or - yes. I think we're...

Joan Kerr: I guess I'm interested in...

Rita Eteuati: Yes.

Joan Kerr: ...what was it that they were saying that you thought you should sit in this room.

Rita Eteuati: Well just probably in the last six months or so there's been like growth in ICT days and there's been - I mean there's a lot of issues with cost right now. Some of the rural areas don't get connectivity because the commercials don't want to build out in that area. But it's - for the most part Samoa has probably about 90% coverage mobile data. So we're covered there. And they get Internet that way.

The issues - there's quite a few issues. We've had issues, you know, with the technology now. You know, the kids blue tooting, you know, and people complaining about the Prime Minister and then, you know, then they get slapped on the wrist by the government. You can't say that.

Kind of freedom of speech sort of issues come up. You know, a lot of knowledge too soon can be dangerous because, you know, it's just thrown in right away. So I know the Ministry has been trying to do work with awareness and education.

You know, we're a very small community. So even though we have full time jobs, we also do other things, you know, just to help out. It's just our way, you know, outside of that.

But issues, domain names. I guess probably I don't see issues with the domain names as such really. Maybe just try to get it out there. As far as the language, there are certain names that cannot be registered because of the actual...

Man: Yes.

Rita Eteuati: ...yes (IPM). But I think that that's - we can talk later. Yes. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. Well I recognize the fact that you say I don't know you, there are issues. That's exactly the issue itself. People don't talk about the issues to you because they are not aware of that you could help them.

It's they don't ask if you're not telling yourself and that's where it starts. And that's where we as a group need to go out and send a message every time we can; look, a domain name has a value.

And when you are sending your content on Facebook, you're feeding an American engine. You're not doing anything for your own. And even not for your own local economy because that at the end what is important.

That's where I think there is discussion that you can have with your government and say look, if we are enabling our community to have our own local system, we can raise money. We can create economy. And then we have the country itself and have the government. That's where there is (a connect) with government.

I'm not always opposed to government. Sometimes they are really good partners because they want to get the win-win anyway. They want to win something. If you call me with proposal, than can happen.

And for instance, one of the exchange that I had a few months ago with Liberia - I have somehow a link with Liberia due to the ISOC chapter and (Fred Johnson) and others that I know over there.

I had the discussion with the Minister of Education. And I said, "Well look. I know that you want to reach out to the community. But most of them when you reach out to them it's with messages that is - that are felt as yes, he wants to get votes."

And I said, "Well look. There are other ways to do. If you can bring to the table those you want to address, we will talk to them about the advantages in the Internet space." And at the end they will be happy because they got something through you. And that's a way of working together with the government at the end.

There are many ways to do. But we have to figure that out. And that's the reason also why we try to share all what we are doing in our community in a way that you can take profit of it. That's how NGOs operate. It's by sharing - knowledge by sharing ideas that you end up in being successful and doing very interesting project. I see a hand at the end of the table.

(Nana Gochan): Hello. My name is (Nana Gochan) from Armenia. I just want to say a small remark on that. From the end user perspective if you see it in like Facebook or a domain name separate one, they don't care about that. I mean they don't care who's (sitting) your U.S. Government or your national economy because it's easier.

Facebook tool is easier. And I used to work in a registrar company for many years. And we're going to - all those people who come (like) end users to registrants to register their domain name - well, you need to explain them what the value of our own one.

But there is a challenge because if you're going to have your own domain name, then you need to have a Web site. So you need to have somebody creating the content and it's difficult. I mean the tools are not so easy to get for them. While (a fee) Facebook it's real easy. You can share.

And we trying to make - some customers trying to make a research for those who don't have their own name of Web sites and domain names. And they say no, we're not (with that). I mean we have a limited budget for our company. A small group of I don't know, kindergarten or schools that are for the Facebook things.

So it's really competitiveness (unintelligible) budget thing. If a company, the organization, especially not for profit organizations they are very limited in budget. You cannot do that. And it's a real challenge.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. I'm very happy that you're raising this issue. It's one of the missions we also try to address. And as you probably know, as you're an ISOC member, welcome colleague, we have (unintelligible) an answer that is trying to address that issue by offering a .ngo and offering you Web pages - a few Web pages and then some knowledge. But that is definitely not enough.

What we have to make people aware of is when they put their content in Facebook, they are no longer the owner of it. And as an organization, you're giving away your knowledge, your intellectual property. And that's where (unintelligible) will hand you over the Pathfinder initiative documents.

You will see we have now true, the work we have been doing here (unintelligible) have found a collaboration with intellectual property lawyers that are really interested in helping NGOs having their brands registered, pro bono even if possible.

And that's how you can also have the protection that your domain name cannot be hijacked (either) because as I explained to you, we're not yet here. But we have seen through the survey that we did in Europe on the (acosoft) list is that many NGOs are losing their domain name after two or three years because they didn't know that they had to renew it or it was hijacked and it is in hands of corporations today.

So the trust of the .org is an issue today. And offering services to organizations such as NGOs on the domain name space itself is something that is really doable. They don't need to have immediate early Web site. They can have a page. We can easily help them to many structures and organizations that they have a page.

But what is most important is the communication. And as I mentioned earlier, I will come back all the time with that notion is trust. I'm not trusting a gmail - a message coming from gmail if they say I'm organization (XYZed). I cannot trust it because everybody can have a gmail.

