

ICANN
Transcription ICANN Johannesburg
New gTLD RDS to replace WHOIS PDP
Wednesday, 28 June 2017 at 08:30 SAST

Note: 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**.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, good morning. This is the Executive Committee of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group meeting. Unfortunately we are not all here but we'll have to make do and have the decisions reviewed later by missing members.

First thing on our agenda, member applications. We have quite a lot of them so let's try to be expeditious. Start with new individuals as usual. NCSG. NCUC (unintelligible) usually review it from NCUC point of view but now we're looking at NCSG.

So the first one we have (Zin Abraham Humad) from Chad, an individual concerned with public interest aspects. There's a LinkedIn page. The review. Does not have a domain. That's not a requirement either. Opinions? Joan? Monika?

Monika Zalnierute: I think it looks okay.

Joan Kerr: Looks okay to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Do you speak great French by the way, because his LinkedIn page is mostly French.

Joan Kerr: I don't, other than bon jour.

Tapani Tarvainen: Brief Google translation. Dynamic, accomplished, versatile, passionate and highly motivated with 15 years of success combining a major commercial and marketing achievement in the field of telecom. Strongly committed to achieving vital sales objectives in real-time distribution projects as well as the development and implementation of various business plans and execution of synergies

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Demonstrates varied adaptability to different work environments providing input. Of course this is a LinkedIn text so that's kind of self-advertising. Not sure how much worth we should add to that, but we need to find something that talks about his/her non-commercial interests here.

Joan Kerr: Doesn't sound very non-commercial – telecom. Sorry, Joan for the record. In her interest statement, she's interested in NCSG and sharing best practices but she can do that without being a member. And there's no non-commercial, right?

Tapani Tarvainen: So it may simply be that she did not realize that people want to know what those non-commercial interests are, and the LinkedIn page is still like an application type thing so it does not indicate what she is doing really. But we don't really have enough information to approve her I think.

So maybe we'll ask for clarification? If you can describe your non-commercial interests we'll come back to you.

Woman: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Next, (Fayad Mohammed Sejek), which I probably mispronounced horribly. He gives reference to (Aprello). That's not technically a problem. The at-large is (unintelligible). We have at-large members. Interest statement is rather brief, list of things – security, trust, privacy, governance, (IOT), human rights, cybersecurity. But no Web site, no LinkedIn page, no reference. Opinions?

Monika Zalnieriute: Monika for the record. So as far as I understand we have this - like a template sentence that they all use. I thought that they at least wrote that. Okay, I understand now. So it doesn't say anything at all. We can ask for more information I guess. Otherwise we have to reject because there's nothing.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, ask for more information. We have to work on that application form so it makes clearer people have to explain a bit more what they do.

Next is Vrickson Acosta, Venezuela. It has a bit more information here – actually quite a lot more. Has been collaborating with the CCWG accounting, ISOC member for several years, fellowship, (unintelligible) in the (unintelligible) Center for Entrepreneurship and Internet (unintelligible) Paraguay.

There's a reference. We tried to make (unintelligible)? I don't remember. May be a member of ours. There's a LinkedIn page. That's have a look what that looks like.

Monika Zalnieriute: I have opened it. Systemic thinker, business intelligence.

Tapani Tarvainen: Twitter Pay as well but... So opinions?

Monika Zalnieriute: Monika for the record. Doesn't look non-commercial to me at all. Looks some sort of a combination of business and maybe government even. But then it indicates that our application form is not clear enough for people to even understand what they're applying for I guess. What are your thoughts?

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: I don't think it sounds too non-commercial, but what I'm even more intrigued with is the fact that this person was a fellow and has - still applied with having more information than the general public. I thought that's what the fellows was trying to do was to educate people about the different constituencies and stakeholder groups so they had a full understanding. So I'm sort of bewildered about that. But...

Monika Zalnieriute: I'm sorry, but it's not an ICANN fellow. It's something else. A fellowship to attend the inauguration first course of (Lax Center) for entrepreneurship. It's not ICANN fellow.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes that's how I read it as well. So again I see that we don't have much information on non-commercial interests although it's been in CCWG accounting. Too bad that Robin isn't here. If she were here she might know, know him.

