

**ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
NCSG Meeting
Tuesday, 8 March 2016 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Also found on page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Tapani Tarvanen: Okay, good morning everybody - afternoon actually depending on where you are. For most of the people somewhere it would be morning I'm sure. Yes. So, this is the NCSG Open Meeting starting. I'm Tapani Tarvanen the Chair of NCSG. And welcome everybody, I'm not going to spend much time talking in here. I'm letting our distinguished councilors and other members do most of the talking.

And apologies for starting a bit late. It seems that several people were having lunch and so couldn't be on time. But without further ado let's go on to the first agenda item here which is about the big thing that's been messing up with everything in ICANN the past two years -- the CCWG accountability. Councilor (Edward Morris) has promised to talk about that. (Ed), over to you.

(Edward Morris): Thanks Tapani. I disagree with the characterization of accountability. I think it's great because when it's done for the first time really in world history we could have an organization. If we do it right that's going to be bottom-up multi-stakeholder running the global common resource. So I'm excited about it even though it's been an incredibly large amount of work.

We have an issue -- some statements -- that we need to get before the GNSO Council today, so we could take brief detour from the general discussion. I want to turn this over to Marilia -- who's our Policy Committee Chair -- to try to do something with our PC is at the table.

Tapani Tarvanen: Hey Marilia, go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much Tapani and (Edward). The way that we're going to conduct the voting is that -- for those of you that do not know -- we have an informal GNSO meeting tonight in which we are supposed to advance our positions, the particular recommendations that we have issues with, and that we may want to call a vote on. And this shall the prepare the voting of tomorrow.

So the session of the GNSO tonight is supposed to diffuse any tensions or any surprises and make sure that we arrive in the voting tomorrow in a more collaborative way. And that is why it was suggested that maybe we examine at this moment some of the statements that the councilors want to put forward tomorrow to make sure that we are all comfortable and we are on the same page. In order to do this (Edward) had suggested that we hold a PC meeting inside this NCSG Open Meeting.

But that first thing I would like to ask, if anyone has any issues with it or if we can proceed this way. Yes, please. (Mike)?

Klaus Stoll: This is Klaus for the record. Just for logistic reasons where and when is the meeting tonight?

Marilia Maciel: I don't know. I need to look at the schedule. This is not on schedule because it's an informal meeting.

(Edward Morris): That was my point. It's an informal meeting that we're going to literally make decisions that are formal. Basically what did GNSO leadership has asked us to do is let them know how we intend to vote the next day so they can better arrange the schedule. I'm not sure if they've asked us for the verbiage we're going to use in support or opposition of the recommendation.

Marilia Maciel: No. Actually they have asked us things that we single out the recommendations that we intend to request a vote on, and that we kind of signal that to them. But I think that's more if we are going to put our language because they gave us the opportunity to put language will accompany the GNSO vote.

So if we are going to do that I think that the most transparent manner is that the councilors kind of advance more or less. Maybe we don't have a fixed language yet, but the draft language that they are planning to put forward so we can discuss this language here. So I think it would be nice if we can send to the GNSO to night so everyone is aware. Klaus, you have a question?

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I'm confused because basically I'm against informal meetings making formal decisions. That I think is a bad show and it's not transparent. It's not in the spirit of our multi-stakeholder model.

Marilia Maciel: This is a fair point that's why I began by asking everyone in the room how they feel. I do feel that we do not have another opportunity to discuss this if we do not discuss here. So, I think that we have a reasonable quorum in some of the members of the Policy Committee. So that is why I'm asking the members of the Policy Committee to voice their concerns or if they are in agreement with this. I see Stéphane wants to...

Stéphane Hankins: I just want to make sure that we talking about the same thing because we are confused here. So probably you are talking about the informal GNSO meeting tonight, am I correct?

(Edward Morris): Yes.

Stéphane Hankins: Yes. So that is an informal gathering over drinks from six to seven. It is for GSNO councilors only. But the constituency chairs are invited so there in a way there's a way of observing what is going on. And it is a coordination meeting. Decisions would not be taken. If I understand what our Chair -- (James) -- wants to do is to fill the room a little bit.

Klaus Stoll: This is Klaus for the record. I think the important part was at the end of what you said. Because what (Ed) said so it's basically formal which means that the decisions would be made. If there are no decisions to be made, then it's fine.

Tapani Tarvanen: Okay, there will be no formal decisions made here. It's basically just the PC members talking and coming (unintelligible) for the message they want to send to the...

(Edward Morris): As long as you tell us later what's coming out it's fine.

Tapani Tarvanen: And we can discuss it here. So we would actually don't have to tell you later what happens here. Marilia, you want to go on?

Marilia Maciel: Yes. So if no one has any objections for us holding this as a PC meeting in our NCSG Open Meeting then maybe we can discuss the recommendations that we have in front of us and discuss some of the language that some of us have put forward or addressing to accompany our vote.

Maybe before that I know that NPAC had a discussion on the recommendation. Maybe it would be nice for us to hear a report from either Rudy or Klaus or anyone that wants to report that.

(Rudy): Thank you. (Rudy). For the transcript I think I will refer to Sam who is our Policy Committee Chair. And we have been discussion and he knows about it.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you. (Sam)?

Tapani Tarvanen: I intervene a bit just before to clarify that what we are doing here is simply I'm letting Marilia to run this part of the session. So, it's a not a formal PC Policy Committee Meeting. We're just discussing the item we had in the agenda and we are rounding up policy committee members (unintelligible) to have a position here.

(Edward Morris): We need to vote on this.

Sam Lanfranco: I still need a repeat of the question. I was busy reading something.

Marilia Maciel: The question is you sent an email to the list saying that NPAC discussed your position on the CCWG proposal. And I think that's a good point for us to start before we look at the recommendations and the text that some of the councilors are thinking about putting forward to accompany their votes, if we hear from you on the discussion that you had so everyone can be informed and on the same page.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. I'm not going to go into the detail on discussion since I'd rather have that come out later. I think I correctly reflect the position, and that's that we would prefer comments that accompany the specific recommendations to come out of NCSG rather than separately from NCUC and NPAC so that there was a kind of consensus -- concerted voice -- that came out.

So I would rather not say anything about any of the particular things now but let them emerge and let my colleagues bring them up as we go through them.

I think there's a strong consensus that it should be - that those should all be distilled down into and go in with NCSG or as independent submissions, but not three sets of submissions from NCUC, NCSG and NPAC. That's all I'll say for now.

Marilia Maciel: Absolutely. I completely agree with you. And I think that this is a reason why councilors want to put the language here to see if we can make comments as NCSG or not. But the idea is to discuss together. So that's exactly it. Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: I just would like to add to that that what we are trying to do is something - it's called a constructive criticism in the sense that we are aware about as more premiums we are giving in -- as more ammunition we are giving to the people who are against the transition -- and we really want to be careful with that.

And as you all know we all have a lot of problems with a lot of things in there, and we can talk days and days and day about it. But in the interest of the overall transition I think we have some wonderful comments from Robin and other things that are sufficient, and we don't have to add anything more to it. But just be aware our stomachs are hurting too.

Marilia Maciel: (Sam).

Sam Lanfranco: I want to add one more point that I made in discussions yesterday. And this is not the World Cup of FIFA. This is not an encounter where you either win or you lose and the loser goes home. The transition and this accountability language is basically restructuring the playing field or the battlefield where everybody is going to be there after it's over still defending what they're defending and protecting what they're protecting.

So, it's not as though we can win a point and lose a point but we don't win or lose the game. The game goes on.

Tapani Tarvanen: If I may, please introduce yourself when speaking.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you for the reminder Tapani. So, I completely agree. And I think that this is maybe a good way to proceed -- is to proceed as we're going to vote on Wednesday, which is Chair has asked looking at the package of recommendations from 1 through 12 if there are singular particular recommendations that the councilors want to set apart to be discussed and voted on or present comments on.

So at this moment maybe we should go recommendation by recommendation and open the mic from everyone to participate in the discussion, but particularly for our councilors here who has flags if they want to set apart this recommendation or not. We need to say this tonight to the GNSO.

So yes, Stéphane.

Stéphane Hankins: Stéphane. For the record just to our NPAC colleagues, they might be diverting using the room. And we also know the stakeholder support that you have put forth already. And we would try as GNSO councilors immediately to represent, you know, both NCSG and NPAC as it is fair to do.

But probably one different way of looking at a program is to see the comments we want to submit as sort of footnotes for the implementation. So in sort of proactive, positive manner, not as complains but as, like, raising a little flag -- there might be some problems -- and that we need to follow closely what will happen next.

Marilia Maciel: Thank Stéphane. So let's begin by Recommendation #1. Any other councilors plan to flag this recommendation tonight as one recommendation that we need further discussion?

(Edward Morris): I do.

Marilia Maciel: (Ed) can you explain your rationale maybe in (unintelligible)?

(Edward Morris): Yes. I mean this one is a tough one for me because there are a lot of good things in it -- inspection right, investigation right. But what I can't get over is it takes the advisory committees -- which have always been different from the NGSO -- and it makes them decisional participants.

The one thing that really gets to me is allowing the Government -- through the GAK -- to be both a decisional participant but also have special advisory powers. That seems to be me to be a little bit double-dipping. It changes the equation of power within ICANN. And I did not get involved in this community to give governments veto power over the decisions of the community. And combined with Recommendation 11 that's what this proposal does.

