

**NCPH Intersessional meeting, January 29th 2013  
NCUC meeting, 09:00 Local time**

Coordinator: This is now being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time.

Thank you and you may begin.

Bill Drake: Thank you very much. Welcome everybody. I'm Bill Drake, the Chair of NCUC. And this is the NCUC meeting at the intersessional meeting of non-contracted party house at ICANN headquarters.

And I'm sorry to the folks who are online that we're running a little bit late, but we'll get caught up as we go. We had a little gathering to get everybody pointed in the right direction and it just ran a little bit over time.

So what we're doing today is I sent out an agenda on the NCSG members list, a proposed agenda for the discussion today. We have a lot to do in not very much time, so we're just going to be really briefly overviewing a number of different aspects of current initiatives.

But before we do that why don't we do a little introduction of everybody in the room and online. So again, I'm Bill Drake from the University of Zurich and Chair to NCUC. And (Kim), why don't we go around this way.

(Kim): I'm (Kim) from the (Expression) Group.

(Ed Norris): (Ed Norris) from the University of Leeds and I'm on the NCUC/BC as the North America representative.

Kathy Kleinman: Kathy Kleinman; I go back to the founding of NCUC and Santiago, Chile is an amazing event. And glad we're all still here and getting so much bigger.

Mary Wong: I'm Mary Wong, participant for the last few years thanks to (Robbie) who dragged me in. (Unintelligible) and I in my normal life I am an IP law professor.

Wilson Abigaba: I'm Wilson Abigaba; I'm on the NCUC (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Hi, my name is Robin Gross and I'm the chair of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Avri Doria: I'm Avri Doria; I'm just sort of around.

Woman: I think you guys need to yell because you're a little bit away from the speaker.

Man: We've got a speaker right here.

Woman: (Unintelligible). I am from Brazil NCUC and represent the new NCSG to the GNSO Council.

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer; I work policy council to the World Wide Web Consortium as an academic fellow with Berkman Center on free expression online and the Chilling Effects Clearinghouse. And I am a NCSG rep to the GNSO Council.

Maria Farrell: I'm Maria Farrell; I'm based in the UK from Ireland. I'm the European NCSG GNSO Council rep and I am on the board of the Open Rights Group in the UK.

(Stefan): (Stefan) (unintelligible) from Finland from (unintelligible); not to be confused with (unintelligible). And now the European member in the Executive Committee of the NCUC.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: My name is Wolfgang Kleinwachter; I'm also a member of the GNSO Council for the NC - for the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. And in my real life I'm a professor at the University of Aarhus in Denmark and the founder and the chair of the Summer School on Internet Governance.

Bill Drake: Okay. Great. And could the people online introduce themselves? I'm looking - I don't know if there's people online listening in who are not on the Adobe, but so far I see Amr. So Amr, are you there?

Amr Elsadr: Yes I'm there. I'm - this is Amr Elsadr from Egypt, but currently in Norway doing my Masters in E-health and Telemedicine. I've been a member of NCUC for a little over two years now.

Bill Drake: Great. (Brenden)?

(Brenden) is on the Adobe, but not voice connected I guess.

Carlos? No?

Lars Hoffman I see?

Man: Lars is not returning information.

Bill Drake: Okay. So and (Sara)?

(Sara): Hello.

Bill Drake: Hi.

(Sara): Hi, I'm (Sara) (unintelligible). I'm a Masters graduate in (unintelligible) and I've only recently joined the NCUC.

Bill Drake: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. So this...

Man: Is there anyone on the phone Bill?

Bill Drake: Is there anyone on the phone who's not on the Adobe?

Okay. So this inter-sessional meeting of the Non-Contracted Parties House, I guess those genesis was some discussions during the Toronto meeting in October. And the idea was to try to get the members of Non-Contracted Parties House together to discuss a number of different issues. And there was a lot of discussion in the preparatory group asked exactly what would be emphasized.

Some folks wanted to have a meeting that would be focused very much on outreach and growing the Non-Contracted Parties House. Some people wanted to have a meeting that would focus more on sort of institution building, getting procedures and policies in place so that we can all work together more effectively. Some people wanted to focus more on the substantive issues for the GNSO that are particularly hot at this time.

The staff tried to interweave all those different agendas into something that was consensually appealing to everybody that I think ultimately did a great job at doing that. So we now have an agenda that has both sort of procedural, institutional components out of each components and substantive policy issues.

This first session is on the more procedural, institutional side. It's about trying to get our act together as a constituency so that we are in a better position to be able to support NCUC's participation in the NCSG and in the GNSO policy process more generally. And obviously in order to be able to be effective and

influential we have to have our act together and there are ways in which some of us feel we could do more than what we've done so far in that regard.

So that's what we're going to try and talk about this morning. We will then for those of you who are not here in the room with us be meeting with Fadi as a stakeholder group together with EMPAC after this session. And then there are further meetings during the lunch break and then we go in the afternoon into broader discussions of stakeholder engagement with the CSG, the Commercial Stakeholder Group people.

And then three hours of substantive discussions on new gTLD's, RAA and Whois. And then tomorrow we have further agenda that is more on the sort of institutional and procedural side I would say dealing with issues like the GNSO toolkit, you know, which supports the work of all of these Non-Contracted Parties House. Dialogue on ICANN and Internet Governance landscape and discussions the community needs in order to be able to participate more effectively on ICANN's work.

Discussions of budget and then to wrap up - and a meeting also with some board members who are in town. So it's quite a full agenda for the next two days and I wanted to just look down to Robin and say would you like to add something to the agenda that - because you were tickling me or do you want to say something else?

Robin Gross: I was just smiling.

Bill Drake: Just smiling. Well that's good; that's a lovely way to start. So the agenda that I propose to you does anybody have anything they want to add to it before we jump in?

Mary Wong: Not so much adding to the agenda, but I think there were a few members who requested a download?

Bill Drake: Yes. That's been done.

Mary Wong: Has that been done?

Bill Drake: Yes.

Mary Wong: Because some of them (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: I recognize that, but the staff did write to me this morning and say that they were dialing out to those people.

Mary Wong: Thank you.

Bill Drake: So is there anything we'd like to add to that? I'll go through the agenda very quickly that I sent out. So my suggestion was to - well I just did a brief overview of highlights - so the inter-sessional meeting.

So what the main focus I think what we'd like to do is walk through efforts to build the constituency in light of the recent election and our desire to sort of boot up a number of different capacity building initiatives. And teams have been formed to do that.

And then after that there's of course any other business part we could talk a little bit depending on the time that's left about the policy discussions that will come later in the afternoon and then tomorrow as well or anything else people want to add into the agenda. Does anybody have anything they'd like to toss into the pot at this point or should we just lunge in?