But again the LinkedIn page, well that's (unintelligible) business or work-oriented things, but it does not give us enough information to judge this either. So we ask for more information from him too. There is - a bit more than usual - ISOC member and CCW accounting, but those don't really tell us the non-commercial interest. So what do you think? Likewise, we request more information. Okay, thank you. Moving on.

We have little more than 20 of these to go. (Shridip Ayamaji) from Nepal. And he's got also (Apuelo) member but there is a lot of interest statement at

least is good. And we have (Nigeria) as a reference. And LinkedIn page. So read the interest statement and let me know what you think.

Monika Zalnieriute: This one looks good to me. A journalist interested in privacy, security and so on, human rights, freedom of expression. Sounds – sound...

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. Sounds good to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I agree. And then interest statement, looking at the LinkedIn page and the reference from (Unintelligible) all add up to looks very good. So shall we approve him? Okay, approved pending - Robin and Poncelet appearing later.

Next (Josh Moitui), Kenya. Also has a lengthy – () has a lengthy interest statement and LinkedIn page. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes I think this member is absolutely suitable for us. It's just a very strange opinion that has on business and human rights, but yeah, okay. I support this application.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Looks good to me too.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, agreed, approved pending Robin and Poncelet later. Next we have (Gordon Adams) from United States. No LinkedIn page or Web site but nice interest statement. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I didn't yet look at the LinkedIn page, but I read the small description. This person wants to put cybercriminals behind the bars and only talks about that. Very interesting. I'm not sure what kind of emotions that brings in me. What do you think?

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan? I note that this does not really give any idea if he understands what gTLD policies have to do with this. The other - and cyber security does. It's relevant to our work as well so it's not impossible either. Monika?

Monika Zalnierute: No it's not impossible, but it seems to me at the end this person says that it's vital to be on the cutting edge of what's going on with the Internet and crime. So that's the - yeah, it's not very - maybe we can ask for something more specific. I'm not sure.

It doesn't necessarily does not fit, but it just - the weird explanation maybe that the person is mostly interested in crime and chasing criminals via ICANN somehow. I have no idea, but maybe let's ask for more information. What do you say?

Joan Kerr: I agree. I think we should ask for more information and how his experience will help with policy making maybe.

Tapani Tarvainen: And I think we should ask again specifically how he thinks that the gTLD policies are relevant to this and how it intends to have that work on those. So - because that's what we do and not cybersecurity in general. Okay, so asking for more information.

Next (Carlos Alberto Diaz Way) from Peru. And his interest statement is in Spanish so I'll have to look at Google translate again. I want to have more experience and have more knowledge as part of women in politics of which I am a member, establish relations and interinstitutional agreements, so cooperation in knowledge, also share experiences.

And no LinkedIn page. There's a reference - (Sylvia Rosa Way). Do we know here - (Sylvia Rosa Way)? Is that our member? So at this point I'm guessing she's bringing her husband in. May be wrong. Or brother, yes, or

something. Anyway, are we satisfied with this information or want to ask for more? Monika?

Monika Zalnierute: Maybe more, I don't know, to establish interinstitutional cooperation?
That's what it says, yes. Joan, what do you think?

Joan Kerr: I think we should ask for more information on how they want to accomplish that. Can you just read it again, please?

Tapani Tarvainen: I guess I can just cut and paste (unintelligible).

Monika Zalnierute: And it says something about women in politics but that is a man applying.
Usual.

Tapani Tarvainen: So I just cut and pasted to chat Google translation of (Carlos Alberto Diaz Way). So it is simply too brief in my view at least. And I think I get the feeling you agree. So what do you think? Shall we ask for more information?
Monika.

Monika Zalnierute: Yes, Monika for the record. I agree we should ask for more.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, that's what we'll do. The usual – please explain your interest in the gTLD policies. Good morning (Martin). Welcome to join us. You're not a member of the NCSG ExComm actually so you don't have to be here but you're welcome.