Same if you have a Facebook page. Who guarantees me that that page is from that organization? We have seen so many fake pages. And the problem is that most of the time the people don't understand that they are losing some of the capabilities because others are taking advantage of their name, their brand and take the money while they don't - the others don't know. And that's a big issue.

(Nana Gochan): And we - and (especially) development important reason if explaining people is that email address. Whenever we - when we reaching people on this we're saying that whenever you representing your company think that your email address is in gmail that's not so serious and that's (to sell it) is not so trustworthy. Exactly we do this and so I agree completely with that.

Man: I saw Adam's hand up. Yes. Adam.

Adam Peak: I think that the conversation about losing names is very interesting is that it goes way back into ICANN's history of we have this notion that we actually own the name and we don't. We rent them basically. And we lease them. And it's a mindset sort of thing. It's not my name yet, you know, just make it clear. And I know it's a long history. Goes right into (wizards) in all of this.

Just something talking to Rita's comment about bandwidth and so on. One of the things we're thinking about -- this goes back to the engagement strategy -- is that at the moment at lot of ICANN information is very high quality streaming video, Webinars.

If you go back and want to look at - for example, if we want to go back and review the - this meeting, we can go back and we can follow a whole stream of this meeting by getting the exact AC room. That's great if you live on a, you know, a few gigabits of bandwidth. It's awful if you don't.

So what we're trying to do is just move that over into downloadable content into content that is lower quality. I don't know what we can do

about the AC room but we could - you know, there are mp3 files available. But this would be something that from your communities would be very helpful if you can help guide us. Our technology teams will understand it but we may not be expert on it.

You know, software that people use for downloading, which is - means the - if the connection is interrupted, you can continue the download without having to start from scratch.

Downloadable so that you can move into lower cost bandwidth arrangements that you may have with your ISP or your mobile provider. So anything you can think about on that area would be very helpful because getting information out is still valuable for everybody. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Adam. And then - we certain we pick up that and then go back to our communities and ask what they expect being a good solution for them, so because they have to tell us. We don't have to tell you. They have to tell us.

Adam Peak: And I've got to leave. So thank you very much. And I hope to speak to some of you later in the afternoon at the NCSG meeting and I'll catch you at lunchtimes and things. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Adam for being there.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I have to leave in ten minutes Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes Carlos. And I'm really happy that you're here. I think you're understood that our community is a quite important one and has all the discussions that also has to see the daylight in the ICANN discussions.

And that indeed we will provide more but we wanted first to figure out are we addressing the right issues because that's the goal at the end. I see Sam you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. I want to make a comment following on the comments about the situation in Armenia. A lot of our talking is about why it's such a good idea to be here rather than there and why it's maybe not a good idea to be there.

And the point that you made that most small organizations cannot afford to be anywhere except where they are. One of the things that I'm pushing in our outreach is the kind of minimum cost defensive strategies that you can use.

If you - for example, if you have - if your main communications with your supporters, your members, your clients, the public is a Facebook page, I'm always worried about the ethics of letting Facebook milk all those people for data. And that's one of the concerns. It's a real concern.

If you don't have a choice, well you don't have a choice. But it's not that complicated or expensive to actually own a domain name, have it point to that Web page and own - and have 15 or 20 email address that are off the Web page - I mean off that domain name.

So there are these defensive strategies, not just the aggressive what you could do but ways of - if your back is against the wall, I mean I - I'm a development economist. I work with a lot of groups who say we have to do with a dime what they do with a dollar.

In other words, we have to come in at most 10% of the budget that you should have here. That's the one point I'd like to make is there's some defensive strategies that protect you against certain forms of abuse and protect your options down the road. And that's the main point I wanted to make is that they're - just because you're poor doesn't mean you're completely dis-empowered.

Rudi Vansnick: Sorry. Thank you Sam. I would like to - hello (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: To present something that I had a presentation of. And I think that it could fit in some of the plans we have. We all know that there are a lot of refugees issues today. Refugees are trying to get help everywhere in the world and especially as we see from the Syrian region and Iraq and others.

We are looking into possibilities to help refugees. We're going to try to talk with the U.N. and others. Yesterday I had a very good discussion with Paul Zamek who is the guy behind (talk music).

And the idea is that we would do some auditions for refugee musicians to get them doing good performance so that they could earn a bit of money. We would do a video, put it on TV channels and at the end would do a world tour with the refugees to demonstrate that refugees

can be quite helpful in the community bringing music, helping the cultures of their regions where they are coming from.

So that's an idea we are - we have been discussing yesterday for an hour and a half. There is some invitation that Klaus will hand over to you. We have events that are touching upon it.

But I would like to go back to (Tom) meanwhile. You can go around Klaus with the invitations. But (Tom) has a project that is called Frogans. And it is something that could help for refugees especially where we see - and I'm taking the case of Belgium. It was a disaster when we got several thousand coming to Brussels and camping over there and not knowing where to go and what do to.

With - the idea of the program there is a possibility that we could - you could offer that to organizations that could have a close community where they can address only the issues that are of importance to refugees. So (Tom), you have the floor.

(Tom McKinesey): Okay. Thank you. I should just perhaps clarify this. I work as a consultant in Paris for this company called Items International. And it's - this Frogans project, which Rudi is talking about is a project, which has been set up by a separate group also based in Paris and they are one of our clients, if you like.