Woman: Is it possible to put the agenda into Adobe or is that required (unintelligible)?

Bill Drake: That will probably require some skill set that I did not contemplate. Let's see; what...

Woman: Is the agenda online some place where we can...?

Bill Drake: Yes the agenda - well the agenda was in the email that I sent out in the members list.

Woman: I was just looking for the most expeditious link to share in the Adobe so that everyone can be on the same page.

Bill Drake: That will be very useful and I cannot tell you...

Woman: Okay. No worries; I won't go into...

Bill Drake: If somebody knows how to I'd like to get into the conversation because we're already 9:25. People can look at the email that I sent to the members list for the outline of the agenda. I'm sorry we didn't get it posted to the Adobe and I don't know how to do that right now.

So okay - so as I think everybody knows NCUC has made a lot of progress over the years in positioning itself to be able to represent non-commercial users more effectively within the GNSO policy process. We have grown substantially particularly when Robin was the chair of NCUC. We've took on a lot of new members. (Unintelligible) circulated numbers to me this morning that he had gone through the list of members. He tried to clean it up a bit.

What was the current...?

Man: Two hundred seventy-seven members, 69.2% of them are not American which makes us the most international of all constituencies.

Bill Drake: Wasn't that 69% or the ones that you're able to identify?

Man: Yes I should put this out. I could only identify 82% of our members by nationality. Within a month or two we'll be able to get that to 100%.

Bill Drake: Right.

Man: At very least 2/3 of our members are not citizens of the United States.

Bill Drake: Yes question?

Woman: When you say more than any other constituency you're including EMPAC?

Man: Yes.

Woman: Okay. I haven't looked at their membership, so I didn't know.

Man: They're second best. I mean they do try unlike some of our...

Woman: Do you know what that figure is?

Man: No I do not. I can tell you the Business Constituency is 70.4% American.

Woman: I think we need to be careful.

Woman: If you don't know the numbers for EMPAC...

Bill Drake: Right.

Woman: ...in stating that it's more than them just if we don't know the numbers.

Man: Okay.

Woman: So if you knew the numbers I'd say cool. If you don't know the numbers, then big question.



Man: I will know the numbers by the end of the meeting and we'll make sure that everybody gets them.

Woman: If I'm going to ask, you know someone else might.

Man: Okay. Thanks Avri.

Bill Drake: Fair point and EMPAC is obviously a very international in its membership is the question.

Maria?

Maria Farrell: Yes just on that, an apology - I missed Thursday's prep call because I was house hunting in London. And just I think that 70% number is something you absolutely need to like hammer home to Fadi when you mention measure. And so apologies if that's been covered. So compelling.

Bill Drake: We do have every intention of bringing this up with Fadi. So we have grown substantially, but nevertheless it's clear that Internet Governance is moving up the agenda globally in a lot of different environments with the processes we've seen going on in the International Telecommunication Union and so on.

Politically it's becoming more and more high visibility and ICANN of course is about to go through some very significant changes with the addition of the new gTLD's, players and so on. So it's a moment - it's kind of a transitional moment where it would be really important I think for representatives of non-commercial stakeholders to be very well-prepared to step up and play a leading role in articulating a vision and advancing the interest of global society and the public interest generally.

And I think NCUC has done a lot with very little over the years, but at the same time if we can clearly see ways in which this more could be done. And

that's what we want to try to tackle. It's not a question of saying that anything that we've done so far isn't adequate, et cetera, but we clearly can be better than we are in terms of our internal coherence, our growth, our ability to bring on board new people and engage them fully in the work of ICANN, et cetera, et cetera.

And that will in turn of course greatly support our ability to engage effectively in GNSO Council and GNSO working groups and ICANN more generally. So there's a very strong link between being internally further capacitated -- if that's not too horrible a word -- on the one hand and being effective in the policy work. There's no division between having policy discussions and having institution building discussions. We need to do both in tandem.

And so we had I think a lot of discussion around the various issues that NCUC has confronted since I've been a member over the past four years. And a lot of times we've sat around saying, "Gee we've got to do something about these things," but we have not actually managed to take a lot of action. And now we've just had an election. We have a new executive committee, several members of which are here with us for the first time. People who have never worked together.

And so we wanted to really take the opportunity to walk through some of the ways in which we might go about building capacity of NCUC. And to that point, during the election that we just had I suggested possibly the need to create teams or working groups or whatever you'd like to call them that would take on a number of different types of key functional tasks that would help to expand and strengthen NCUC. And people expressed support for that.

And so we are now launching into that effort. And so what we're going to do now with your permission is to walk through the key issues and perhaps hear from some of the people who are going to be involved in trying to drive these efforts forward. There are seven teams that have been formed recently with

the part in engagement of a number of new members which I think is really encouraging and a lot of good energy.

Perhaps way too much email for some people to process in the initial getting going of this, but that's inherent in the proposition. But we've got initiatives underway now to try to rethink and rebuild the electronic platforms that we use to collaborate together to strengthen our in-reach and member engagement, our outreach in new member recruitment, our finance management and engagement of the ICANN budget process, our communications and our ability to represent NCUC within ICANN and to the broader world.

And then also an initiative to do essentially programming because it seems that there's a space for the NCUC to play a kind of leading role in creating dialogue spaces during the ICANN meetings by holding policy conferences and so on. And there's other things that we'd like to do as well. So there's a team being formed around that.

And then finally charter revision because the charter for the NCUC is dramatically out of date and does not map very well, but it's who we really are and what we're doing. So that has to be tackled. So there's quite a lot that has to be done. So those are the seven issues I'd like to maybe spend, you know - we have less than ten minutes on each I guess with the remaining time. But let's try to go through them briefly to get people on board, what we're doing and see if we can solicit feedback, input and participation.

Woman: And just opportunities.

Bill Drake: So while the list of - I'm not entirely sure now because some people have written to the coordinators. We identified people to be coordinators of each team and I distributed on the members list the email addresses of those coordinators. So some people have been writing to the coordinators directly and saying, "I'd like to join such and such team."

So I don't necessarily have a complete breakdown now of everybody, but when we did this initiative on the members list, I think we had in most cases five to ten people in each of the different teams which is really quite...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay. So - well I get that as we go through each.

Woman: Okay.

Bill Drake: So just let's start then with e-platforms. The coordinator for that is Wilson; (Tapani's) also very involved in this and is playing a key role in getting our listservs together and so on. There are a number of issues here; the tools that we've used to facilitate cooperation and representation of NCUC over the years needs some consolidation and operating and rethinking, both the Web sites and the email lists and so on.

So perhaps - I'd like to be able to turn to the coordinators so people who are leading these efforts to overview a little bit. So perhaps Wilson and (Tapani) also and anybody else from that team, if you could just take a couple of minutes to give us some ideas of what we're discussing and people can jump in with questions and so on.