Next we have (Oliana Sula) from Albania. And in the unusual category, employed by or a member of a large non-commercial organization and it is too complicated or I lack the standing to get my organization to join on an organizational basis. I do not see indication of what that organization is, which is a bit of a problem.

The interest statement looks – my research interests are cybersecurity, education, retail skills, retail literacy, social media literacy. I lecture as well ethics and business where I have elaborated a course in such a way related to business with cybersecurity, cyber crime and cyber security issues. My Ph.D. thesis is about online networking competencies for young people where I map retail skills for millennials and its (unintelligible).

So apparently an academic. But I think (unintelligible) we have a rule of this too complicated thing that we have to ask what that organization is.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Otherwise actually I have no problem with this. Shall we do that?

Joan Kerr: Yes. Joan for the record.

Tapani Tarvainen: And Monika said yes with her mic off. So please Maryam, a request, please tell what that organization is and do we want to ask something else actually or are we satisfied with interest statement otherwise? Okay so Joan or Monica do you want to ask something else?

Joan Kerr: I don't want to ask something else of this person but I'm just wondering if we should be in the letters or the note when we're asking is maybe put a definition of what NCSG is and - because we don't want to be doing two or three times.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes and for this particular point we already asked (Martin) way back to put in the application form that whenever they take this, it will ask for that organization but it hasn't happened yet. Oh well. But so we'll just ask the organization at this time, yes.

Okay, next (Hosam Kabi) from Tunisia. There is a lot more information here. Let's have a break, read them quickly. I note that there is also a Web site,

the International Institute of Debate, which sounds very appropriate for ICANN, but it's a name but I can't find any more information about it. So have you had a look? Opinions on (Hosam Kabi)?

Joan Kerr: Looks good to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Joan. Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: I agree. This looks actually a very perfect fit for us. So approved pending Robin and Poncelet later.

Next (Sharon White), United States. Very little information. "I would like to ensure the civil liberties of all people of the world." Yes, so would I but - so Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I don't know. Again more information or just reject. Doesn't say anything.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes I agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: So ask for more information. The standard question of please explain your interest in gTLD policies. Maryam are you following this? Okay, Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes, if they don't have a Web site, do we specifically ask them for one or please provide a Web site if you have one?

Tapani Tarvainen: It depends on the category they are in. There are two categories of - three categories of individuals. And this particular one they're using is one that does not require a Web site.

Yes if they don't have a Web site or LinkedIn or anything else then we'll have to ask for more details. That's what we've been doing all along. We don't really require any of them. Not everybody is on LinkedIn or anything but some explanation.

But moving on, (Guputso Maguro). Now I'm sure I mispronounced that horribly, but that was - a Ph.D. student interested in community Internet networks. He also register and develop Web sites and there is a LinkedIn page. Opinions? Have you had time to take a look?

Monika Zalnieriute: Monika for the record. What does it mean, register and develop Web sites? That's non-commercial or not?

Tapani Tarvainen: That sounds like the usual side business of IT students, so building Web sites further so I'm not holding that against him at least in the strongest, looking at the – it seems that she is a student (unintelligible) university here actually. Chances are he's around for this meeting or was in that outreach. Community informatics researcher. So seems to be academic or wanna be academic, maybe is a student. So...

Joan Kerr: I'm okay with that, yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: So let's approve her, again pending Robin and Poncelet later. Next is (Mark Elkins), South Africa, who is actually a member of the DNSSEC Program Committee. Recommended by Avri Doria and (Andrea) (Unintelligible) referring to them and seeing this as an interest into Internet governance. No LinkedIn page but there is a Web site.

Monika Zalnieriute: Sorry, where do you see the Web site? Monika for the record.

Tapani Tarvainen: Displayed in that – which column is that? Let's see... There is no actual link. It's written down. You have to cut and paste the URL for that. Elkins.nom.za. At least for me that Web site gives a lot of SQL errors, so not all that

competent Web site manager but that's not the issue for us. Doing some teaching stuff from there apparently. So opinions?