So as much as I want to support as much as I can within this report -- which I spent a lot of time with (Robin), with (Matt), with a lot of people here working on -- I just can't get over the fact that if I were to vote for Recommendations 1 and 11 I'm empowering governments in a way I don't want to empower them. So I will be voting against Recommendation 1.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much (Ed). Any other comments on this one? Any other councilors would like to raise concerns, flag this particular recommendation? At least we know that we there will be one that will be flagged and the rest now would be more or less I think what I presented.

If there are no other comments and Recommendation 1, maybe we can move forward to Recommendation 2. Do any other councilors present to flag this recommendation?

(Edward Morris): Hi everybody. I can't tell you I'm going to do with Recommendation 2 -- a lot of the same issues. But we also have the issue that Recommendation 2 contains threshold issues. The problem with that is we don't know if the GAK's in or out and we may have to redo the thresholds once they decide.

There has been a statement agreed to by some of us in with the business constituency that addresses our understanding that when we pass Recommendations 1 and Recommendations 2 that the decision making bodies will be clear beforehand whether they're going to be in or out. So perhaps then we can adjust the threshold.

One of the points we want to make is if one of the five parties decides to opt out that we will not have any threshold which is unanimity. In other words, the four remaining groups have to agree in order to exercise powers. So until I see if this letter of understanding is adopted by the entire GNSO I cannot tell you how I'm going to vote.

If we get that understanding as part of the package, I will support Recommendation 2. If we don't I'll oppose it.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much (Ed). Any other comments on Recommendation 2? I don't see hands up. So, let's move onto Recommendation 3. Any councilors or anyone who likes to raise concerns on Recommendation 3?

It would be useful if we had the recommendations on screen, I completely agree. I completely agree. Not all of us have them memorized. I apologize for that. (Brett)?

(Brett): Do you want me to bring you a copy so you could read then the titles of the recommendations so that everybody can have an understanding?

Marilia Maciel: Thank you (Brett). I do have them in my computer here somehow. I'm trying just to find the list so I can - yes, I just did. So Recommendation 3 is about standard by-laws, fundamental by laws and articles of incorporation. I don't know if the staff could just hold the recommendations. If we can see them on screen it would be helpful. But I don't want to waste time, so why don't we do that? I would just read the titles

Any points on Recommendation 3? I don't see any hands up. So let's move onto Recommendation 4 which is Ensuring Community Involvement in ICANN decision making: Seven New Community Powers. Any points on Recommendation 4? I see none.

Moving forward to Recommendation 5: Changing Aspects of ICANN's Mission, Commitment and Core Values. I don't see anyone else.

Recommendation 6: Reaffirming ICANNs Commitment to Respect Internationally Recognized Human Rights as it Carries Out in its Mission.

(Edward Morris): Me again. Hi everybody.

Marilia Maciel: Hi (Ed).

(Edward Morris): If my vote is decisive I will vote in favor or Recommendation 6. If it is not, I will not a volitional abstention. And what that means is I really don't know what's in this recommendation. Because the definition of its content of human rights is going to be decided in Work Stream Number 2 -- I have concerns.

Human rights can often be used to butcher the positions of intellectual property interest. They can be used to limit speech. And in this proposal my major concern is you could use hate speech derogations to free speech rights or you could use the IP protection (six biz burn) which had been incorporated in some human rights conventions to be able to attack Recommendation 5 - excuse me, the provision of Recommendation 5 that keeps ICANN out of content.

So I could perceive a situation with dot that thing -- dot-com -- could be brought to an IRP panel and argue that that - for example, it's hate speech or that is some semblance of intellectual property interest that is not trademarked -- maybe copyright related -- that is the author's right which is protected under human rights. And that could be used to beat the prohibition

of ICANN getting involved in content. I don't know that would be the case. I don't know what an IRP panel would do. But that concerns me.

An additional concern -- and some lawyers here agree with me; some lawyers disagree with me -- is that I believe that ICANN as a US Government contractor is obliged to respect the First Amendment. There are decision coming out of government contractors in the Iraq warzone were folks are - where it's being stated that the corporations themselves and their employees have First Amendments rights by virtue of their tie to the US Government.

We are not duplicating the First Amendment -- free speech -- necessarily in the human rights WS2. So I want to make sure to use this to make sure that the First Amendment principles if I know it's American. But when we replace the NCIA I want to make sure those principles carry through into the future here at ICANN.

So I am going to vote a volitional extension because I don't know what we mean by human rights -- many repressive regimes cite human rights in doing what they do -- and to try to ensure what Work Stream 2 considers free speech at a very high level.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much (Ed). We're going to see the recommendations on screen very soon. I just would like to ask who is responsible for remote participation because I am having...

(Brett): (Unintelligible) right now.

Marilia Maciel: Okay. Because I have, like, someone bugging me on Skype saying that they are trying to participate but they are not having any feedback. So, if we can make sure that remote participation is taken care of that would be nice. And please say your names in the beginning before you speak, we are forgetting to do that.

Any other comments on Recommendation 6 either from our councilors or from other that want to speak on this particular recommendation? And it would be okay NPAC -- I know that you have discussed the recommendations -- if you want to make a summary or report of what you have discussed in recommendations. That will be the moment as well, I think it would be good.

If there aren't any other comments let's move onto Recommendation 7: Strengthening ICANN's Independent Review Process. Any councilors who would like make a comment or remarks on this particular recommendation or set aside for vote?

(Edward Morris): Which - I'm sorry.

Marilia Maciel: Seven. Number 7.

(Edward Morris): One comment. I'm going to support 7. But one of the things in 7 that concerns me is a provision - we're going to make IRP free basically in terms of administrative class. But there's a provision in 7 -- and I will make a personal statement -- that concerns me in that we have a loser case provision that if the IRP panel finds that the case itself is somewhat frivolous -- or how they define frivolous -- that we could force the cost upon the complaint bringing the case.

That concerns me if it's not done at the initial level of filing the case because it could be used to stifle free speech. It could be used to stifle people who are afraid of the cost from even bringing complaints. So I want to make sure we have that done at the very first level before cost concerns by complainants.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much (Ed). Any other comments on 7? I don't see any.

So let's move onto Recommendation #8: Improving ICANN's Request for Reconsideration Process. Any comments?

Recommendation 9: Incorporating the Information of Commitment Reviews in ICANN by-laws. Any concerns?

Recommendation 10: Enhancing the Accountability of Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Any councilor would like to raise anything with regards to this particular recommendation? Is this a recommendation that we you want to flag?

(Edward Morris): I would be flagging Recommendation 10 strongly. Recommendation 10 contains nothing good. I don't understand why anyone in the GNSO would support it. It allows the board to unilaterally set the terms of the reviews of SOACs without any community participation. It allows the GAK to avoid the same accountability reviews that every other SOAC undergoes.

Now if the GAK is not a decision maker that's fine with me. But if they are a decision making participant they should have to undergo the same reviews as the rest of us. So for me, of all these recommendations I can argue pro or con 11 of them. Recommendation 10 to me is abomination. It should not pass.

I would encourage everyone before voting for it to take a look at it and to be prepared to explain to this community -- as I'm explaining why I'm voting against things -- why you voted for Recommendation 10 because to me there's no reason to do so. Thank you.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you (Ed). Any other comments on Recommendation 10?

(Edward Morris): Marilia, could I ask some of our councilors who apparently are going to vote for Recommendation 10 why they are voting for Recommendation 10? I just don't understand.

Man: Really it doesn't change the situation much from what it is now.

Tapani Tarvanen: Please identify yourself.

Man: (Unintelligible). It literally does not change the situation that much from what it is now. And mandating a review is not the same as mandating the outcome of that review. We have regular reviews. I don't think hammering a few extras is going to be that terrible a thing.

Marilia Maciel: Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I apologize, I didn't catch who asked that last question but I feel I have to respond. I'm not voting against any of the recommendations because I don't think it materially changes the output and I think it's confusing.

I think at this point in time either we attach a comment to it, which clarifies how we feel and what we're watching for in the implementation period -- and I encourage everybody to join the implementation groups because we need all hands on deck to make sure these things don't go wrong. But it's really a procedural matter. I don't think it lends anything by voting against it.

So, I'm voting the package through unless instructed otherwise. I'm leaving it at that. Thank you.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Stephanie. (Ama)?

(Ama): Yes, what Stephanie said.

Stéphane Hankins: Stéphane, yes.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much. (Ed) I hope it satisfies you. Any other comments on this particular recommendation? So we'll move onto Recommendation 11: Board Obligations with Regard to Governmental. Advisory Committee Advice, Stress Test 18. Anyone would like to flag this recommendation?

(Edward Morris): I guess it's me again. Recommendation 11 is not as bad as some people would like to make it out to be. We managed to lock in the GAK to full consensus advise. But Robin Gross brought this out in our Los Angeles meeting -- there's a principle involved. I do not want to cast a vote that for the first time in history allows a decision making portion of ICANN represented by governments to be able to overrule the rest of the community.

That's a step too far for me. I will be voting against Recommendation 11.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you (Ed). And finally Recommendation 12: Committing to Further Accountability Work in Work Stream 2. Oh Padmini, I'm sorry.

Padmini Baruah: I'm sorry Marilia. This is Padmini Baruah Center for Internet and Society for the record. I probably misunderstood that we - I probably weren't supposed to make a comment. But I thought it's only for the council. But I'm asking for slight detour on Recommendation 8. And three points I'd like on record on Recommendation 8 on the reconsideration process - the proposal as a standard right now is slightly weak on three points I'd like clarity.

One, on the timeline for reconsideration request -- the timeline for processing them. Two, on the grounds for reconsideration. And three, what falls within the mandate of reconsideration request? For development of this recommendation now or after its adopted means to take these three points into account as what is strongly believed. Thank you.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much Padmini. So, I don't saw any hands up in Recommendation 12.