Wilson, could you start?

Wilson Abigaba: Thanks (unintelligible). Thank you Bill.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes we - for the e-platform we had our initial meeting (unintelligible) where we met with the board in Surrey. And most of them (unintelligible). We just

wanted to give the other teams and NCUC the ability to do their work very well. (Unintelligible).

So we are supposed to give the position of what (unintelligible).

(Sara) has provided us with a mock-up of that. Thanks very much. Despite other issues that you had. So (unintelligible) that have been discussed. (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay. Thanks Wilson. (Tapani) has created listservs for each of the teams to get us started with. So that's the first thing to point out about this.

(Tapani): Yes I just had a few notes that we already have ten people on the e-team at least according to (unintelligible). And just starting working fast. So (unintelligible).

And looking at the other teams (unintelligible). But otherwise the e-team's still very much in the beginning of trying to do what we are going to do. But the basic plan is to set it up on our own with our own server. (Unintelligible).

Not even ICANN too much.

Bill Drake: So we're going to try to establish a holistic approach to managing all of our e-resources. One thing is obviously to pull the listservs together and everything else in one server somewhere. I'm not sure the time frame on that, but presumably by Beijing hopefully.

(Tapani): Yes at this point will take more than a day if we decide that we do it. Otherwise we pray for it basically. At the moment it's on the (unintelligible) server which (unintelligible) for a while, but...

Bill Drake: Well I think it's clear that we have enough money in the budget to be able to handle this over the long term. So that won't be as much of an issue.

So one is to sort of consolidate resources and manage them more coherently and so on. A lot of stuff has been setup by Robin over the years and then also of course the - Wilson and (Brenden) have a bunch of things on the Syracuse University server. So I don't know to what extent we're going to consolidate all of that or what the plan is, but I leave it to you guys to figure that out.

Then the second set of questions has to do with web presences. The NCUC Web site is a name that has got some capabilities, but a lot of people think is kind of a little bit long in the tooth and has not been adequately used and perhaps visually is not as arresting as it could be. So we're thinking about completely revising the Web site, perhaps moving to a new platform and so on. Something that would allow for collaboration, et cetera.

(Sara) on the call has been playing with that. (Sara's) a professional web developer and has forward some initial ideas for the Web site. And (Sara), would you like to say anything about that real quickly?

(Sara): Hello there. Can everybody hear me?

Bill Drake: Yes.

(Sara): Great. Very difficult if I can't see everybody and just listening in. And yes so basically I revamped the whole Web site. I thought it needed to be very clean, very modern and very easy to use. And I have redesigned the logo to something quite basic. I thought the old log was outdated, so I think this should be up for discussion at a later point.

And yes I just welcome any feedback. And I don't know if anyone else who isn't in the platforms team has been revamped. So yes I welcome any suggestions that people have.

Bill Drake: Okay. So this is something we're going to play with going forward. Then there's of course the question of in terms of working on an ongoing basis, the use of Confluence site which is where Robin has put all the NCSG stuff and where other parts of the ICANN community have a lot of the ongoing, in process work.

Obviously I think NCUC could be using that better as well and frankly if you go the NCUC site on Confluence it's pretty much empty. So what we have to do then is sort of visualize how we want these different Web sites to work together and how to integrate the different activities. And also think about whether there's other platforms we might want to consider that might be a little bit more spiffy and up to date.

(Ed), you had some suggestions about that. I don't know if you want to talk about that or?

(Ed): Well first we should point out that ICANN has generously to connect to webinar, so those of us new to the process can actually learn how to use Confluence. And try to find out what the capabilities are because we still really don't know all it can do.

And then actually Avri - sorry - Avri had some suggestions in terms of trying to do some collaborative programs and some applications we could use for collaborative work. Maybe she could talk a little bit about that because we're not as far along in that process as we are in say the mock-up of the web pages.

Avri Doria: Yes. No I mean I haven't done any work on it.

(Ed): Okay.

Avri Doria: It seems to be something that did not traction among most of the people. Most of the people that got into the discussion at that point seemed to think that doing things the old fashioned way was still the right way.

I would prefer to see us having various tools like (unintelligible) pads, what have you and there are many types, you know, from things what you can send mail to and be included versus things that you always have to log into. So I think it'd be a good idea to sort of come up with the requirements might be, but it needs to be collaborative. But it also needs to accommodate people who live in places that are not bandwidth free.

It needs to deal with the fact that some people, you know, spend too much of the life on airplanes. And therefore if they want to edit something they need to be able to do it offline. So for example I really appreciate Google Drive, but let's sort of look at the work beforehand and say, "Oh I'm going to take this one offline because I want to work on it while I'm on the plane."

So if were to put together I think that - I hate and in fact will drop out if I have to any of the let's send work files back and forth. You know, when that becomes the method of working something I'll send comments in an email, but for example I've noticed if you're using different versions of Word.

If you happen to be one of those people that's used a Word look alike on your Android tablet, if you happen to be somebody that uses, you know, LibreOffice or, you know, it used to be called OpenOffice -- those things mess up the file. So by the time you've passed it around enough times whoever is holding the editor pen has a mess on their hands. And so therefore I'm looking for something that would allow people to cooperate, that would allow people to meet those needs, but not be Word files go back and forth in email.

And I guess I was insulting to people when I said we didn't want to do that. So I apologize for insulting people by saying I found it old fashioned.



Man: Well I made the same comment about mailing lists and I had my dinner served to me. So I do know that feeling.

Bill Drake: Well what about the tools like Basecamp and so on that allow you to kind of integrate the email and having everything on a web platform? Are there interesting options there? I mean have you guys explored that stuff?

I was asking about Basecamp as an example...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Bill Drake: ...where you're able to - you know, you send an email and it all goes into archive on a web thing as well and you can share documents more effectively.

Man: Yes Basecamp is one alternative, but one thing I don't like about it is a commercial solution type 1 company which a lot of things we don't have much control over it.

Bill Drake: Right.

Man: But there are alternatives and there's a possibility we might still go with it. But I prefer something that we can move around.

Bill Drake: So any thoughts from folks who are not on the e-platform team?

Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Yes we need a place to put your storage documents. And one thing I get questions all the time is, you know, what have we done before. And it would make life easier for like the thick Whois working group if there was a place they could go to see every document we've submitted.

And it's only, you know, half a dozen or dozen on Whois will be fine, but you know, worth the compilation, the review of NCUC and NCSG over the years to go there labeled Whois to find historic documents rather than coming to me and I search through.