And so I will just give in two minutes just present this project, which is a slightly unusual project because I suppose it started with - it started ten years ago. But it's started to be heard about in the - in ICANN circles because they applied for a gTLD.

But in fact it's not a normal gTLD project. It's a project, which will allow the deployment of a new technology; a technology, which will allow the publication of a very small kind of page on the Internet, which will function sort of independently of the Web.

Now this sounds like a very tall order. And they are in the early stages of the rolling out of this project. But the idea is that it will allow all kinds of people in very different situations around the world who perhaps haven't had the time or money or for various reasons haven't found they were able to publish their sort of content online. And with this kind of low cost low-tech technology that it will allow them to get there more easily.

So it's, as I say, it's a project in the very early stages of its rollout. If you're interested, they've got a site. It's called frogans.org. They are - so it's a French group. And actually it's so early that I think the only people who are really able to engage with it at this stage are developers who will start to get their hands on this technology to start creating sites and to see what really what is - what the potential is.

And so there we are. I guess when Rudi was talking about refugees, I hadn't sort of particularly ever thought of refugees as possible beneficiaries for this technology. But maybe it's because it does include features - security features, there is a - there's a more reinforced or at they claim that there is a - there's a more enforced measures to protect the identity of people who've created the site.

So people - where your sort of identity is a sort of - in cases - in situations where the identity of site holders is a bit sensitive, I think this technology does offer a certain amount of sort of protection.

So that in a nutshell is what this very sort of different unusual sort of connected to the DNS but not quite the DNS project is about.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Tom McKinesey): It's called Frogans, which is spell F-R-O-G-A-N-S. So it's early days. And I think...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Tom McKinesey): No, it's not - anything actually. Well they have a site. They do actually have a Web site. Even though they're in the business of creating this sort of - another kind of layer, if you like, on the Internet. But that - so the site to access information about this thing is frogans.org I think; dot org. There you go.

Rudi Vansnick: Dot org. Well thank you very much. I knew about it. And there's a reason why I asked you to come and - because I considered that this could be an extension of - I ask to turn off the mic to avoid echoes.

I think that this could be a solution for outreach because we could isolate what is needed for NGOs so that it didn't get lost in all the information that you find around in the world and especially on Facebook that (deviates) your attention quite often.

That could be a project that keeps you focusing on what you're looking for, what you need. And as it can be an application that is that eventually could run offline, that's also helpful.

So in regions where like in Africa where you don't have continuous connectivity, that could help a lot in having offline info available while it's online too. It's one of the reasons why we have all these apps now.

But not everybody in Africa has a smartphone, so we have to try to help them getting solutions in offline as Adam Peak was also mentioning earlier. It is important that we could have eventually the material in a way that it is (owner of the build) that is usable at the local and offline level. I think that for NGOs it's very important.

And so have a look at that frogans.org. You will see that there are some ideas we can really use. And we need to extend our communication and then see how we can eventually also combine it with Pathfinder program because I think that's - it could be something we could put in a negotiation with the U.N. or the World Bank and say look, this is something where you really can help and avoid that the commercials are taking part in it and taking attention away.

That we would be able to bring that forward as a solution which World Bank or the U.N. would invest and bring it to the community that needs it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Mic. Mic.

Man: Right. It's a whole new discussion but I mean one of the things - it was actually more to do with what we - what you were discussing before. But if cost is an issue to acquiring getting online, get - acquiring different extensions, I mean if there was some kind of facility - World

Bank facility that was - that allowed NGOs that were recognized as NGOs to sort of acquire an extension for free, well that would be amazing. I mean...

Rudi Vansnick: That's one of the ideas we want to go for but we need to be sure that the domain name is not going to be captured and hijacked again. So...

Man: If you've got - if you've got some kind of funding facility, then you can use that to validate your - because that's the problem is that when you - at the moment the whole process of validation for example for the .ngo is, you know, that's being passed on to the people who are buying the domain name.

So they're having to pay a premium for this premium kind of service, which was - is going to guarantee or it's going to - it's supposedly going to guarantee all kinds of things. But that comes at a cost. If somebody else is prepared to foot that bill like the World Bank, well then good, great, you know. (Sounds great).

Rudi Vansnick: Don't forget to turn off your mic. Otherwise nobody else can - just to - before passing to Klaus. It's up to us to propose it to the World Bank. The World Bank will not take initiatives themselves. It's up to us to bring forward ideas that could help.

But again, in - it could work in the beginning but what after a few years? How is (unintelligible) taking care of the validation each year? That is something I see as an issue. And that's where if it's somehow related to the - an email address that is not going to be continuously in the loop and is owned by a person, you're going to have an issue.

Man: Just to come back. It's not only the World Bank. What I - what basically happened in the last two or three years is to after so many years of trying to promote Internet use, the development agencies have recognized that the problem was really not to promote initial use of the Internet domain names but also the continuous strategic use as it's called.

So the point is it's now under economic development. It's not under development. It's under economic development because the World Bank has and other agencies have realized that this is one of the major hindering sector of economic development.

So these things can be attached and can be tackled and can be approached at this way. This was not possible till about two years ago because of the case that the development agency didn't seem them as a worthy cause basically. But not we can demonstrate clearly that it's the main factor of economic development is that it's something - what Rudi tried to say. It's something which needs to be set up, written up and done.

(Tom McKinesey): Well, I mean I'm not part of this community yet but I mean if this is a proposal that - if this is something that you're going to work on and you need to develop a proposal to be submitted to the World Bank, that's something that would interest me personally very much.