But before we move onto the next topic I'd like to ask staff is we have a response from remote participation because I do know that people are trying to raise their comments on this private session. And I would not want to move on before giving them the chance.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marilia Maciel: Okay. So can we check maybe the person who's trying to participate, maybe you're in the wrong room? Yes. So if you can check your connection and make sure that you are right in the room that will be good. But I will make sure that we can come back to the points if you that are listening to us want to make a comment. And you can (unintelligible). I will make sure that we open an opportunity for you to make a comment on this particular point.

So I think that this is what we have on accountability. As I mentioned we are going to express this to the GNSO council -- the meeting that we have tonight -- and we expect to vote it tomorrow.

(Edward Morris): Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Yes, (Ed).

(Edward Morris): Could I actually - we have actually a member who I would like to hear from. Sometimes I feel like I'm the only one up here with a particular view -- and that's okay. Robin Gross has been our official member on the accountability - - CCWG accountability -- for the past 15 months.

I want to hear from Robin. How do you feel about the recommendations? Are you happy that the NCSC apparently is going to be approving these with the exception of me?

Robin Gross: I think it's really a mixed bag. I think there are lot of really, really good things that are in the overall package of recommendations. Things like improvements to the independent review process, and the reconsideration request process, and getting new transparency requirements put in, and the human rights - respect for human rights in the by-laws -- and giving the

community an opportunity to have some say on things like the by-laws and recalling their board members and some of the other community powers.

So there's a lot of really good things in this -- in this package -- and that frankly are long overdue and critical if ICANN is going to be able to continue to do this important governance job. However, having said that I do have concern with one aspect of it -- and it's a big concern. And that is the issues particularly with Recommendations 1 and 11 and enhancing the power of governments at ICANN.

We talked about Recommendation #1 gives governments the same say as we have over recalling board members and budgets and strategic plans, in approving by-laws and all of the community powers. So making them a decisional participant is a major fundamental shift in the way that ICANN has previously operated.

I mean you look at Number 11 and we're saying, "Well, and the board is going to be even more obligated to follow the Government's advice than they have in the past." So you put those two together and I think it's just a bridge too far when it comes to the Government enhancement issue.

Now I'm not going to suggest you vote against the package -- not at all. But I think it is important that we register some descent on these issues in particular because this is a fundamental shift at ICANN. And I fear that it is taking Internet governance backwards in the wrong direction and will have a negative impact on the things that we care about like freedom of expression and privacy and openness. So it's not all black and white for me.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Robin. I see that (Matt) wants to speak.

(Matt): I think this is a very interesting question. I have throughout this process shed similar concerns to Robin in terms of just proportionately impairing certain parts of the community. However, when one looks at the total package of

recommendations -- and I consider where we were two years ago and where we might be post transition in terms of the accountability of this organization - - I don't have any hesitation in supporting the transition.

And I think it's important for us to look at this holistically at the same time as looking at it recommendation by recommendation. Thanks.

Marilia Maciel: Avri please.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. I guess I want to take exception to the notion that this is setting Internet governance back. First of all, we have maintained the power balance in that Government still have a much weaker position than any other the other stakeholders.

I think it's also important to recognize when we're talking about Internet governance that we are talking about all stakeholders -- including those that governments represent in that whole mix. So for us to continually insist that governments must have absolutely no role in this is very much equivalent to them insisting that we must not have any role in other parts.

So if we're going to talk about ICANN in historical, well then there's perhaps something to argue about. But if we're trying to say that this is a reflection on taking Internet governance back a step, I actually think this is very much taking Internet governance forward a step because it does give us a leg to argue that, you know, they should treat us as we treat them. Thank you.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Avri. Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes. I just think it's important - a lot of times this particular concern gets mischaracterized as "governments should have no role." And that's not at all what I'm saying. Governments have an important role, and it is an advisory role. It is not the decisional role that has belonged to the bottom-up process.

So I just think it's important people realize that it isn't - that those of us who has this concern are saying Government should have no role. I realize what is often going to be explained that way to you by others who don't share this view. But those of us who do, do not feel Government should have no role. The role is an advisory role. Thank you.

Vidushi Marda: Yes, thank you. This is Vidushi Marda. I just want to actually echo what Avri and Robin both said. And it points out to the fact that the GAK is one of the few ways in which a lot of governments can engage with the ICANN process. And by governments I mean people of countries that don't have easy access to it.

And so I don't think anyone is saying that the government needs to - that the GAK or governments for that matter need to look into day-to-day issues but more of an advisory. I think it's very important to have a multi-stakeholder model in which you actually endure every single stakeholder. And so even if it's not something that we want to hear I think it's important that we do.
Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you Vidushi.

Woman: (Unintelligible) from the Center for Communication Governance. While I do agree with the points raised about how it's important to have GAK participate in this multi-stakeholder process I think the main concerns is having two bites of the apples. Because right now they will get to be both the decision participant as well get not just as an advisory role but the special advisory role.

So it's not that they're disadvantaged in any way, but is that they are mobile from any of the other (unintelligible). I think that is what is of concern. Thank you.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you. Any other person would like to speak on this particular topic of accountability? One thing that I think is important to flag is that the procedure that was suggested by James and adopted back say that we would present our reasoning on writing. And I know that councilors are still working on the writing reasoning.

If you finish it before the meeting today on Tuesday, it would be interesting to show this to the other councilors I believe and of course sent to the PC lease - to the NCSG list as well. So everyone in the world will see the exact language that is going to be sent to the report. That would be my final remark about this.

If anyone has any point to raise with regards to accountability? I don't see any hands. So I hand it over to Tapani to continue with the next agenda item for our NSCG meeting. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you Marilia. We are running a bit out of time so I will not spend much more. Marilia can you get this main agenda again?

The next agenda item would be about WHO2 -- and Stephane Stephanie Perrin has promised to give us a brief overview of what's going on.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And apologies to everybody who heard me in the early morning session because I'm going to repeat much of what I already said in the early morning session.

So, by WHO2 I mean the RDF/PDP which has recently opened up, to look at whether or not we should change the WHOIS directory. It is building on the results of the EWG report. And if you look on the ICANN Web site and go to the area on WHOIS I think you will find links there to these things.

But if you want to look at the RDF/PDP in particular go to GNSO. Look for the open PDPs and you will find the one for RDF. Basically there are a number of

issues in the all WHOIS thing. The first one of course to note is that we've been fighting about whether there should be an open directory of registration javas for the last, well, 17 years let's say.

And the tension is between those who want data protection both for individuals or personal data protection and as a protection for free speech and freedom of assembly. So, confidentiality to protect the identity of groups who might have domain names in the Internet. Both are released on the public directory.

So there are many technical aspects to WHOIS. And one of the other besetting programs with WHOIS is it gets sliced up into many different pieces -- the technical bits. The RDDS or the RDAP rather, the Registration Data Access Protocol was recently developed by the IETF. And ICANN is in the process of applying.

There's a call for comments open. Those of you who are specialized in this area please feel free to comment. There is the issue of thick WHOIS versus thin WHOIS which is basically who's got all the data -- is it the registrar or is it the registry -- and there's many others. This PDP is supposed to be allowed to have a broad scope and to examine the fundamental purpose of WHOIS.

And from the perspective of those of us who care about data protection, that would include the fundamental purpose of gathering data in the first place. It is to get a domain name. It is not to provide a reservoir of personal information. But it is available to law enforcement in the event that there is a problem eventually with the Web site.

So if you read the registrar's accreditation agreement which basically sets the terms under which a registrar is allow to sell a domain name you will find a complete list of everything that they have to collect from the registrant, everything that they have to keep for two years after the last transaction with the registrant and everything they have to put in escrow.

Now the escrow provisions are solely not for law enforcement. They're there just in case the registrar goes bankrupt or something and you lose your domain name -- that wouldn't be good. So there's definitely Consumer Protection Act aspect in this. But it's restricting the uses of the data that has and has had civil society concerned for the last 17 years.

On the other side there are many, many claims on that data. There are notably the intellectual property folks who are trying to enforce their trademarks and intellectual property rights. There's law enforcement who often are precluded from getting this information by national law and national constitutional protections. So they find it very convenient to have it all at ICANN.

Also for all of these players there's jurisdictional issues when they try to go to another country and get registrant data. So they prefer it to be in one place, preferably one that ICANN can serve up to them.

There are also other players -- who I've referred to as bottom-feeders the other day and I'm still getting feedback on that -- but basically once you have a free dump of a lot of registrant data the people who are repackaging that and making it available. So if you ever made the mistake of putting a personal cellphone on your registration, good luck ever getting it out of the record because there are WHOWAS contractors who will charge you \$15 a year to get that taken out. And there's more than one.

So, you know, these are the kind of value-added service providers that from a privacy perspective we don't consider this value-added. So I think that gives you some sort of flavor of what the issues are going to be. The group is just starting. It's a big PDP. There's 120 people on the group and an equal number at least on observers.

It's interesting that in this particular PDP the observers can at any time switch into being regular members and participants. Observers do not have the right to speak up in the meetings, they're just observers. So I want to encourage anyone who is new here -- it's a great way of learning about all the issues at ICANN -- get yourself on the observer list. Those of us -- and Kathy's on this PDP. (David) is not just on it he's one of the neutral chairs -- he's a Vice Chair.

But there are several of us on the group already. And we would be happy to translate anything, give you any help and encourage you to get involved. It's not going to be fast moving I would suspect with 120 members, but we are having weekly meetings an hour and a half at a go. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you Stephanie. Any comments on that? I see David wants to speak. Sorry, that's David Cake speaking.