The other thing that I'd really want is collaboration tools. Some of the working group guys were talking about also the ability not just to be public, but also to be private. So I don't care how many people, you know, from NCUC or the NCSG join the group that have the easy password, but sometimes for developing positions we don't want the other side (unintelligible).

So some way to do some document development behind a screen until we're ready to submit it.

Man: Yes (Sara), you were planning on trying to incorporate that now, the password we've spoken about?

(Sara's) not here.

Bill Drake: Oh then historical...

Woman: Are we talking about foreign?

Man: No talking about passwords you'd send the IPC and you would like theirs by having passwords as some place to do collaborative work behind a wall so we can...

Woman: Oh yes, on the mock-up design I put a little bulletin at the top for members log-in that members can do. And then - yes.

Bill Drake: I definitely want - I think we all agree to get the historic documents up there. One of the - the classic example to me was when we had the whole discussion about MAPO, Morality and Public Order, and Robin had done all

this great work years prior with keeping this all neutral and all this kind of stuff.

And when this discussion took off a lot of the stuff that NCUC had done around these issues just wasn't accessible to anybody or wasn't known. And then other parties kind of jumped in and said, "Well we're leading the discussion, et cetera." We started to visualize this whole problem and I kept feeling like why can't we point people to - in an aggregated way - look at all the stuff we've already done. We've already debated through a lot of these, et cetera.

That's true in a lot of cases. We don't represent ourselves effectively enough in part because our stuff isn't all together in one place, searchable and then presented to us. So we definitely have to make that happen. Robin and Wendy's scowling at me. So but and Robin's smiling and Wendy's scowling. So I don't know who to call on.

Man: Wait a minute; can I say Wendy is smiling and it's a beautiful smile. It is not the scowl.

Wendy Seltzer: But it was a scowl.

Bill Drake: Robin and Wendy.

Robin Gross: I just wanted to mention something about the Confluence Web site that ICANN hosts. At least with respect to NCSG and I think this will be also for the various constituencies, ICANN is currently revamping if you will our NCSG Confluence site. Ken Bour has come up with a little template for policy statements and membership.

And if you go to the Confluence site you can actually take a look at it; it's called Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Testing. Again it's just a test right now where we're going to port all the content that's currently on the

Confluence site that we have over to that site because it should be more user friendly and easy to navigate and that sort of thing.

So I think we also have this opportunity as well if you want to take advantage of that.

Bill Drake: Absolutely. I think so. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: I think we should - I like the idea of presenting our materials in a way that the public can see what we're up to. I think trying to develop a management system for finding everything neatly is a challenge that I've never seen any organization tackle well.

Google does it best of all. So as long as the stuff is on the public web I would suggest we Google four things and remember that they exist. And sure put them into the pages when we have links. I would say we shouldn't spend too much time trying to re-architect our old material.

Bill Drake: Yes I didn't mean that. I mean obviously we're all bandwidth challenged here. We're going to do what we can. Anything we do will be more than we've done, right?

So but I don't know if we're going to reinvent.

Wendy Seltzer: I would just think it'd be cool if we had a Whois Trademark Clearinghouse.

Bill Drake: Right, exactly.

Wendy Seltzer: When you put those in you get everybody else to Google our stuff and there are many ways to get to our - and just keep it updated so whenever something formal goes in like the thick Whois working group permit. It goes up there.

Bill Drake: Right.

Wendy Seltzer: The informal submission to just (unintelligible) automatically or whatever process we develop.

Bill Drake: And we have to have proper communication between the people who are involved doing the policy. So like when somebody writes public comment or so on, make sure - you know, forward it to the people who are managing the Web site to get it up there themselves depending on how we configure it.

You know, we just have to have a work flow to do this.

Yes?

Man: Just a quick comment because actually there's already some our stuff that's not findable by Google. The original NCUC discussed ways to improve 2001, 2003 (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible). I'd like to collect all that stuff in one place so it doesn't disappear.

Bill Drake: Exactly. And it's not together with the Syracuse list now, right? Okay so e-platform's clearly - there's a lot to do and just there's something that will feed into all the other efforts that are going forward. And then there's been really robust debate among the people involved in that team. So that's really good and I'm hopeful that we can keep pushing that forward.

So a secondary that we need to do some serious work on is in-reach and member engagement. And we've created a team for that as well. I dug up a list of teams actually as of when - the last I heard about them. The in-reach

team actually is relatively underpopulated. By now we only have four people who volunteered for it.

But anyway hopefully we'll get that going. And here we're dealing with the fundamental problem that in my view there's just - I almost feel like NCUC is sort of a serious concentric circle, you know? There's a small group of people who are very closely engaged, go to the ICANN meetings, they're very plugged into all the policy stuff, but who very often don't report in any kind of ongoing way to the larger membership.

And so the membership doesn't really know what the hell we're doing. And then we send out these - we forward messages to the member's list and say, you know, meeting about such and such or here's a document or whatever. And a lot of the members they have no context to make sense of what this is, why am I looking at this, what do I do then. So we're - in a way we're missing a real opportunity to capacitate people - and I get to get another word for that. But to empower people to feel like they really know what is going on the inner policy discussions and figure out where they can engage.

It's just very, very hard for people to I think -- and I hear this from various members -- they just think like those of us who come to the meetings are doing this stuff sort of off on another planet. And that's I think highly problematic. We have to find a way on an ongoing basis - make sure that we report to people. I would like for example if NCUC if the Executive Committee or the teams could aggregate and send like a monthly report to members on what's happened in the past month at NCUC, et cetera with pointers to things and so on.

But also some of this we can't do on our own; some of this is stuff that's like it's a problem the way ICANN has presented the information. If you're a newbie and you want to know about IRTP you go to our Web site and there's just like a zillion documents and getting the big picture with knowing why this

matters and whether or not you might want to start to engage in the discussion rather I think is very difficult for members.

So in-reach, making people feel engaged and giving them the incentives to want to participate, to join working groups and so on is a real challenge. It's a challenge in every similar society or organization or network I've ever seen. So we don't want to rarify a division between the sort of inner circle who are all plugged in, in the broader outer circle. We've got to really break that down and get people fully engaged.

Avri's spelling it. I mean so if you think there's something wrong...?

Avri Doria: Yes I think this notion of in-reach, outreach rarifies the division between inside and outside and the whole notion there should be communications that go to a wide enough audience should be a goal. In-reach, outreach notion, just -- I wouldn't have used the word rarify if you hadn't -- but just goes to making that division real and somewhat permanent.

And so you do different things for the ins and the out. You think about it differently and in that you have made them different. So I really have a problem with the notion of in and outreach.

Bill Drake: Okay. Just to be clear; by outreach we mean to non-members to bring on new members and by in-reach we mean to existing members. Why is that binary problematic?