And so if you've got the contacts or if you - at the World Bank or there's a call for proposals that needs to be submitted at some point, that's something that I'm happy and would be very interested to work on or collaborate on it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: I saw Joan and then Sam.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So I'm going to be devil's advocate. What's new? So I'm always in favor of obviously providing tools and support to make a not for profit thrive. How are we going to talk about the benefits - I do a lot of proposals, as you know.

And one of the things that you have to define when you're proposing an economic development project for a community is that you have to say these are the benefits, right.

So one of the things that I personally would have to come into grips with is that a for profit company is charging a premium fee for the service. So we would have to have a discussion with the company itself that okay, if we do this, what will you do in order to help the not for profit in an (un-good) way. Because again, the (un-good) is the (un-good) for yes we're going to good profits or - right.

Because you - from a not for profit point of view the (un-good) is a name. It's a selling name. But when you really start to dissect it, it's really about making profits and about making money. And the, you know, and I really dislike when that happens.

Man: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Because it's a perception thing. And if you're going to do something for good, do it. But, you know, you know what I'm saying. I mean I don't want to get onto the - on the bandwagon.

But all I'm saying is that one of the things that we have to define if we're going to get behind this is how is this going to benefit the community as a whole because the whole issue is yes, they're going to sell the benefits of the technology but what about the economic elements for the community?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Joan. Sam, you want to follow up?

Sam Lanfranco: In the world of ideas, policy and implementation, there's nothing worse than a good idea badly implemented because people are always talking about the beauty of the idea while the implementation is eating away at your foundations.

We are about to go into Round 2 of the Internet and economic development. The Internet and economic development were on the front burner about 1995 for about a decade. The banner was ICT for development, information and communication technology for development.

Absolutely preposterous ideas like one laptop per child were rolled out. We fought them from day one. They succeeded in getting funding just because they had their friends.

Woman: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: And this went on and on and on. The millennium development goals fed a lot of people. Jeffrey Sachs with the Millennium Development Villages...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Sam Lanfranco: ...blew \$240 million with virtually, you know. And everything that didn't work we knew in advance. So about 2005 ICT for development fell off of the priority list of most of the major donors, world banks, (SEDA), USAID, so forth. And it kept slipping down the priority list.

But now they just issued the new sustainable development goals. And already it's a bit like when the Grameen Bank won the Nobel Prize. Everybody began to put a microcredit component into the project. They didn't have a clue as to what microcredit was. They just - they put it in.

They - I actually knew the major documentation source on microcredit knowledge. And the librarian there said that people would fly in in the morning, come there and say we have a \$5 million project in Country X and we don't know a damn thing about microcredit and my plane doesn't leave until 4 o'clock. Give me something to read.

And so we're about to get what in the American language - I'm in Canada but the American language was called the carpetbagger period, which is when after there's something big happening, these people show up with their business plan and their credit card and a carpetbag and try and sell you something.

So we have to be very careful here because every aspect of the - of the next 50 - the beginning of the next 50 years is going to be people trying to lead with the Internet, ICT, domain names, Web - it's all - all of this stuff is going to come out like - and we're going to have to try to be a voice of clarity, you know, to at least force sober second thought

when people come dangling money and, you know, in front of people and saying.

Man: Yes.

Sam Lanfranco: So it's going to be a - the promise is there but the risks are very high.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. I saw Klaus, you were - oh sorry. Yes.

Rita Eteuati: Oh. Thank you. In Samoa a lot of the families are dependent on remittances from overseas. But that also creates a culture of dependency. You know, not willing to get up and go and, you know, work the plantations. You know, there's the agriculture is green and lush and, you know, and the dependency.

You know, my first reaction to oh great, World Bank funding for this. But on the flipside, you know, there's the other thing and it creates a culture, you know, because, you know, some of the people, you know, you have to work, you know, work - work had and, you know, we - I think there's a need for more of the awareness part and the education.

I know it's difficult. It's difficult for us in Samoa. But we try to keep plugging at it, you know. And just because people, you know, have the money and they say we're going to do this to you. But sometimes there's those agendas. I mean I'm speaking frank. Sorry.

You know, and you have to be aware that well, you know, is this really - they're just really giving it or, you know, is there something behind it that we have to follow these rules, you know, with the funding that comes with it?

And sometimes, you know, there's that, you know. And yes, I think, you know, we try to help ourselves help each other, you know. And if we get funding, great but, you know, with kind of a - I'm not sure I'm saying this. But, you know, not with the rules but, you know, for the best interest of the whatever not for profit or for the people and the individual. Sorry. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. And that input is very appreciated. We need more from you to be able to address issues that we are not treating today. So Joan, you have the floor.

Joan Kerr: Sure. It's Joan for the record. The - I know the funders are doing things differently now. So one of the things for example, a for profit company working with a not for profit and what are they giving and what are some of the results is a good proposal because that's what they want to see.

They also want to see a lot of local engagement as opposed to - because the model of a company or big (funder) coming in saying this is what you do has not worked. So that's why, you know, engagement is a - is very specific on how it works.

But there's a trend now that they - the three Ps, you know, public partners - public private partnerships working. But the strings attached is what you're talking about. What are the strings that are attached? And how are you going to be sustainable after say a project is funded and what is the next step is also as important.