David Cake: Yes, David Cake speaking. As Stephanie said I'm one of the Vice Chairs, so I'm trying to remain sort of a little neutral on public comments on the outcomes side of it. But I want to say this is a huge one. It's an enormous, enormous part of policy. There are lots of people on it but not many of them are on our team. We can certainly do with a few more.

It is a very complicated group. We also have at the side sort of, you know, intellectual property people, (unintelligible) people and business people and so on, and registrars - registrars and registries. And of course you're going to have to deal with actually implementing whatever we decide. And there's people from the tech community. And there are a number of issues here ranging all over the place.

Whatever skills you have, if you are enthusiastic about it we can probably use you. We need - you know, if you happen to be a data protection expert that would be fantastic. But we're not expecting to find too many of those more. But certainly, you know, there will be places when we need technical places.

There will be places we need people with experience at consumer advocacy or registrant advocacy. There will be places where we'll need everybody.

And we will have a public meeting toward 12:06 tomorrow and there's a fair bit of time on the agenda for that allocated for public comment and discussions. So come along and talk about it.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you David. Any other comments on this? It seems that was a sufficiently comprehensive presentation that everybody's happy with it as it is. In the interest of not wasting any time let's move on. And next we have Kathy Kleinman who wants to speak about rights protection mechanisms.

Kathy Kleinman: (Ron) too was drafted. I'm happy to talk about rights protection mechanism. This is Kathy Kleinman. And this morning for those who are in the session we talked a lot about the different pieces of rights protection mechanisms. The UDRP, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy -- the URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension which is a faster, quicker version of the UDRP -- with some changes -- just renewed top level domains in The New Trademark Clearinghouse. But here we're with a much more expert group in some ways -- the NPAC and NCSG together.

So I thought what I'd do first is tell a story and then ask some questions and open it up for discussion. Because this is a brand new working group, this is - in fact the charter hasn't even been approved yet. The charter we expect will be approved on Wednesday. The charter for proposed PDP to review all rights protection mechanisms and all the ccTLDs. So there's no update from the working group per se because we haven't started yet.

So we are definitely recruiting people -- as Stephanie as for the new registration directory services. We're recruiting people who would like to do it. And hopefully in the discussion if you're not familiar with it you'll find out more about the details of what we're working on.

But here's the story. Years ago we drafted the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy. And in fact there's a non-commercial community that held it up because it wasn't very fair. All the rights were for trademark holders and there were no rights for domain name registrants. The fact that if you're a small business, an entrepreneur, a new non-commercial organization you couldn't defend your domain name because you didn't have a trademark to do it.

And at the meeting in Santiago in 1999 we chartered the non-commercial usage constituency and the first thing that we did was pass a resolution to try to stop the UDRP -- and so it was more balanced. And I wound up on the final drafting team and we put in rights for domain name registrants -- reasonable rights.

Rights to balance that allowed the person looking at the domain name disputes to really look and see, "Did the registrant in bad faith, did they take the word Xerox and registered Xeroxed.com," even though they weren't Xerox or did they happen to be using a normal word like computer or rose in, you know, in an unusual way?

I went to a workshop -- WIPO - the World Intellectual Property Organization which was one of the big handlers now of thousands -- tens of thousands -- of UDRP disputes of these domain name disputes. WIPO had an advanced UDRP workshop up in New York and I listened to - and I went up and I listened to them talk about all of the rights for registrants -- all the rights we forced into the system, we've put into the rules -- and how this really adds to the balance.

And the panel was really using things we wrote in like protection of cyberbullying. We hear about cybersquatting all the time, but sometimes trademark owners are guilty of cyberbullying or really pushing their trademark too far. And the panelists are really using the protections we've put in -- the balances we've put in. They use them all the time and I'm very proud of what we did.

So here are my questions for you guys. We're about to start a brand new working group. We don't have this moment together very often where we're sitting around a table taking a big breath before we start something - I'll pause. But I love coffee so I get it.

Have you guys used the URDP? Have you used it either on the side of trying to get a registration, trying to defend a registration? Have you used the URS? Have you used the Trademark Clearinghouse? Have you registered a new top level domain and got what's called the trademark claims notice that tells you, "Wait a second, time out, the domain name you're registering overlaps with a term that's already registered in the Trademark Clearinghouse? You may want to think twice before registering but you can still go ahead and register."

Have people encountered any of this? If so did you like it? Did it work? Did you not like it? Was it unfair? Do we have kind of any community experience on all of this? Thanks.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you Kathy on so very nice introduction to the subject of the summary of what's up. Anybody have any questions or do you find that Kathy's presentation was comprehensive? I see Martin.

Martin Sutton: Martin Sutton here from NPAC. I have a little bit of experience with the UPR (sic). I did an extensive research on the use of the system in the Latin American region. And basically the unbalanced situation of arbitraries being only from the US mainly, not having local moderators to solve the problem so there's a form of abuse. Because the big companies can hire a lawyer that they have fluent English, they know how it works.

And when the small has to defend themselves sometimes because of our language they fear the fact of being involved in an international or American

organization. I can only share that much. I haven't used it myself. But in the research that I've done I found the system to be unbalanced I would say.

Kathy Kleinman: Can I ask a few questions? So this is the UDRP or the URS or both?

Martin Sutton: The UDRP.

Kathy Kleinman: The UDRP. And the issue is language or representation or both?

Martin Sutton: It's a little bit of everything. Just imagine being the case of someone from Paraguay or Argentina or it can be Brazil, they get an email saying that they're being challenged and most of them denounced it. It was amazing. I reviewed thousands and thousands of case. I went through the whole history of people (unintelligible), and in most cases people just denounced it. And the main reason was that.

Even the cases where they did answer to defend themselves, usually they - what's the name of the moderator that is arbitrary -- el árbitro?

Kathy Kleinman: The mediation.

Martin Sutton: The mediation judge was usually biased. I mean in the Latin America region most of them are owners or partners in law firms that do domain name things. The conflict of interest is amazing. There is no representation in the mediation judge for academics or single society. All of them come from trademark big law firms. It's a cost the process. It's even beyond the process -- and the metaprocess problem if you may.

Kathy Kleinman: Did you just say the golden word you've got research?

Martin Sutton: Sorry?

Kathy Kleinman: Hold on. Did you say you have research, like, maybe some papers?

Martin Sutton: Yes. It's just published in the Observatory of (UPen).

Kathy Kleinman: I didn't know that. That's great. I'm giving you a card right now.

Martin Sutton: The (unintelligible). I was helping to research with her. She's the main author. It's about domain names and the Latin American problems if you may.

Kathy Kleinman: Have you ever heard of touchdown? Great.

Tapani Tarvanen: Okay, thank you Martin and Kathy. And (Sam) wants to speak. (Sam) go ahead.

Sam Lanfranco: Just a very brief comment. I looked at a couple of these and they're very - if you're small they are big. You haven't a hope in hell. The one I watched was Donald Trump's lawyers trashing somebody who's first language is English and they ran rocks out over him. They abused the English language.

And it was just a question of power and deep pockets that have nothing to do with equity or fairness or even trademarks and patents.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you (Sam). Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: I just want to share when we were doing the URS -- it was, you know, 12 years after we've done the UDRP -- one of the things we required in terms of language was that the UDRP sent in whatever the language was of registration. So it's a little - I mean we're working on things like this. And yes, the bias is interesting.

It's great to have research papers. If people have anecdotes, if they know what their friend down the street has gone through or an organization has they know has gone through, please feel free to share those stories with me

by email or in the hallways or whenever. Because the more we collect the better off we'll be. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you Kathy. It seems Martin wants to continue.

Martin Sutton: Just one big thing, the document I was talking about that was focused on the issue is (unintelligible). It's about featured agreements and the impact on domain name policies. But since I did the intensive research and that I have a little bit of people insight on this specification.

Tapani Tarvanen: Okay, thank you Martin. Marilia wants to speak.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Tapani. First of all, to agree with Martin, in my view the system is not viewed in a way that is accessible to non-English speakers, to people that are not familiar with ICANN is, what the UDRP is. It's really hard for - they just like a domain dropped. They don't even respond.

But my question to Kathy is another one, that there are some countries like Brazil that did not just adopt UDRP. They have created their own policies for dot-BR, and of course separate policy. But in your eyes the changes -- the we're going to implement here -- how this will affect the resolution of ccTLDs because they need a lot -- the UDRP and the global policy. They have some issues that are particular to the do the dot-BR -- but they need a lot.

So do you think that this will influence the...

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you Marilia. Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: There's going to be a lot of pushback not to change the UDRPs that much. Certain powers are very happy with it the way it is. But as you said, the UDRP has influenced different country codes, which country code policies are not controlled by ICANN.

Country codes participate in ICANN voluntarily but their policies are not controlled. So when dot-BR uses the UDRP they use it by way of example or persuasion. So my guess is yes, that anything we do in the UDRP may well trickle down into country code policies.

If you're advising your country codes -- and I know here that we become advisors in many different levels -- please know the UDRP does not in any way reflect the protections of your national laws. It will represent the protection of most laws. I mean it's not best synthesis and there was a reason for that.

So if you're working with country codes -- top level domains -- put in all your protection and push for more protections in your national laws, please.

Tapani Tarvanen: Thank you Kathy. Anybody else on this subject? I don't see any hands up.

Kathy Kleinman: Tapani can I ask one question?

Tapani Tarvanen: Okay, Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: If there's anyone who would like to work with us on this new working group when it starts, I don't have otherwise have their name or email address.