Avri Doria: Because it really does separate the world in two. And the information, the communications that you want to get out to bring people into doing the work to bring people who are concerned about the issues, to bring people into contributing bottom up to the issues doesn't really matter whether they're innies or outies.

What really matters is that you get their comments, that (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: You're pushing belly buttons; I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: It was a counter to rarify.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Avri Doria: But yes there should be something of, "Wow, you've been really active." You know, "But you're not a member. How would you like to join?" And that's not quite outreach at that point; that's just sort of recognizing contribution and saying, so actually think the contribution and getting the bottom -- and I think I said this in one message somewhere perhaps not on this list -- is we talk about being bottom up. We're not.

The bottom are the people that aren't here. And so bottom up means bringing their viewpoints in. But I think in-reach, outreach and doing it separated like that is problematic.

Bill Drake: Just to be clear...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Yes. Yes. Now I mean obviously a lot of the same kind of messaging you would want to use in both directions and so on. I simply was trying to make basic distinction between trying to engage our members and trying to get new members. But I think your point that we shouldn't build a big wall there between those two things - and by the way it should be pointed out that (Ed) is the chair of both the in-reach and outreach team.

(Ed): Thanks for noting that.

Bill Drake: Having a single human coordinating both should help with that.



(Ed): In the interest of time why don't I take both in-reach and outreach real quickly to let you what we're doing.

Bill Drake: Yes.

(Ed): We haven't got much in the committee. We have been focused like a laser on e-platform for the simple reason as Avri pointed out, the messaging that needs to go out needs to go out to both of those in our group and those outside. The messaging has to be similar.

So what we're focused - one of the problems I've seen coming in is you look at our Web site, you've looked at our list; we're full of ICANN's acronyms. APRT, GAC, the ALAC; nobody wants to be part of that. And so our messaging at least on the outreach home page, et cetera we're focusing on human rights, freedom of expression, the things our group stands for.

Bring the people in. Inspire those who are already in and gave up because they didn't understand what was going on. I was speaking to (Mary) earlier today and she suggested we need to have some sort of program - an educational program for new members. Bill has talked to me about starting webinars; we can combine those two ideas. We try to educate our members as a form of in-reach.

But it's more that that; we do have 277 members. We currently have about 10% of our membership active. That's the problem. I had all sorts of solutions until my friend Amr pointed out you're giving solutions, but we haven't defined the problem yet. We need to first define the problem, to diagnose the problem and then do the solution. So one thing I'm committed to is personally writing to every member we have that I know is not participating and ask what can we do to bring you back in.

And frankly I have to do it off my personal email address because some of our non-members that I've spoken to at the IPS, everything we send goes

into the trash bin. That's how they filter. We have to get around that; we have to - it goes back to communication. It goes back to how we're representing ourselves as a group.

Now let me say - I'll tell you how messed up we are. I appreciate the work everyone's done, but I get full membership lists and I sat last night in a beautiful hotel figuring out who's a duplicate, who's still alive. You know, I'm trying to find the countries. Robin gave me a great list as of 2009. So I'm trying to figure out all right if they have an IP I'm assuming they're in Italy. That's not a correct assumption, so I'm Googling names. We have to get the records updated and that's going to be our first priority.

Number two on outreach; I guess we define what outreach is. We are not - we're already diverse enough that I can't say like some of our (unintelligible) for example is really focusing on Africa now. But all to their credit. I can't do that. So I'm going to focus on Africa. My friend Norbert who unfortunately isn't here today, he's going to yell at me, "What about Asia?" We're already so diverse I can't take a geographic focus, however I'm going to.

And let me tell you as a personal goal as leader of this group; we're not going to ignore everybody else. I'm very concerned that we had when I took over one active Russian member. Russian, CIS and the geopolitical ecosphere of Internet Governance are very important countries. So when I hear the Russian federation say, "Hey ICANN's an American tool. We're not involved." I look at all of our houses, there was nobody from Russia there. We've started to solve that problem.

(Olga) is one of our first recruits. She's President of the Law Students at Russia. She's trying to get in here, but he's having trouble with her site. So she's not here today to talk about what we're doing. But (Olga) has generated a list of 23 NGO's in Russia that are potential members. And we're going after them.

So I am going to make this a focus with Russia because I think they deserve to be here and they're nowhere else in the houses. They're not in the BC; they're not in EMPAC. They're not - nowhere. One of the problems of outreach is we all talk to our friends. You know, I know so, so, so and none of us had friends in Russia. So we need to solve that problem and if I have to go myself to the Russian IGF I'll be there. We're going to make - and (Olga's) volunteered to translate some of our web pages so we can have a Russian web presence.

If we're going Facebook we're going BK. I mean we're going to try to reach out to that community during this year. That's my personal goal. My other goal is in terms of outreach sometimes we just talk about numbers. Everyone's interested in voting for various committees here. And yes numbers are important, but I'm also interested in targeting recruitment. We need some more IP people here. Mary and Kathy cannot do it all themselves. I know there are other folks contribute.

So I'm asking them...

Bill Drake: We have a pretty good IP cloud I think actually.

(Ed): We do, but take a look at where they're from. We have European IP folks too, you know, and they deserve to have a voice. There are IP people in Asia. We need to bring them together. And so I'm going after them; I'm getting a list of names and I'm contacting them personally.

That's in addition to the overall outreach which is going to be aided immensely by our web presence. As (Tupani) has told me several times he has Finnish people he wants to bring in. I lived in Finland for 12 years; I'm also bringing in Fin. So be careful; be aware of what you're looking for. We may have the Finnish flag here next year.

Bill Drake: We'll all have to learn tango.

(Ed): Exactly, but the deal is - (Tupani) has told me I can't recruit anyone without web presence. So we need to fix that first. So in terms of outreach the basic plan is to do a little bit of target and recruitment to address your IP professionals and any other groups that anyone has in mind, get it to me. I'll go after them.

In my early days I actually as an assistant hockey coach for a catholic high school in Massachusetts. I know how to recruit people. It's the same deal. I go into the house, I say, "Hi, we're great freedom of expression/human rights. You've got to be with us." I also want to recruit people who are going to work. Too often when I look at the recruitment in the past few years you guys have got the numbers up - so you're teasing yourself Robin -- you've got the numbers up and a lot of these people joined and are silent.

So I want to make sure some of the folks we get in can share in the work because as much as I love Avri, we are now 63 committees at once. I mean you shouldn't have to do that.

Avri Doria: Yes but I don't have bandwidth problems.

(Ed): Okay. But you shouldn't have to do all that work. And it's also not good to have to support 20 people. But you shouldn't have to do all that work. And it's also not good to have to support 20 people representing the 2 billion non-commercial Internet users.