Klaus Stoll: As a recipient of several of these (grounds), I just can tell you if you don't hope then you don't get what you wish for. And the worst thing is that actually if you are successful. Because we had a Latin America project to create a online shopping mall for migrants and (unintelligible) and it worked very, very well.

And at the end we spent more money giving information out and trained other people for - without money than we actually worked on the project. But Sam, it's just (shameless of you) to use the opportunity and Sam's mention of trying to sell you something.

Just very quickly. Next - tomorrow Wednesday and Thursday we have to birds of a feather sessions. That simply means informal sessions for people interested in a topic come together and start talking. That's basically typically is a beginning of a project. So first step of a project.

So we have tomorrow one at 1230 to 1330 on implementing a clearinghouse for DNS related legal services for NGOs. Very simple, straightforward. You're an NGO, you have a plan, you have legal requirements like the big companies; just on a smaller scale but you don't have the money to pay for.

There are lot of pro bono services and things like that and law firms available, which basically are happy to do the work for you because they can write it off against tax (for) hours.

So we are bringing together a number of law firms and civil society organizations. And if you're interesting in it, come to me. Get one of these pieces of paper. And please come tomorrow at 12:30 up to the

fifth level outside and we find a empty room. The same time but on Thursday and the topic migrants; how can the DNS support migrants?

Rudi Vansnick: Refugees. Thank you Sam - Klaus, sorry. Don't forget to turn off the mic. Do not interfere in the echo. We have 50 minutes left for our meeting. And I have a lost agenda point. We are unlucky that Fadi couldn't make it.

The Board should not take on too much on the (CU) and allow the constituencies to have more access to the CEO. It's going to be important. Otherwise we say IANA transition, no way with out us. And then it will fail simply. And that's rude. That's why my name is Rudi.

Man: Are you angry?

Rudi Vansnick: I'm becoming angry. I need food. Just the last agenda point. And it's important for us to prepare ourselves for Marrakech. Hence, we have identified a lot of things that we need to really go into deeper discussions with other bodies.

We have convinced ourselves that we are on the right track. That's good. That's perfect. Now the next step is that we need more discussions with bodies in ICANN in the ICANN meetings. So next one is Marrakech.

What I would like to - well, sorry. First of all, I already have been talking to Pierre Dandjinou -- is responsible for the African region -- to have a session on explaining again why NGOs are important, why they need the domain name, why they need help. And we're going to try to have an event that will address that one.

I have (Victor) is willing to do something with us also in Marrakech. So there is quite a lot of interest - growing interest in what we are doing, which is really amazing to see.

Next what I would like to touch upon is for our Constituency Day meeting in Marrakech I will insist again on having Fadi exclusively. I will stretch all the Board meetings if he is not coming.

But aside the CEO because he is going to leave at that moment and I want to have an impression of Fadi of what he has been seeing NPOC moving forward or backwards. It's good to know. The CEO can tell you that. But also that we should have discussions and invite for instance maybe the registrar community to have that discussion about the loss of the domain name by NGOs.

Maybe it's a moment that we find a way of having that discussion with them. Say look, we - we're concerned. Can you help us? Can you tell us why is this happening? What are you not allowed to do? Maybe we as a partner in the constituency in the GNSO could raise the issue and create a PDP, whatever.

So that's one that I would like to address. We will probably have a presentation of the IANA transition final proposal most probably. And something that maybe could be interesting to do also and it depends on the timing of the other AC, I would like to invite ALAC as it has been raised that in the outreach prospectus we have common grounds we need to work on.

And as (Ronjack) highlighted that during the ALAC session where he was talking to them that it would be good if ALAC and NPOC could work closely together on having the transfer of good advice into policy development at an early stage, not when it's going up to the Board and it's too late, we are using two years.

So the idea is to have good (boiling) advice in the ALAC that we can pick it up, have a discussion among us together with ALAC and see how we could eventually trigger a PDP or a working group or create an ad hoc committee that would jump immediately on the issue to see if that advice could end up in changing the policy where it fails.

So that's the idea that I have to have ALAC coming to us, probably having the registrars or registries. We need to see how we could do that. And having the CEO eventually but that's another point that I want your approval on too is to have eventually two or three Board members coming to us.

Then they can have their Board meeting with us with Fadi. We will have Fadi at the same time. I'm joking now. But I would like to hear from some Board members what they think we are doing, if they understand what we are doing.

I think it would be a good idea for having them in Marrakech. You know, our session. That's the plan for Marrakech roughly. So I don't know if somebody wants to pick up on this and have some ideas or comments, remarks. Shoot. Joan.

Joan Kerr: I love the idea of working with ALAC of course because I think they had some similar issues regarding the civil engagement project. But I

also would like to see something to the effects of -- and I don't even know how to - I'm thinking out loud -- that when a project is forced on you without consultation, what repercussions do we have?

What measures do we have to, you know, if not stop it at least have some influence to say this is not exactly reflecting the community's mission. What can we do? And it should be - there should be some mechanism to stop it at least in some way until that issue has been resolved and then it could be continued.

But have a project being forced on you and saying well, it's now in staff's hand and it can be done I think is wrong. And us as a community should not be able to just go ahead and implement it just because it's forced on you. I think that's a big issue.

And it's the wrong message to send to the - never - just talking about not for profits or anything like that but the world in general. Just because somebody comes up with an idea and forces it on you that you have to do it, it's not a dictatorship.