Martin Sutton: Martin here. Of course I would love to.

Kathy Kleinman: Fantastic. And will you guys let me know - you're looking interested so I'm drafting you. Okay, good. Please let me know.

Tapani Tarvanen: Okay, so everybody interested in that get in touch with Kathy. Otherwise let's close this subject and move on.

Next agenda item will be an overview on what's happening with the gTLDs.
Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Tapani. Marilia Maciel speaking. I will be brief because this working group had just started to work. We just had two calls and we chose our leadership and basically the moments that we hold our calls. So there is not much to report.

I think that maybe the interesting thing -- I excuse myself because I will repeat a little bit what I had said this morning in our NCSG meeting -- is just to bear in mind first of all that I think that we should focus on the policy development process, therefore the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group and the working on rights protection mechanism should be our focus.

But we should bear in mind that the new gTLDs are being discussed in different parts of the community and that these discussions are going to have a feedback effect on one another. So we will need to keep track of how details here are being discussed elsewhere. And particularly I'm talking about new gTLD -- how the auction proceeds -- as we saw in the GNSO report that was provided by Jonathan Robinson.

We will have a charter for this working group soon. We know that this would be a quite contentious working group that are different ideas with regards to how the auction money should be spent. And we have a serious new gTLD program reviews that are being conducted by (unintelligible). These documents are of the result of a self-evaluation that ICANN is doing on the new gTLD program in several different aspects such as the rights protection reviews, the program implementation review, the DNS abuse review and among these reviews the two that I would single out as being the most important maybe for us to follow is the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice.

The group has just started to work as well. But I think it will be a good evaluation even to give us ammunition in the working group in the GNSO to

be able to develop policy. And the other one is the program implementation reviews.

There are several documents on metrics with regards to the new gTLDs and with regards to studies that have been commissioned to Nielsen and other companies to do this evaluation of acceptance of the new gTLDs, have they really fostered competition in the market which was one of the initial goals when the new gTLD program was launched. So just make sure that we know that this is really a broad topic that will be discussed in different parts of ICANN and we need to be aware of that.

With regard to this particular working group on new gTLD subsequent procedures it will be a very important one. And I think that one of the things that we will need to do as NCSG is to make sure that when the topics and the groups inside of working group are created and start to be operational that we are represented in each of these two groups. And since this will be a massive PDP that will basically look back in the policy that has been developed by the GNSO in 2007 and see how this policy was implemented basically in the Applicant Guidebook, was this policy successful, and we'll look at the whole program. This will be certainly a very large PDP.

What we are looking at right now is to divide the questions that have been proposed and the part of the charter of this working group into clusters so we can look at them better. The (unintelligible) are still moving parts so the questions can be aggregated in different worries. But certainly there are topics that are important to us.

My last point is that our leadership has been chosen for this particular working group in our second call. The leadership is Jeff Neuman, Avri Doria, and Steven Coates. And so they will be our representatives, our chair and co-chairs. And having said that I'd just like to pass the floor to Avri because I think that she's in a much better position than I to talk about next steps and what is expected inside this - the work of this working group. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Marilia. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Avri Doria speaking. Yeah, I guess we have yet to be confirmed by the GNSO Council as the co-chairs so we are prospective co-chairs. I'm being very careful not to call myself one. Yeah, I believe that this one is going to match the Next Generation RDS - registration data direction services for complexity.

What we're starting out we have a first meeting - we have a face to face meeting on Thursday where basically we'll start out by going through the history of how we got to here and basically looking at some of the previous recommendations. There has been sort of a set of discussions as to whether the application guidebook and the previous recommendations match each other. And there's even a bit of discussion as to where we're starting.

And I'm not sure that that's even a fully arrived at - whether we're starting whether recommendations of 2007 or we're starting with the application guidebook of 2012. My feeling is that we should start with the recommendations from the GNSO and not that.

Part of what comes out is the world was very different back in 2007. And ICANN then basically we had nothing to say about implementation. There has now been a whole PDP, policy development process, on how policy and implementation relate to each other. There's a whole notion of implementation review teams. So that will change the outcome of this.

We've also learned that when we do a policy now we really need to be far more extensive in describing it than we were then. Then we basically described things at a very high level. We had a little bit of discussion about how to do it but we really just handed it all over to the staff.

And I know, as I was the chair of the GNSO at the time that we came up with the previous policy, there was a lot of disappointment in that the policy came out - the implementation came out different. So anyhow, we're going to start with going through the history a bit at the - on Thursday morning. If I finish the presentation.

And then we're going to start looking at some of the overall issues. Once we've looked at overall issues is when we'll then basically do the division onto subgroups. And we will be discussing the subgroups to make sure that people are comfortable with that.

The one other thing to mention is that the list of issues was produced by a pretty much a year-long discussion group, yet another creation. But basically there was a discussion group and several reviews trying to get all the issues on the table. So there is a draft, I mean, a document that lists all of those issues. But I suggest people take a look at that and make sure that all the issues are there and covered adequately. And so I am really hoping for lots of participation, you know, especially in the subgroups that'll be doing most of the real hard work. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Avri. Any questions or comments? Okay, I see Milton, you want to - and do introduce yourself even though we do know your voice.

Milton Mueller: This is Milton Mueller. Avri, just curious, so does the charter of this working group or whatever it is, tell you - does it answer the question of whether you should go back to policy in 2007, 2008?

Avri Doria: Not clearly.

Milton Mueller: What is the charter? What does it tell you to do?

Avri Doria: It tells us to take the program, review the program. There was basically a tussle between those that say, well we've already got an application book,

why don't we just start? Right? What's the problem? Why don't we just continue from the application guidebook with the program that we have now like take the advice of the reviews and start as opposed to those that are saying wait a second, there's this whole batch of problems and such. I do believe we will start from the policy.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Milton and Avri. Any other comments, questions? Robin.

Robin Gross: Thank you, yeah. I think it's worth mentioning on this particular issue that there were some recommendations in the new gTLD policy that our constituency, the Non-Commercial Users, fought for very hard. And we got in the GNSO policy but were in fact never implemented by staff. For example, the principle to protect freedom of expression.

We fought - it was NCUC that fought for that particular new gTLD principle. Now you're probably looking like, what? There's a new gTLD principle to protect freedom of expression? Because it was never implemented so people don't know much about it and the policy that came out from the implementation that came out from staff certainly doesn't protect free expression. So this is one of the new - the GNSO's new gTLD principles of 2007 that was completely dropped once the pile of recommendations moved to staff for implementation.

So I think it's extremely important that we go back to the principles and not the draft applicant - or excuse me, the Applicant Guidebook because the Applicant Guidebook misconstrued - left out a number of the important principles particularly what we care about. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Robin.

Avri Doria: If I can point out...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. That was actually not just a principle, it was actually one of the recommendations. So it was even stronger than a general principle that should be adhered to, it was specifically Recommendation 6.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Avri. Any other comments, questions on the topic? No? Okay let's move on. Next agenda item would be improving public comment process. Rafik Dammak. I noticed it's your turn. So agenda Item 6. Maryam, can you put Rafik's proposal on the screen?

Rafik Dammak: Okay so, I mean, just maybe to explain the background why we want to improve how in particular for the case of public comment. We - for the NCSG we had a lot of, I mean, we have to handle a lot of public comment. And for now we don't have kind of specific process in how we can get the public comment that it was announced, who will take the lead or volunteer for the drafting. How we can do the consultation to get all feedback and input. And then at the end, how to approve that and to submit in time.

We tended to do this in kind of ad hoc manner. In the previous two years we worked hard really to respond to many public comments but still we are not catching up with others. So we know that many of our members participate in working groups but public comments matter a lot because it is the way for us as a stakeholder group to submit our statement or our position about the recommendation that are delivered by the working group.

So it's quite simple proposal. Is first to agree on some timeline and milestone. So we can have a kind of maybe checklist that the Policy Committee chair will take care and to ensure that (unintelligible) that we are doing things in time. It's really when you have a milestone that will help a lot, it's not just give more visibility in the way to ensure that you are doing things on time.

So I suggested some template and taking that like most of the public comment it's just 40 days but it can be changed. So - for 60 days or

whatever. But the idea is to have several milestone. Another thing to have in mind is also for the Policy Committee to do more planning. Because we can have some insight that something is coming. If you are a working group you know that this working group is going to deliver its report soon. So we have that. We just - we cannot just wait for the public comment to be announced to start working, we can have that insight.

So let me see. So first if there is a public comment announced maybe in the - between Day 1 to 3 the NCSG PC, Policy Committee, can initiate a discussion about this report and share it with the list so to inform the people that we have something on - something on our plate to work on. And for this we can use some kind of project management tool or for now, well, for example, we have the wiki space that we put like the public comment and so on. But it's not enough. We may use some - some project management tools.

It's quite also important, I say this, about priorities because there are so many public comment that announced but not all of them are necessarily relevant or important for NCSG. So we need the Policy Committee to make some decision here if we should reply. And then for that we need to make a call for volunteers. So it's here quite important that we - and then we get someone to do the work. We cannot expect that somehow someone will just know. You need at some level to be sure that someone is taking the lead.

It can in the BC, it can any NCSG member also in particular a member who is involved in the working group. And then we can use some tools like creating Google doc, or any (unintelligible) tools or, you know, that can be used. And that's maybe something we can explore later about the kind of item that can be used for us for more collaborative work.

I'm not sure that people are following me. So just double here checking. So as says it quite important to get someone to have the lead. And it's also important to expand our pool of volunteers. We cannot just have the handful

number of people doing most of the work so we need to expand. It's important not get worried - yes, Stefania, was that something.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay, to not get worried if you have knowledge about that issue. Someone it's more really to be the editor (unintelligible) to ensure that we get comments and to ensure to share the information and also to read the report. Yes, Stefania.