Bill Drake: Right. So we definitely want to I think probably have a systematic approach to outreach to each try to bring on some people if we can that would add something to the mix, but also once we get them in the tents try to ease their path into engagement.

And we have to keep track of them. We haven't had even proper numbers. I mean the reason (Ed) was counting people last night in his hotel room is

because I noticed when I looked at the Web site that we had a miscount for our announce numbers on the Web site. And that also didn't include a lot of people we brought in. So when people join NCSG and they indicate that they want to be in NCUC or join, they should get added into the list.

We should revise, update, et cetera and we should find a way to reach out to them and say, "Where can we help you? What would you be interested in? What might we be able to help you slide into in terms of activity?" And - just go Mary.

Mary Wong: So this is not really technical communications which I agree with. (Unintelligible). This is to pick up where (Ed) mentioned we had talked about similar to your idea; it seems to me that this meeting is a really (unintelligible). We've got different policy issues that we know (unintelligible) and we've got policy leaders for the next two days; maybe that's why we work on the webinar idea.

(Unintelligible). Each of us has to be on the phone or Adobe for at least 20 minutes. That's Whois problem; that's RAA.

Bill Drake: Exactly.

Mary Wong: And I think we can all connect (unintelligible).

Man: But I'd tell you that independently Bill has come up with the same idea as Mary did. So we're coming to these ideas that everyone's having, but for us nobody's communicated in the past about what to do.

One last thing; there will be - at some point we're going to be coming to everybody on the list about a (Metrian) program as well. I brought four people in this year. I'm mentoring them. We have one on the line, one trying to get on the line. We have another person - so when you actually bring them in and don't forget them and say, "Hi. Do you have questions? You can come to me.

In the first few months while you're getting your feet wet, come to me. I'm sort of here for you."

So everyone in this room may at some point get an email from me, "Hi, can you step up and take one or two of these folks?" And I think that that's a way to ease the transition as well and get people involved because one of the problems when you get a group or you get an individual in and then we don't contact them. And they read all these things with all the acronyms; there's no personal contact. They don't get to attend the meetings. We need to have a personal approach.

Once we get them in we need to give them something to work on. (Sara) is a great example. (Sara) joins and we immediately say design a web page please and do it within a week. And so she produced and she's here. And that's what we need to do to engage members once we bring them in.

Bill Drake: It's a good thing that we have a low energy coordinator for outreach and in-reach efforts just to keep everybody on caffeine levels.

We need to move onto other topics, but let's get other - no, no. Just quickly is all I'm saying.

Woman: No. No.

Bill Drake: So Kathy and Wolfgang said something.

Kathy Kleinman: No I really like these in-reach/outreach approach. I see it as a spectrum and not as a wall. But this idea of grabbing people who are interested with outreach in the big picture and then beginning to help them find a small picture.

In terms of communication my - everybody knows I'm back in private practice now and I'm watching how we educate our associates in communications and

Internet. And we make our associates responsible for our communication which means they have to go out to the expert rather than having experts write more because we're already kind of overloaded with what we're doing.

Take some people who are in the in-reach stage who are really beginning to get the acronyms, beginning to figure out a little bit about what's going on. Have them go out to the experts, pull the information in and translate it so that people who know less than they do in terms of the acronyms and just help them understand. Make them the communicators.

Man: I want to thank Kathy because in terms of our outreach committee her 14-year-old son (Sam) has joined. I have some 16-year-olds from Hong Kong I met in (unintelligible). (Sam) is going after them right after his exams next week.

Kathy Kleinman: That's right and (unintelligible).

Man: I'm so happy that (Ed) brings this new steam to the coup and I support all his points 100%. So, you know, just my view, you know, I think this is a coup where a lot of academics are involved and that's probably in (unintelligible).

And what academics are doing is research and teaching. So I think the - today the webinar as it was already mentioned is such easy tool now and it's so useful that everybody can do it. Why not also that we strengthen our profile and advertise it in the right way. We're thinking about a monthly NCUC webinar where we go through the general things. You know, it's easy to find, you know, ten people who are here which give to various issues related to ICANN and GNSO policy or over general Internet governancy issues.

Just to prepare lecture 30 minutes. So this - you know, if we have a calendar and say every month NCUC is the place if you want to get knowledge about how this all work, you have to go to the NCUC webinar. So and then we have time table and we call it the monthly NCUC webinar which then could become

this very good teacher. You know, the place where people get their knowledge if they want to do something.

This would strengthen our profile in ICANN. This would really serve the community and would do a lot for outreach because a lot of our let's say our visitors and students or fellows would be encouraged after they have listened to the lecture to join the NCUC. So this is a way which combines all those elements which means I formally propose to think envisioning NCUC monthly webinar.

Bill Drake: Well this is what we've been talking about doing and we simply need to resource it. And what I thought it would go under the programming thing, so you're moving ahead of me. But that's fine. It's something that I think we can really contribute.

I wouldn't necessarily and I say this as academic - I wouldn't necessarily privilege academic voices in this and I think one thing, you know, NCUC, we do have a lot of academics, but we really need to get much more NGO's that have members and that are real groups engaged as well.

And we shouldn't also just put our voices forward. So we have to figure out a way to bring in the people from the community without looking like we're Empire Building, but make it a useful activity. So this is part of a larger, strategic, engagement approach that I think would be very useful to pursue.

David Cake was just - managed to get off the plane and directly from Australia. Live from Australia.

David Cake: Hi everybody.

Man: Thank you David.



Bill Drake: We were just going through some of the initiatives that we're trying to get going here and talk about in-reach and outreach in a sort of coordinated way. Are there any last points on this?

Wendy, you were looking at me and I wasn't quite sure if you...

Wendy Seltzer: Just wanted to (unintelligible) these efforts are happening and particularly they bring in more people to help spread the effort. It's not my strength and I welcome those. There will be other people who can help us to bring the ideas in the (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Okay let's talk briefly about - we've got 20 minutes left. We've got a number of points just to cover. Finance and budget, ICANN budget. We for people who don't know NCUC does have a little pot of money that was accumulated over the years from meetings that it's organized, brands that it's won and so on.

Milton is the - got the account. But we clearly can do more to fundraise to build our own independent capacity on one hand and so that's something that we'll hopefully look at from a strategic standpoint. The other part is to really engage in the ICANN budget process more fully, more effectively. There's quite a lot now going on in the budget environment with the new resources coming in and expansion of ICANN.

Maria has agreed to be the coordinator. As a former staffer she knows where the bodies are buried and the ins and outs of ICANN's secret processes. So maybe you could just give us a little bit where we are with this stuff.

Maria Ferrell: Yes. So (unintelligible). And Milton has the checkbook.

Bill Drake: Can we not make that a bumper sticker?

Woman: How much money and how do we bring more?