Rudi Vansnick: Very good point Joan. And I'm looking at our Policy Committee Chair.

Woman: Well there's another - I just want you to know.

Rudi Vansnick: But it's a good idea. It's important and I'm looking to our Chair of the Policy Committee. That's probably something that is to be picked up in the Policy Committee to see if - because that's somehow policy implementation that fails if that happens. So it's maybe something we need to address. I have seen Martin. You have your hand up. You have the floor.

Martin Silva: Yes. And maybe - I believe that shouldn't be (unintelligible) because the people at At Large or the stakeholders of At Large are represented inside the GNSO (developing) processes. (Theoretically) they are giving input already (theoretically).

In our case I think that is really, really not happening because as we know, a lot of NGOs inside ICANN are not - (unintelligible) with NPOC. And in that (set) I think we have to reach out to At Large because full of NGOs. And they're already inside ICANN. Most of them even have leadership positions at ICANN. And then I think it should be part of - that's (separated). I mean there's a deep pock of NGOs.

Well, let's ask them, you know. You are NGO. We are developing the process. You are commenting on the (cases) that have already been done. At least join us, comment (unintelligible) because I mean that's a shortcut at least to NGOs that are already involved in ICANN.

Rudi Vansnick: I fully agree. And don't forget, I was involved in ICANN more than ten years ago. And I created the At Large and I saw that okay, what they are doing is great and it's improving the process in itself. But still they are doing advice.

While we have another mission, we have - I'm always converting that in another language saying look, they are giving advice to a structure but if the structure doesn't do anything with it, it ends there.

While in the GNSO we are writing the law somehow based on advice. Sometimes the track of the advice is so long that when you want to ride the law, it's too late. Internet doesn't wait till we get the law done.

So I think it is important that we start having the discussions at the very early stage before ALAC is going to bring it up. That we have a kind of cross community committee, not a working group but a committee that would address the issue of raising the...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: ...raising that issue so that in the policy world we can address the policy at an early stage before the advice goes up so that when the Board receives the advice there is already a policy development initiative that could say look, we know about the advice that you're receiving.

Well, it is important that you give us immediately response so that from the GNSO we can start doing the development of that policy. I want to welcome our CEO, Fadi Chehade. You're very welcome and we are happy you have made time to come and join us.

Just to reflect very quickly, we have had for the first time the NCSG Chair in our meeting, which is great. It's an amazing improvement. We had GNSO Council staying with us for almost all the time listening and understanding wow, there is something that we need to take care of that should see the daylight because NGOs definitely don't have the space they need.

And we raised the - during the discussions as we created our agenda, we have an important issue that we are going to bring to the table based on - discussions based on input from the community, based on the survey we have been doing.

It is clear that for a certain TLD the issue is there that NGOs after two or three years quite often are losing their domain name. And it is ending up in corporation's hand. We have a sample case in an applicant wanting to become a member of NPOC where the person mention (unintelligible) and so we had (an open case).

It's an organization in Pakistan working essentially for women. And during our validation in NCSG of that application, we look up on the domain names and look at the Web site and saw we have (unintelligible) in hands of a U.S. corporation. So NCSG said oh, just a minute. We cannot accept that.

And I talked to the lady. She says, "Well, we lost our domain name and we didn't know how and why." And this is not the only case. We're having tons and tons and hundreds of samples now.

So it looks like we need to address maybe a non-PDP process to say look, there is something going wrong here. The trust in the .org is lost because you cannot guarantee that when you're visiting a .org domain that is an organization that isn't civil society and just NGO.

And that makes us quite unhappy but also frustrated that we are not able to change that. So that's one of the issues that we have been addressing today and where everybody is convinced that we need to make process.

Coming back to one - I will bring up one question that we prepared three topics for you but there is probably one that fits immediately in that discussion is what do you think that the role of civil society in

ICANN and especially when we look into the context of the IANA transition. We have the accountability doing the presentation. They were quite happy to have our input. But we would like to know where you see NPOC having an important mission in the process.

Fadi Chehade: First of all, thank you Rudi. Thank you everyone for having me here. And I will preface by saying unfortunately I'm already late to two, three other meetings. So I have a few minutes. But I'm happy to come and meet you and see you and welcome you.

And more than anything else I'll also start by recognizing the incredible new energy in NPOC that I feel and the progress you're making and the thoughtful way you're trying to bring this important community into ICANN. So thank you for that. Thank you for putting the time and effort to do that, all of you.

And I hope that in the weeks and months ahead we will see a strengthened participation by your groups into the ICANN affairs. And it's not easy. I mean ICANN is a very, very vigorous community with bit piazza where everybody comes and, you know, deals with their issues and, you know, maybe in a way you're the newcomers or at least with new energy into that piazza and feeling a little bit the normal kind of elbowing and resistance to get in.

But it's good. It's okay. You know, don't give up. This is exactly what we need you to do. This is exactly what you should do. And your views and your experience in managing public interest around the world are, you know, are a need to inform us, need to enlighten us, need to make us a better place and balance the various interests, you

know, where we have very strong business interests, very strong governmental interests, very strong civil society interests.

We need your interests and your views at the table. And they will give us more balance and ensure that we are serving our community better. So thank you.

How to answer your question is as follows. Of course the CCWG process is like a bullet train. It's moving very, very fast. So if I answered that question for you about 8:00 am this morning, it would be invalid by now because - so just be cognizant that this is fast moving train right now.