Stefania Milan: That was one - first of all, Stefania Milan for the record. Thank you, Rafik, for the planning. I think it's very important and helps in the discussion, I mean, in our next actions. I was wondering whether it would be useful to compile a list, and this could be a task for the Policy Committee, to compile a list of expertise so having, you know, tables, some kind, something that is evolving of course as we include new members would match names, contact details, and potential topic that each person could work on and that the Policy Committee instead of simply addressing the general list, what a lot goes through, and probably a lot of people miss on it, addresses specifically single individuals.

I know this adds extra work for the Policy Committee, which is already overworked, but probably it's a way of attributing responsibilities in a very direct way, especially when the time is so constrained.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you. Yes, if I can respond. I mean, one of the basic idea here is not to try to fix all problems or issues for the PC, is really to focus let's fix maybe kind of small issue here is really to get some (unintelligible) to follow up the whole process.

This kind of sounds additional solution for - our other problem is to identify who can take of a report to identify the skills. But okay so I seen several I think Marilia, Sam and Kathy.

Tapani Tarvainen: Marilia, go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much, Rafik. I think that Stefania was spot on and I think that this is something that we really need to do. I can tell from my position more or less what are the expertises of people in NCUC even though I know that people are going all the time and sometimes it's something that you were not working on but you want to work in the future. And this shifting of interest is really hard to map.

But on the side of NPOC, yesterday for instance, Rudi introduced me to a very (unintelligible) NPOC member that just joined. And I don't know the expertise of this person. So it would be interesting for the Policy Committee to have this information. So I believe that I'm going to speak to the co-chairs, Matt and Dave, but if they also agree it is a good idea maybe a next step would be for us to organize a survey - an online survey that our members could respond. And in this survey they could point out what are the specific policy areas that they would have an interest to work on.

Because I think - I do agree with you, Stefania, that sending comments to the list and requesting people to be engaged on the NCSG list is very important for visibility and for all the members to have access to information. But sometimes we are overwhelmed by other emails and other lists. So if we have a mapping out this interest the PC can play this role in reaching out to people and if they do have the time they can participate and work on the public comment for whatever task we have in front of us. So I do agree, it is a great idea.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Marilia. Just I want to respond. For the information I am neither in the Policy Committee of NCSG, neither Executive Committee. So I am here making some proposal for you guys. And it's quite important for the Policy Committee that you make this - your own proposal.

In term of about surveying, what I would suggest that you work with the Executive Committee because the membership management and so on, that's their role. You are doing policy so some coordination here I think Tapani will be happy to do most of the work but.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for your confidence, Rafik. Anyway, I have Sam speaking next and then.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. Sam Lanfranco for the record. We've had some heated discussion around this topic inside NPOC. And the one additional thing we were looking at, and I think a coordination between the chairs of the Policy Committees - the three - as the kind of troika that administers this, one of the criticism that we got was that this is very late in the policy development process. And it's really unfair or there are a bunch of stronger words used, to bring in new people at this point because they don't have the expertise and they don't have the history.

So we were looking at actually pairing people up. We bring in somebody who's got the expertise and we bring in somebody very junior, very new, as a novice and they participate in this as part of their orientation so that it doesn't just go to the experts but it also goes to this - to the newer people who are coming in who should be plugging in much earlier in the process but this is a good way of introducing them to some of the issues with what might be a mentor.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Sam. I have Kathy next.

Kathy Kleiman: To both Rafik and Marilia, we - later this afternoon we'll actually begin the process of mapping interests. It's part of the workshop that we have. So certainly for people listening and for those who will be listening later on to the transcript we'll want to bring in the larger membership but we start that today, which is great.

Tapani Tarvainen: That's the coffee machine speaking.

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: Is it part of the consensus. I wanted to actually - I didn't realize I'd be underscoring the same point that Sam just made, because we didn't compare notes. But by way of example of kind of pairings of people and it didn't happen intentionally, but in the Proxy Privacy Working Group, James Gannon, who was then a fairly new member of the working group and a fairly new member of NCSG and he's not here today unfortunately, but he did the first draft of the comments.

And that created the ability for me to go through and pretty quickly edit what was there in terms of the history and the background and the context, things he didn't know. But he kind of helped identify things. It made it much faster to come in. So pairing of different levels of experience is a really good thing. And the stuff is scary but give it a first shot and someone can come in and edit.

Rafik, to your lovely steps, I agree. They're wonderful. We're going to wind up the same volunteers can't do all of it. It's a lot of work.

Rafik Dammak: It needs - I think the - here, I mean, you want to think about many things. I want also to give the context why I proposed this. There is some context. It was about the CCWG report. We got the short time and there was some confusion at the PC how we can make kind of the comment and to be sure that everyone participate in the drafting. That's why I suggested that we create some template.

So that's why I'm really insisting, I'm not trying here in this proposal to fix all issues about drafting comments and so on. Is really to fix kind of specific issue, is to have some template that we can follow up the different process to ensure that we are consulting people.

Is not going to fix the issue who is going to draft. I'm just suggesting that we are sure that someone is taking the lead. I acknowledge there is an issue about the pool of volunteers. But the template is not going to fix that. It's - I know (unintelligible) some issue but trying to say, guys, it's kind of checklist. You need to be sure that someone taking the lead. Is not - you cannot just like some meet for example put Google doc. We have no idea who is - will do the editing or to try to get the input.

So this - what I try to do here. But is not going to fix issue about the expertise, about the volunteers and so on. Is just to give some, you know, it gives some framework little framework small one, for the PC to be sure that we handling all public comments to do some planning, some prioritization. There are so many issue in term how you can get people to do the work but that's not the purpose of this proposal.

Just I want to little clarify why I suggested. I know there is all the issue but just what I wanted here, let's help the PC to have a kind of framework to do the planning and to ensure that we are submitting the comments. So - and, yeah, the mapping is quite important. Mapping the expertise, expanding and so on so it's much more than this one proposal. Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you Rafik. Anybody else want to still comment on this process or shall we move on?

Rafik Dammak: Okay maybe I can try to finish the different milestone because it just we arrived to Day 3 and there are several days in the proposal.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: So for example, Day 7 and just we did the experienced that before is to have a webinar when it's needed for some topics like CCWG. We try to do that and somehow is working. Is okay we share like documentation but not all - every

human being who is going to read the reports of 200 pages. We can do the webinar to present and to highlight the important parts. And usually the folks who are already involved in the process, I mean, the working group can help. Or just we are using the existing NCSG policy call.

Then we jump to Day 21 is trying here to have kind of target to get some first draft and asking the members in particular the PC members for comments and edits and then we try to reserve concerns. We cannot leave the resolution of, you know, some opposed opinion until the end; we need to give some time for that.

And then after one week trying to get a second draft. Then Day 30 is to have a call for consensus. And this quite important is to be sure that we can give - to get people to approve the statement. Then after one week the NCSG PC evaluate the consensus and try to solve any remaining concerns. And Day 40 we submit if there is a rough consensus here. Also allowing for additional minority statement if needed.

So also I said this can be tweaked depending the public comment. There are some like 60, 45. So this milestone can be changed, they are just kind of here for guidance. In some cases, and this is particular, is sometimes in like what happened for CCWG is we get short window of time to respond and then we have maybe kind of fast track - fast track approach or sometimes also we can get request from working groups to receive kind of feedback. So we can tweak for those cases.

So I'm sorry if it was quite long but this is just a minute. There are several details I suggested and I hope that the PC - how say - the PC can work on this and find a way, for example, to do more planning for public comment.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Rafik. That's enough of this subject. Everybody's happy with Rafik's proposal. Just the PC chair earlier will take over from here and work this of course together with the other PC members.

So let's move on. The next agenda item is preparing for the board. Maryam, can you bring that - our questions to the screen? Meeting with the board (unintelligible) soon and we have prepared questions. Let's see if they're coming up. So for new business a piece of information that we usually always have a session where we meet with the board and ask them whatever questions we like. But we don't want to surprise them too much so we send the questions in advance.

Okay, Amr, are you around?

Amr Elsadr: I'm here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay since you have volunteered to ask the first question to the board maybe you would care to comment briefly.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks, Tapani. It's Amr. The first question it's about the GNSO review that has just been concluded by the independent examiner, Westlake. Obviously the whole community - the whole GNSO had serious problems with how Westlake conducted this review. They had problems with the methods they used, with some of the observations, how they did their sampling and in terms of both qualitative and quantitative data and analysis.

And one of the things that this ad hoc group created by the GNSO, called the GNSO Review Working Party, did was go over all these recommendations by Westlake. We categorized them, we sort of prioritized them, which ones may work, which ones don't, which ones we think the board should not implement.

I should also mention that the - you OEC up here, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, that's a board committee and they're the ones who are running the show on this. And right now we're in a stage where the working party has concluded the majority of its work in terms of providing feedback on those recommendations.

The working party is going to try to get those endorsed by the GNSO Council over the next couple of months. And then send this information to the OEC. The OEC and the board in general has been extremely patient in waiting to get this feedback from the community. And I would like to express gratitude for that at today's meeting.

But what I really would like to ask them is that are their intentions in terms of sort of reconciling some of the recommendations of the working party that conflict with Westlake's recommendations. So far the board has seemed to be extremely accommodating to us and they're encouraging us to make sure we get this work done right and make sure that we're happy with it, take all the time we need. It's very comforting actually.