Bill Drake: I think there's \$40,000 in the account.

Maria Ferrell: (Unintelligible). So Robin's in the finance committee (unintelligible). And actually one of our new Nigerian members he's a qualified financial professional. And so we're starting to add a few more people to (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: (Tupani) also?

Maria Ferrell: So we've got about six or seven people as a bit of resource to this. So number one, yes I got no idea how much money we have. (Unintelligible) in terms of how much more we can do with more people on this.

So the item first really is for those who are on the committee to understand how much money we have, what the processes are and how we plan to spend it. But then that's sort of housekeeping.

The second thing that I think is going to be our main focus of work through the next couple of months is going to be ICANN's budgeting process is ongoing. This is basically a process whereby we can actually get money from ICANN (unintelligible) to do work that we need to do. (Unintelligible).

There have been a lot of calls and a lot of verbiage, but really there are only two things that we need to know; one, yes we can get money. But it seems to be more project oriented, overhead oriented, so we can get money to do specific thing. (Unintelligible).

So the support to buy stuff and the support to go places.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Maria Ferrell: And so (unintelligible) is have a secretary or whatever (unintelligible). And so the first thing I wanted to tell you is yes there's money. And number two was the deadline for 22nd of March for us putting together a very well-considered proposal for what we want to do.

So I think our main job is to be working with (unintelligible) and saying what are the projects that we can, you know, we have X amount of money. So we're working with everybody else and really what I would like to do to kick out for discussion I think on the list is, you know, what are the discreet constructive projects that we can do. But we get enough money that we want to do things that we need.

(Unintelligible). And possibly even support for webinars and that's exactly the kind of thing we want to be doing. So yes I guess I'll leave it at that.

Bill Drake: But just to clarify, are there - so the March 22 deadline is for early funding for this year? So for example if we wanted to do something in Bali, we have to have a proposal to them by then and they'll be considered on a kind of first come first server basis I think they said, right?

Maria Ferrell: Yes (unintelligible). And the impression I think we've been given really is get in earlier. You'll probably have a better chance.

Bill Drake: Yes. But I mean I know for example the IGF (unintelligible) had a bunch of people funded by ICANN. The SSACP had a bunch of people funded to go. EMPAC had a bunch of people to go and yes we didn't submit a request for anything, but we could have. And I think this year that it's been made very clear by Fadi on down that they see the IGF now in a more strategic way as a place for ICANN to really make a community presence.

And so I think we should submit a proposal to organize a workshop and perhaps more in Bali. I don't see any reason not to do that as an outreach thing. But there's other activities that we might want to consider as well for

this. I mean I don't really know Robin for Durbin, like if we were going to do the policy conference. Did they already commit resources for that?

They did?

Robin Gross: The space. Yes.

Bill Drake: Okay. The space.

Robin Gross: Yes the space; the venue space. Maybe more, I don't know. But they have committed space - leasing space.

Bill Drake: Okay. So whether we wanted to ask for anything else for that or for Buenos Aires - I mean these are things that would go on the fast track. And then there's the regular budget and the proposal for that is due April 19.

It is always harder to get core funding for ongoing activities. Same thing with foundations. Whoever likes to fund projects and are short-term deliverables that they can point to, nobody wants to give core money to like build a capacity for ongoing activity. So that's just one of the challenges.

Yes Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: One thing I'd love to add to our priorities list is getting people on our working groups out to the ICANN meeting. You know, it's hard enough working by email for the ICANN meeting if you haven't met the people face to face. It's really hard to do the negotiations and it's really hard to do the tough compromises that sometimes need to be done.

So I would love somebody to get these people out if they're going to commit their time, you know, they should be able to come to a meeting or something.

Bill Drake: Yes. Absolutely.

Woman: I mean I think possibly the way to do that under this process may be to (unintelligible) a different tier of people who are in our membership and active, but not yet experts. Kind of a year of activities that we want to do to bring (unintelligible). So I think we do it as, you know, not that we want to have two people in the working group, but we want to have, you know, five plus on seats to come to meetings as part of all these extra things that we are doing.

Bill Drake: Okay. Mary?

Mary Wong: I was going to say pretty similar things and I think the way to do this is definitely as suggested. And clearly I think we can start with the webinar stuff, identify the big picture policy issues. Some of that might be where we sit. The GNSO Council might start appealing to our working group and then develop internal criteria for the folks that we might want to support whether it's how long you've been a member or not, whether you volunteer for a working group.

We can also internally -- and this might be controversial -- basically say one condition is you kind o have to join a working group within a year of going to ICANN meetings or something. (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Certainly some sort of activity justify - I mean does that - if I can just add on to your point is with the three slots that we have for NCUC which I don't - some of that's going to continue until next fiscal year that the constituencies will get the funding.

We have to clarify that, but we both...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Already?

Woman: There's eight minutes left.

Bill Drake: I thought we were meeting at 10:30, but if we're meeting earlier...

Man: No, no. We had talked about a flexible schedule. But 10:30 is...

Bill Drake: Are you cool with that? Let's wrap up?

Man: Yes.

Bill Drake: Thank you. Just to finish the point real quickly; for the two people that we're bringing to Beijing for example, it was tied to actually doing some stuff right?

Woman: Yes.

Bill Drake: And so for travel allocations - I mean we have to be clear that people who want to get funded to meetings have to be engaged and there has to be some deliverable for their participation. So...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: We'll sort that out and we'll rotate that. It's not going to be the same two people funded all the time obviously.

Woman: And do we need (unintelligible)?

Bill Drake: Exactly. Robin, were you...?

Robin Gross: Yes I just wanted to very briefly support the idea of putting forth a funding proposal for the Bali meeting at IGF this year. It's been mentioned that a lot of the other efforts in ICANN had been funded to go to the IGF meeting last year except for the non-commercial users.

Frankly we had no idea that there was money available. We had always been told by ICANN staff that no don't bother to apply for travel funds. There's nothing available. And so when we saw the budget had, you know, IGF and a certain amount tied to it, we just know that that meant we could apply. And we just assumed that's a staff project for staff purposes. We don't get any say in that.

So it sounds like that may be changing now and there is some opportunity to apply for things. So I think what we have to do though is really work with the finance staff members and really push them, "Now where can we apply here? And where can't we apply here?" Because they're not going to tell that.

Bill Drake: I found them pretty forthcoming so far.

Robin Gross: Yes I mean it's not like they're trying to hold it all away from us, it's just that we need to really engage.

Bill Drake: Right. Okay and one last finance point and this is just an outstanding issue; I assume that there's going to be a proposal made from CSG about staff support. And we've had some discussion internally amongst ourselves about whether that's a good idea precisely if there was anything how we would want to figure that.