And not only is it fast moving but it's fast approaching its final point, right. So your contributions to date helpful. What can you do today? Well, tomorrow the CCWG has an extremely important session, possibly the most important in their entire time because all the views are now coming to a head where what are they going to come up with will become clear by tomorrow.

Now if by tomorrow they have a blueprint of what they believe is a solution, then I think we're out of the woods. Then it becomes let's get teams together, write it all up cleanly, communicate it, finalize it, send it to the U.S. Government. Start writing bylaws, building companies and doing all the things this massive proposal asked us to do.

So be frank, if you're here, if you're on the ground, you know, and plugged in, then make sure you're attending that session tomorrow and that if you see the outlines of the solution that you understand them

and that you appreciate them. I will give you now a personal view, not a ICANN view as to what I see coming out if that's helpful.

Rudi Vansnick: That's perfect. Perfect.

Fadi Chehade: My personal view right now is that - hey (Paul). NPOC. No problem. So my personal view right now is that we have a solution that is a good way forward. I'm frustrated a little bit because that solution was pretty much what we talked about, you know, several months ago but it took us - it took us so many routes to get but it's fine.

It's generally where we needed to be, which is, you know, strengthening community powers, creating an appeals mechanism at ICANN, which was missing; a strong appeals mechanism, a binding appeals mechanism. These are the key things, right. Community powers and appeals mechanisms; this is how you make ICANN more accountable.

Now this whole brouhaha about how can we enforce it in court, which yesterday if you listened carefully to the CCWG dialog even they were dismantling.

All the time we spent on enforceability, I mean somebody was telling them really. I mean we're going to consult with the Board. We're going to - on some bylaw change and then we're going to have community forum and then we're going to, you know, agree on that bylaw change or not agree.

And then if we disagree we'll take it to an IRP. And the IRP - the judges will issue a binding resolution. And the binding resolution will

be refused by all of these steps will fail. And the ICANN Board will somehow flaunt a binding judgment. And we still wanted an extra step, which is what if they do all of that and flaunt the binding - we need to go to court.

Okay. We will go to court. So now there's agreement that they can go to court. The community can - if all these extraordinary things happen, then the ICANN community still can go to court. And that's fine. I think that's fine because frankly I really think we'll never get there. And if we get there, then we have much bigger problems to worry about.

((Crosstalk))

It means we've lost our - (unintelligible) lost our unity. We've lost who we are. It - but there's a lot of lawyers involved in this. And lawyers know how to solve things in front of a judge. So the focus was too much on that final step as opposed to on the - what I would call the community regime to get us to that step.

Now in fairness to those who pushed for that, sometimes, you know, just like my teacher in French schools who always had the little baton, you know, to beat us with if we were not good, you know, she would not use it. She's never used it but she had it up there above the blackboard hidden and we would see it. And she'd tell us if you don't behave at the end, if you don't do this and you don't do that, I'm going to bring the baton and beat you.

So maybe we needed that kind of final enforcement power to make the Board comply along the way. And that's fine. If that's what the community wants, it's okay.

What I was worried about, and I'm going to tell you right now because this is where frankly I got very worried almost to the point of saying personally I cannot be part of this transition. I'll go to Congress and say I don't agree to this.

That the first thing that would happen is the baton. And some of the models being discussed is that the first thing is you find people standing up in front of the California court while you are asleep in Fiji or Paris or whatever. And they're asking the judge to change our bylaws.

And I'm thinking wait a second. What happened to the ICANN community? What happened to everything we stand for? Why is the first course the beating? There's got to be some steps in between.

So this is precisely - this is exactly what I think we have successfully avoided. And I hope that by tomorrow we come to our senses, we move forward with a normal process and it includes at the end a big baton. Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Fadi much for your personal views and vision. And I would say to add just one before I hand the floor to Klaus is that what they forget is that most often the judge will not understand what they are claiming.

That's quite often what I see happening in court. When you go to court, you need a judge who understands the issue and what it's claimed for. And if he or she doesn't understand, at the end you don't get the response that you need.

Fadi Chehade: Well this is why again what we had proposed, which is before you go in front of it - the only reason you should go to a judge is it's a binding review - a binding judgment came out of a review asking ICANN to do X versus Y because now the expertise to make that binding judgment is in a standing panel of experts that exists and understands ICANN and understand us.

Then all the judge needs to do is to simply say you have a binding judgment award against you ICANN. Why didn't you implement it? You must implement it because it is binding. And that's all the judge - he doesn't need to look at the why is it, what is it.

He doesn't need to review the case because now the case would have happened through an IRP process that is binding, that includes a standing panel of judges that are experts on ICANN and understand it.

And again, I hope we don't even get to that because imagine what it will take for us - look at us. Look at around this table and the people around this meeting, you know. By the time we get to the point where half the community is standing against the Board in front of three judges to argue about a bylaw change, we're done already in my opinion. We're finished already.

So the real important step that has been added is this concept of forced consultation, which says if the Board makes a decision and the community comes together and say hey, sorry (Steve), we disagree, then (Steve) is forced into kind of a public consultation.

And then all the Board has to sit there and listen to the community and understand. And at that point my sense is if the Board doesn't back off

or reconsider, the, you know, boot them out. This is the wrong Board. This will be impossible to have a - much less getting to a binding arbitration, much less getting to a judge to force it. We'd be dead by then in my opinion. Does that make sense - common sense?