But they still have not given any indication to how they're going to react or consider the recommendations or the feedback on Westlake's recommendations that we are providing. And so I think it would be very helpful not just at the NCSG actually but to the entire GNSO to have some indication from them on what their intentions are in that regard and that's what I would like to ask them today.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Amr. Does somebody want to comment on that - this point?

Milton Mueller: Yay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay comment "yay" from Milton Mueller to be recorded. Anything else? Fine. Let's move, the next question - this was (unintelligible) by Klaus Stoll. Would you care to comment on your proposed question?

Klaus Stoll: Yeah, very quickly. I mean, on the basis of the multi-stakeholder model is the participation. And ICANN has a serious problems with really getting people participating in the policy making process. So whilst ICANN is putting a hell of a lot of resources and it's very commendable for them into outreach and

capacity building, if one looks at the reality of that one it's basically staff-driven, staff-executed and concentrating on ICANN as an organization and with a message basically come to Jesus or, in this case, come to ICANN but not really being relevant or outreach to the people.

So what my questions and trying to do is to ask the board wouldn't it better to shift the focus of the outreach from being ICANN-centric to community-centric and being actually executed by the SOs and ACs jointly and following a joint plan. And I - what I'm trying to achieve here is to trigger some thinking and some process from the - another staff-driven process to community-driven process. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. Any comments on this? Now if Niels is around to comment on the - he's not. Okay, Marilia, would you care to explain this human rights question briefly?

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, Tapani. Well I think that this question it builds up on the previous sessions and interactions that we had with the board. We have consistently, I think, for the last three meetings included a question to the board that, in my understanding has helped to clarify what we mean when make the point that human rights are important.

As we all know there was a lot of resistance in the beginning to the human rights language. And I think that these moments of interaction, one on one between our group and the board, has served as an opportunity to clarify what we mean and ask questions and answer the questions of the board in this matter.

And to my understanding this particular question it just builds on the development of the human rights topic, what we are basically asking the board is once the human rights language gets included in the bylaws then on Work Stream 2 there needs to be enough resources, be it staff members or

other kind of resources to make sure that this general commitment gets implemented in a more concrete manner.

So basically we are asking the question what are the staff and the human resources that will be available, who our contact will be. And we ask a specific question with regards to the board statement that would kind of put forward their commitment with human rights. This is something that the board has mentioned in previous interactions with us and with the CWP. So I think that this is a good moment to ask if this commitment - this high level commitment in the bylaws will actually generate this statement from the board. This would be an interesting thing if it happens indeed. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Marilia. Any questions or comments on this? Matthew, please introduce yourself.

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears for the record. With regards to the last point, so the board's human rights statement was something that they committed to do around the turn of the year with regards to the work that was being done on human rights in the CCWG Accountability.

My perspective on this is that we should really be seeking the assurance of the board that we will be developing this statement with the board rather than leaving it to the board to the develop the statement on human rights particularly given the amount of work that we've been doing on human rights both in the CCWG and around the CCWG and in the CCWP. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Matthew. Anybody else? Okay, Maryam, can you please scroll down to the next question, we have one more I think. Kathy, want to explain your question?

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. I'm going to do the sorry thing of reading what's in front of you. But ICANN has invested on hiring policy staffers in the last year and has a number of policy staffers, dozens, and has an enormous new capability for

work flow but the stakeholders do not. There's no way to keep up with what is in the queue and coming down the pike. I should say there's no reasonable way to do that. How do we make the workload reasonable if want the volunteer multi-stakeholder model to continue? Is it based on ICANN capacity or stakeholder capacity?

And let me just read just some of the things we've talked about today, which are only a fraction of what's going on in ICANN. So we've talked about the new gTLD working group and the rights protection mechanism working group and the Whois 2 registry services working group and reviews and restructuring. And of course the accountability and transparency Work Stream 2 coming down the pike. And you can probably give me a dozen more without thinking too hard about it.

How do we - and plus the policy development process has really been stretched. There are now issue reports and charters and policy development working groups and implementation and then suddenly independent analysis teams pop out of nowhere hired by ICANN. And if you don't notice that they're there you don't know they're reviewing the trademark clearinghouse consensus policy and other types of consensus policies. So a lot of stuff coming out of nowhere.

How is - and this is a lot of material all going on in parallel. So I was hoping we could brainstorm with the board and with each other, not now but later, you know, before the board, about how we can create a flow that's reasonable, an order that's reasonable, and not do everything all at once.
Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Kathy. I see already that there are several people wanting to talk, let's start with Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. I just wanted - this is Amr - I just want to say that I actually agree with Kathy on this. If you look at the amount of work that's going on around

the reviews and everything and like some of those, okay, like they're mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments, for example, fine under all these studies they have and then there are the board-initiated PDPs, right, like the PPSAI and the Next Gen RDS PDP.

If you look at all this work that's going on and what is actually on the community's plate you'll find that the work that has been initiated by the GNSO is an extreme minority of the total work. And so for example, we have the RPMs review and the subsequent rounds for new gTLDs. Those are the only two work items right now that have been initiated by the GNSO. Everything else has been initiated by the board. And it is overwhelming.

And it's - I think it is important to point this out to them and to sort of just take like a big picture kind of overview of all this stuff that's going on and actually try to answer the question, is the community capable of handling all of this at once. So thank you of raising this, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Amr, can I follow up...

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: ...and ask you - that's a really good point about the differentiation between what we initiate from our supporting organization and what's being thrust upon us. Will you join me in presenting this to the board so we can add that nuance to it, really important. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I think first Stephanie wanted to speak, and then Sam.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I had discussed this with Padmini yesterday and so we haven't hatched a complete plan yet. But I'm concerned about the - concerned - I'm curious - associated with this would be the performance management agreements that ICANN staff has. And if for instance, we might see a strategic priorities plan that says we should work on

X, Y and Z, but there aren't dates necessarily attached to them. Obviously there is in the IANA transfer stuff. But there's not always a date for working group activities.

However, the dates may very well be in the performance agreements with the directors and managers in the various areas. So if unbeknownst to us the staff we're working with has to deliver something by a certain date in order to be considered in compliance with their performance management, no wonder we're getting pushed to do things within deadlines that are unrealistic.

So I'm just curious, I'm not saying that's what there, so we thought maybe we'd fire in some DIDPs, it'll fill out the roster of DIDPs. Oh I beg your pardon, document information disclosure projects, because it isn't a policy. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay I have Sam and Brett and then Padmini. Okay, Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay I just want to remind people that part of the upcoming workload is the implementation of all 12 of the accountability recommendations. I know some of the other constituencies are particularly worried about what implementation will look like and the amount of work that's going to be involved in watching that very closely. So that's on top of the load we've been talking about.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. So that was Sam Lanfranco. And then we have Brett.

Brett Schaefer: Thank you. The workload associated with the transition is obviously temporary workload, hopefully it's a temporary workload at least for those of us who have been paying attention to it. But they are long-lasting recommendations or long-lasting activities and reports and other requirements that are set in place.

It seems realistic to me that you would go to the board and say, which these are the most important you and of the low priority ones which ones can we get rid of to clear workloads for the activities which are less important or more

important or more recent or more urgent in the current timeframe. And at least try and set up a dynamic where if you're asking us to assume the responsibilities in the workload what workload can we take off?

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. So that Brett Schaefer - I mispronounced your name as a punishment for you, you didn't do it yourself. Okay next I have Padmini.

Padmini Baruah: Padmini Baruah for the record. Just to quickly add to what Stephanie said. In the events that we do file a request on the document - the information disclosure policy there are three clauses that are going to come in our way. One is internal information, which will compromise the integrity of deliberative processes inside ICANN between the staff.

The second one is personnel medical contractual records relating to when individuals, personal information, blah, blah, blah. And the third one is in the event that ICANN finds it not reasonable, excessive, burdensome or unfeasible then they can deny it.

At the bottom of that, however, they have this sort of a proviso which says information that falls even within these conditions can be made public if we - if ICANN determines that the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the harms that may be caused by disclosure. So in the event that we do take this up we need to make sure that we have a strong public interest ground, Stephanie. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Padmini.

Padmini Baruah: And I support your point.

Tapani Tarvainen: Rafik, did you want to speak and then Stephanie.

Rafik Dammak: I mean, since we are talking about the workload, I'm not mistaken here, I suspect with the kind of response we may get in particular if Fadi is there, like

I'm not sure if one year ago or two year ago we expressed that some concerns in the SO/AC, stakeholder group, constituency leaders there is some kind of working session and we expressed a concern about the level of workload for the community, that there are the public comment, the policy process but also all those kind of project initiated by the staff. We raised that concern.

On that - for that matter there was discussion to get first the visibility what's happening because it's not just in ICANN but also the different SO/AC they are initiated their own process. So to have an idea what's going on. And so I would expect that they will say that David Olive is kind of managing that process. Maybe we can - we will get some more details about what's happening.

From my perspective I think it's a question here in term of the workload is why we should ask the board about the priorities. The question here is how for us as community we can participate in the prioritization. I think that's like what we do, for example, in GNSO and maybe we can work with other SO/AC but also how we can avoid like situation like the staff may initiate several project and so on that we cannot touch.

So this is a question for us is how the community to participate in the planning and the prioritization. So we need that to be sure. Asking the board - I mean, they will say that they don't do that work. And we need to suggest how we can do much better. There is some effort to get visibility but I don't think as community we are participating in defining what are the priorities. It also can be (unintelligible) I think for is how you will find a consensus between the different groups what are the priorities for the different policy process. Yes, Kathy, yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: I was just going to say though it's not just us; everyone is feeling the pinch. You know, I talk to other stakeholder groups and talk to the Registrars, they really feel it too. So but what you suggest, Rafik, is kind of, you know,

different ways to discuss it with the board and be part of the prioritization, which let me mention adds yet another thing to our list. But an important thing.