I think that one thing we might want to do is try to have a focused discussion some point about setting parameters and we're going to have to figure out how to respond if they put this out there on the table tomorrow. So that's another finance point I just leave there.

We've got like just six minutes left because we started late. So just want to go through real quickly the other (unintelligible), communication. You know, we've talked about the fact that we don't get enough recognition for some of the things that we do. We put out statements and so on, but they don't get

properly publicized or fully circulated. We could be more strategic about this to put things onto CircleID or other things like that.

But we also have just the basic perception issues, perception of NCUC which I think can be improved and strengthened by a more coherent approach to communicating to the outside world. So we have a team for that as well which Mary has agreed to be very helpful with.

Mary, would you like to say anything? But then Avri was waving (unintelligible). So...

Mary Wong: Not really, but just that I think we could coordinate with the other efforts that are ongoing (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Hello? Yes. Go ahead. I'm sorry; we're rushing through the agenda and I didn't properly create enough space for people who are on the call.

Does somebody have a point on this?

Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes the point I was going to make is yes credit is nice, but it's important to remember how much you can really get done if you insist on getting credit. And so while I don't want to get in the way of, you know, you getting NCUC more credit, I'm much more concerned with what people get done in terms of human rights and such. And I really don't care who gets credit.

And if you can get something done when CSG gets the credit for doing it, all the better.

Bill Drake: I don't - okay.

Avri Doria: Yes it's an alternative point of view.



Bill Drake: No I didn't really mean so much credit as having it known what we've done. That's all; just having it out there as people see what we've said, what we've done. (Unintelligible) not tooting our horn, barking down the street, you know, whatever (unintelligible) wants to do.

Okay. Let's just real quickly go through the last two points because - I'm sorry.

Man: One of the things we need to get done directly in communications is some sort of written material who we are because it's great to have outreach at events. But when you read the outreach and you don't remember who you put on the event, it really doesn't do as much good. So that's going to be a priority.

Bill Drake: Yes and this also feeds into the web materials and so we need to revamp sort of our public face I think. So we have to think about that. Programming is another team that we're pulling together now. The initial thing that we're working on of course is Beijing where we see doing a small policy conference.

Wolfgang has volunteered to be the coordinator of the programming team. Just real briefly if you could through some of the things.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes. You know, we have more or less the confirmation from ICANN that on Monday we need to be at the opening ceremony. We will have a slot for four or six hours. This has yet to be decided how much we have.

So the idea is to have to keynote speakers; one from Fadi or, you know, one other leader from ICANN and one from the Chinese government or a high level representative. Our Chinese partner, (Hung She) from Beijing University is involved in the program committee and she's responsible for hiring the Chinese keynote speaker. And also doing two things that needs to bring

Chinese speakers to the various panels and to do outreach in the Chinese community so that we get a lot of Chinese people into the workshop.

So we have three panels standing and we are trying to identify what this receptance will be for discussion within the next 10 or 15 days. And as soon as we have fixed the subjects, then we will look for speakers and for moderators. So that means if you have any proposal what would be good subject for workshop in Beijing, then let me know.

And I think Bill has already proposed to ask the question what worked, what is question mark. So it was - this also for China for part of the Internet growth or not, but we should not be provocative. So that means it should be just for preparation. We want to (unintelligible). This would probably not be a good subject for discussion, but certainly we will not ignore human rights issues and it means civil rights, freedom of expression will be also discussed, but in a way that would allow something like a peaceful coexistence or something like that.

We know we live in non-friendly environment there, but thanks to ICANN we can do it now under the ICANN umbrella. Otherwise we would have asked for permission for China to do it as an independent meeting on Friday. And nobody wanted to enter into this trouble to go through China's procedures. So we do it under the ICANN umbrella Monday afternoon and please send your ideas for subjects for the discussion.

And I think the (unintelligible) should be ready until the end of February.

Bill Drake: Thank you Wolfgang. So that's a name that's getting booted up. And again it won't just be a matter of organizing meetings; this group could also take a lead in organizing webinars and those kinds of activities.

We've got like two minutes left. Robin, real quickly.

Robin Gross: Yes I just wanted to add onto the Beijing conference that we've also done some outreach to potential sponsors for this event and so far we've got on board (ISOC) and TIR and I think the Brazilians are also interested in being a sponsor as well. So we're working on that too.

Bill Drake: The Brazilians are always great sponsors for activities as well as PR. Robin's been taking - making that happen.

And then lastly to conclude, the charter revision. This is not something for the next quarter, but for perhaps the quarter after that. We're going to have to get a group going. As I say if you go through the charter that NCUC is living under now you will notice an extraordinary divergence from how we actually operate, who we are. It has things like program committee which doesn't really exist and various other stuff.

So there's a lot of work.

Man: We have a charter in the bylaws and I'm not sure which one I'm supposed to be looking to. I mean we have two governing documents.

Bill Drake: Because they're different versions of the same thing with different names I think. But anyway it's a bit of a mess, so that's another thing that we're going to be trying to tackle probably after Beijing with a vote amongst the full membership prior to - if we decide that we want to redefine as I was suggested perhaps the nature of the Executive Committee members leading these teams rather than being region-based, we might want to have the charter approved prior to the next election which would be for the December cycle.

But we'll see how that works out. The group needs to get going on that and start talking about that.

And so it's 10:30, EMPAC is waiting to meet. I'm very sorry to the people who are on the call that number one we didn't populate the Adobe Connect with any interesting content. Nothing is being shared as it says, but we didn't have it entirely clear what was going to happen with remote participation for this meeting and everything else until late.

But I hope this has been useful start to at least getting everybody apprised of the new kind of energy that is being mobilized to try and get NCUC in a better position to be able to represent non-commercial interests. And we will carry this forward.

Any last comments from anybody?

Man: Just housekeeping for Avri. EMPAC is 50% American. So we are at 69% non-American, by far the leading interest group within ICANN.

Avri Doria: That 50% is still much more than any other group?

Bill Drake: Yes. Absolutely.

Avri Doria: So I'd think it'd be good if you make the statement even if you admit that we're in the lead.

Man: I have intention of competing, but I just want to point it out that we are actually confined with ICANN's strategic statement - plan.

Bill Drake: Formulations.

Avri Doria: And then - I'm just being picky.

Bill Drake: Okay. Thank you. Okay so we are going to end this recording. I thank the people online for participating and listening in. Obviously it was a fairly rushed

discussion to a lot of stuff that we thought, but hopefully it will be useful to you.

We'll continue the discussions online. We know EMPAC's waiting to come in, so we can stop recording. And thank you everybody.

Woman: Thanks Bill.

Man: Thanks.

Woman: Thank you Bill.

Man: Thank you Bill.

Man: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

END