Rudi Vansnick: It's just there is no way ICANN works. I mean we're not tying stakeholders here. So we are here because we need everyone to coordinate, you know, to maintain Internet if we want to work. If they work (unintelligible) a (natural) limit where self-interest of the Board even if the Board wants to get out of the way of the community opinion, (unintelligible) they won't - that will cease to exist the time that the Board stop listening at that level. It's a natural - it's a natural of interest thing.

Fadi Chehade: Absolutely. And the Board members where did they come from? They have not been draft on Mount Moses, you know, they are from the community. You elected them. They're...

Man: Yes.

Fadi Chehade: ...most - next year most of them will be back sitting at you seat and they're some of the people right now screaming we'll be at the Board. I mean this is a Board that is entirely from the community. Unlike any corporate Board, it is elected by the community. It's changed every year. You just saw the three new guys who just started now.

So it is an entirely vacuous fight that was driven by litigious minded interests. And I think we should back off from it. Now they have some valid concerns. ICANN's Board has not always been listening well.

Sometimes it does this. So I think there's valid concerns. But the solution was not to go first to courts.

Well, excuse me, but I really am very late to another meeting.

Klaus Stoll: Could you grant us two minutes?

Fadi Chehade: I'll take - happily Klaus. For you certainly.

Klaus Stoll: Fadi, first of all, whatever happens, whatever has happened, thank you from us all. No more. No less. Secondly, let's stop thinking about all that what is not so positive. Let's think everything goes well tomorrow.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: What can we do to support the transition? And I really wanted to ask you that question but I also want to very, very quickly point out maybe one of the contributions we can make.

I think the point is that a lot of the stakeholder groups are very well represented and rooted in their constituency like some businesses.

Fadi Chehade : Yes.

Klaus Stoll: Civil society is not. And I think we will - one of the criticisms will be you didn't consult enough with civil society. So what I would offer is quite simply once a proposal is up there that we call in civil society organizations without - that are normally not involved with ICANN.

Say to them this has happened; this is what are proposed. What do you think about it? Consultations. Not conferences. No nothing. So that we have a set of feedback on that. When we come to Congress and they're saying what did you do, why - well did you consult - yes, we did and these are the answers.

Fadi Chehade: I think that's helpful. What I want to however - being very realistic with you, the worry we have is that the window to deliver this to Larry and for Larry to review it is really tight right now. I mean very tight.

Once the Iowa caucuses start in the United States of America, you know, also the quote unquote the allegiances you made with people are no longer on the table.

Man: Yes.

Fadi Chehade: So if a Senator told you look, I'm okay with this deal, I'm behind it. After the elections machine starts, just look what happened in Canada yesterday. I mean it's - the machine will move and we don't know where it will go. I'm gone. Larry's gone. (Pritzger) is gone. Obama is gone.

All the people who soon - all the people who brought this deal together are now in flux starting early next year. So as much as I'd like to do another round of massive consultations, the reality is we are fatigued. We have arrived at a good point. I think it is reasonable. I think it took a little bit of time.

It should have finished few months ago but it is what it is. This is how our community works. We need to wrap it up now and wrap it up

quickly and calmly. But, you know, by calmly I mean without, you know, fighting in the piazza again. We should just send the experts in the room, say this is what we want, go write it up.

Let's not spend another \$6 million on lawyers coming up with new ideas. Let's just wrap it up. Let's just wrap it up and move forward because this window will not come back. Not now. My opinion it'll (take a while). Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Fadi.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: And our proposal is to do consultations out of ICANN.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: And bring the value from outside...

Fadi Chehade: Why not? It's a learning - it's a great way to engage people so they don't feel big changes are happening and they're on the sidelines. So do engage in them. However, that's different from saying let's force a - I don't know, a new consultation period and...

Rudi Vansnick: No, no, no.

Fadi Chehade: ...it's outside. Outside.

Rudi Vansnick: We want to do that as a mission and do that in three or four weeks from now. We have already discussed to do it having session in Washington and Geneva.

Fadi Chehade: Good.

Rudi Vansnick: We tried to have one in Africa and in Asia before the proposal goes to the NTIA so that you can say look.

Fadi Chehade: Excellent.

Rudi Vansnick: This is coming from outside.

Fadi Chehade: Excellent. Courage. Keep your courage. Keep your focus. And we have great things to celebrate in the months ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Fadi for your visit.

Fadi Chehade: (Thank you).

Rudi Vansnick: And we are inviting you already for our Marrakech meeting because we want to have very nice discussion with you on what you're going to do next. Thank you very much.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: So we have to round up because we are going to be kicked out of the room.

(Paul): And I (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yes.

(Paul): (Paul) (unintelligible), ICANN staff. Maryam Bakoshi just asked me to announce that the NCSG meeting it will be held at 2:00 pm. It will be on the fourth floor. Thank you.

Man: Did somebody (unintelligible)?

(Paul): Fourth.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: What floor?

(Paul): Fourth.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. And I have to excuse myself also because I'm expected to speak to the next (gen). I'm trying to do the outreach for NPOC as far as ICANN. It is this morning at the fellowship. I'm going now to the next (gen) and try to sell NPOC again.

Thank you all for being here. Thank you for all those being online because I see you - several people being online, several of our members. So thank you very much for being there. And sorry that we couldn't bring you in. But for Marrakech we hope to do more. So thank you all and with this I can adjourn this meeting.

END