So the prioritization - but really what I think maybe just bringing to their attention, I don't know if they understand that one hand is not talking to the other and there seem to be lots of hands out there. And so maybe if we bring it to their attention we can work on prioritization, streamlining, putting things in chronological, you know, priority order, all sorts of things. So thanks for all the suggestions here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. I still have Stephanie and Marilia and then I want to move on because we are short of time. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: I'll try to brief. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Just to follow up on what Padmini said, in my view, none of those exemptions from disclosure should be valid in these instances. And the important thing to note here is we are working hand in hand on these PDPs with staff and it'd be good if we knew what the real deadlines were. And therefore I think that we have many good reasons to demand that we at least get some of this information.

So I plan to appeal every possible mechanism and Padmini being the lawyer is going to help me figure that out. But I think it's important that we understand that this is shared work. I'm not sure I'd want to be staff here at ICANN because you've got umpteen bosses and, you know, they have a right to plan their own work.

On the other hand, they're planning our work too and we're not able to keep up. So there has to be some way of getting just a little better look-in as to what the priorities are there. I don't mean priorities, I take what Rafik said, but this is like actual work planning and performance measurement, you know. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, Tapani. Marilia Maciel speaking. Actually I have a question for Kathy and an observation. I realize that we begin the question by mentioning the number of policy staffers. I just would like to understand what you are calling policy staffers because I have been following the hiring section of ICANN because I do feel like we need more policy staffers because we have so much work.

And I have not been able to keep track - the positions for policy that have been open at least recently in the last month, nine months, 10 months I would say. I did not see much being kind of called for applications there. So are you calling the policy people like the ones that work with us in the GNSO or is it a larger number of people that are you speaking about? And my observation with regards to this question is that to me the most important part of the question is the last sentence, is it based on ICANN capacity or stakeholder capacity?

Because I feel like if we - if we get overwhelmed what we are basically saying is that people that compile the public comments and write the issue reports, they have more and more control over the process if the community is overloaded. And I do not think that maybe we have the clarity of the side effect that we are creating when we increase the amount of work that we have in front of us. I think that this is a side effect that is really hard to fight and to avoid if we have more and more work a lot will be done by staff members if we have volunteers working on the topics because our time is limited.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Marilia. Now that was the end of our questions. Okay, Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. I actually tried to take out the first line because I think we could talk about it better than we can. In the last two or three years dozens of policy

people have been created under David Olive there's been a lot of hiring. Not just for the GNSO though, for the ccNSO, for ICANN, for others. I know this because somebody told me that they're, you know, that they've had a lot, you know, the number I got was about 100. So but not last year, it's probably last two or three years. Hi.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Kathy Kleiman: Okay well I'm not going to give my source but that's the number he gave me. And - but I'm glad you're here. There are a lot of people, there's a lot of new capability. But what division are you in?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Kathy Kleiman: How about policy people supporting - it doesn't matter. We'll talk. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible) 27 people.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. Does somebody want to comment on this? No? Maryam, the board also sends us some questions they want to talk us about. Can you scroll them up, Maryam? Okay, Brett. A quick comment here.

Brett Schaefer: Very briefly. I mentioned the other day that Bruce and Markus have promised to send a link to the minutes for the discussion with Fadi. I haven't gotten that yet. I'm going to ask them for a status update on that if you don't mind.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, okay since it's something the board promised to do and didn't it's fair question I think. And have upload in progress. Maybe we have a technical problem anyway. The board send us two questions. You have them online. Okay, one of them concern what are we going to do about diversity stuff.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, we're waiting for them to show up. Okay, here are the counter questions board sent to us that they want to talk with us about. So the first is the diversity (unintelligible) to be a challenge in ICANN and how is your SO/AC - I guess they're asking this to everybody - doing with regard to enhancing diversity in all its dimensions? And what can ICANN do to support that effort? So what are we going to do about that? Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, Tapani. I think that many did not have the opportunity to see when I sent the questions to the list, I asked Rudi to present the data for NPOC so basically we cover the different constituencies. And Ed has presented this data in the GNSO with regards to NCUC because these two questions, in my understanding, they are being repeated to different SOs and ACs so since Ed presented this information for NCUC I asked on the list if anyone would like to present the information.

My understanding is that Stefania volunteered for this question so basically now what we have is Stefania presenting for NCUC, the information with regards to participation and diversity and Rudi presenting for NPOC.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you. You want to comment on this point too? You are just ready to go on?

Woman: Avri wants...

Tapani Tarvainen: Avri has something to say.

Avri Doria: Under the question of what can ICANN do to support this effort. This morning watching Rafik try to be multilingual and then seeing those pathetically empty booths back there at that time, I was thinking that we should ask - they're not empty now but basically sort of ask for regular, you know, translation services on our meetings. I think we've gotten to the point where we're sufficiently diverse linguistically that, you know, we should request that level of support from this point on if possible.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Avri. Noted. Stefania.

Stefania Milan: Yeah, thank you Avri. Stefania for the record. I have already included a point - the other points are outreach and mentoring for capacity building. I would like to briefly refer to the numbers because I think NCUC we're doing quite well with diversity. But I would like to also offer the broader picture of, you know, the efforts that are behind this diversity and what ICANN can do to support us better. I'm going to probably mention resources as well but that's not the main point. Translation is in there.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. Rudi, you want to comment briefly on NPOC side?

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, Rudi for the transcript. Very briefly. We have the figures also and we are doing quite well, surprisingly well. We are equally represented in all the regions. We have to do some efforts on the female - on the gender diversity because that's a point but it's a problem that we see popping up in every structure in ICANN, although I see that there is improvement.

With regards the support that ICANN can give us in getting a better diversity representation I think that what they tried to do until now had a good effect at a higher level but not at a lower level. And I mean with that that our community is essentially around NGOs, not for profit, small organizations that doesn't have nor time nor money to be present in an ICANN meeting. And to get them involved in the work we are doing there is much more work to be done.

And we are actually ourselves in NPOC we have been doing some survey, we have been doing some study and research and we are almost ready to propose a plan that would help bringing in new blood. We are seeing that the mentor pilot program had a very good effect and it looks like if you can give them incentives they are willing to come and join. And we are going to request from ICANN a little bit more support and in that sense to allow and create incentives so that there is a benefit for people that are coming from NGOs that are giving up this time even at their day job to be a part of our club, that they get more help. I think that's an essential element to get them involved.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Rudi. Amr, be very brief please.

Amr Elsadr: I will be. And I'm not going to say something nice right now. I agree with Rudi, we need to get members more involved. I think all the numbers we have on our membership I think if anything they - well they don't reflect well on us because we do have a great deal of diversity, the majority of our members are not from North America and Europe. But if you look at our participation on the policy process and the views of the NCSG that are represented there, they're all about our North American and European members.

We have a minority of people from Australia and New Zealand perhaps, a couple from Africa. We've got Marilia from South America. And I'm very excited to hear more from Martin, that's fantastic. But if you look at our participation in terms of how NCSG views reflect the policy positions of members from Asia, Africa and South America it's really lame actually.

And as far as NCUC is concerned I'm sorry to say that I blame the regional representatives on the Executive Committee, it's one of their primary jobs is to make sure that the existing members we have are - assisting them to get more involved in the policy process and seeing how that could be done and possibly working with folks who are actively engaged in policy to get this

done. It's never been done. And we should really be frank about this as an existing problem within our stakeholder group and constituencies. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Amr. And time is running out so I think that the second question from the board is actually about that we discussed at the beginning of this session so I'm not - let's not go into that anymore. I just trust that Ed Morris will present to the board...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: And Robin. So you will present it to the board. Clearly. And we have one more agenda item which is something new we haven't done before and Kathy Kleiman, wants to do a little experiment here.

Kathy Kleiman: Well we have to be out of the room at 4:30 right?

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, this is a little experiment that doesn't have enough time to do it but let me explain what it is and then we'll seek consensus on whether we should do it now or try it another time. The idea was this was the turnaround session where we were going to divvy up and really listen to the newcomers in the room in small groups and see what they're interested in and what they're excited about and what types of skills they bring and what they'd like to be working on and then see if they'd like mentors and if we could hook them up with people who are interested in being mentors in this kind of areas that they're interested in working in. Fifteen minutes or even 10 minutes is not a lot but who thinks we should give it a try for a few minutes? And if so we'll move around the room and see what we can do. Who thinks that we should do it another time?

Avri Doria: Another time.

Tapani Tarvainen: Let's try it.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay so the people who have the yellow papers who are leading the workshops, could you - for the newcomers could you join me on the other side of the room? We're going to move I think. And newcomers, anyone who's a newcomer or fairly newcomer to ICANN let's meet on the chairs over here. The people who - who's leading kind of the senior sessions? Robin...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: Senior - veteran NCSG-ers are going to come together around Klaus and around Robin and Rudi and Amr and talk about what you'd like to mentor in, what areas you'd like to mentor in if you want to talk about it. If you don't that's okay too. And then we'll do a big matching later on. That's the idea.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Everybody, we got one minute. There's another meeting starting here at half past. So close what you're doing in one minute and start clearing out. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Your minute is up. Please stop now. If you have - you can carry on outside in the corridor or something carry on at that time but we really have to clear the room.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Test.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, people, move. Next meeting is starting in 30 seconds.

((Crosstalk))

END