Monika Zalnieriute: I'm okay with that if others agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Okay with it too.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we are approving (Mark Elkins), pending Robin and Poncelet? I see he sent through this invoice here twice but that's technical error or his, I'm not sure, because we've seen this before. But keeping the second one, we don't have to him twice.

Then we have (Pamela Soloen) from South Africa. An upcoming ICT entrepreneur. Would like to learn more about Internet and engage more people from my community. Recommended by (Unintelligible) which is a bit strange that - well maybe - well any case, opinions?

Monika Zalnieriute: More info or reject.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan? Yes and - that description would almost qualify for rejection on the fly but he might - or she might have some non-commercial interest. We don't have a categorical exclusion for entrepreneurs if they do have also non-commercial interests but it does not tell anything. So what, so let's ask, okay? So please explain your non-commercial interest in the gTLD policies.

Okay, next (Itaway Macanjula) from Nigeria. I currently work with the Nigerian telecommunications regulator. A member of the Nigeria Intergovernance Forum Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group. I want to be an individual member because I'm interested in the Internet policy-making process and I want to make personal input to develop policy that governs the Internet. Comments?

Monika Zalneriute: Monika for the record. Well sorry, perhaps that's not the right place. Individual member because Nigerian telecoms regulator would not be a member of NCSG, would it? So either the usual more information or reject. That's my sort of understanding of it.

Joan Kerr: I think reject.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. A single vote for rejection is enough, so we reject. (Unintelligible) basically.

Monika Zalneriute: It strangely feels so good because for the first time we reject somebody that looks outright unqualified to be here, but then we always ask for more information, so...

Tapani Tarvainen: Well of course even when we reject they can reapply with a new story. But we have to tell it.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Tapani Tarvainen: We should?

Monika Zalneriute: I think we do. In this case we can just put it seems that you work with a - you know, a governmental agency.

Tapani Tarvainen: We might actually - we might even put as a bit of a special explanation that in case of a people working with telecommunication regulators or the like, we only approve in exceptional circumstances when their individual interest is clearly distinct. We understand that because that's a very difficult scenario when we have members from that kind of place.

It's not an absolute criteria that where people work may have nothing to do with their personal interests but in especially in the case of regulators, we are

very cautious about that. So drop him. Response that we do not generally accept tele regulator employees unless there is some reason why their individual interests are really unrelated to that.

Okay, moving on. (Enrico Calandra) from South Africa, who has a strong interest in Internet policy being an Internet policy researcher. And the specific interests are access development, human rights. Reference is (Andreat Estrahousen). And there is a LinkedIn page too.

Monika Zalnieriute: Monika for the record. Is this (Andreat) from the (ABC)?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Looking at her LinkedIn page, this is an academic senior researcher in Cape Town University. Opinions? Joan?

Joan Kerr: Seems okay to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: So do I. This looks good, so approved pending Robin and Poncelet later. And I see that she also appears twice in the form. I guess that's a technical issue.

Then we have (Muriel Alapini) from Benin is from (newcome) original program. And she says, "I want to be a member because I'm an African woman passionate about Internet governance and I want to work for and with the community to prove and help on the Internet use." That's all we have there so okay e-mail her. Just put no LinkedIn page, no Web site or anything, no reference. So...

Joan Kerr: More info. Ask for more information.

Tapani Tarvainen: Monika.

Monika Zalnieriute: I agree with Joan.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay so we ask for please explain your interest in the gTLD policies as usual. Although on the face of it I suspect she might be good but information is too thin on the ground.

Okay, then we have (Shalgot Sabiroff) from Kazakhstan. He's involved in the Internet community of Kazakhstan over 12 years, since 2008. Worked on the draft laws for property, copyrights, freedom of media, Internet governance, ISPS regulation and ccTLD development Kazakhstan. And one of the references is Joan Kerr. So Joan perhaps you can tell what you know about him.

Joan Kerr: So he had applied before for NPOC membership as an organization and was rejected based on the fact that he was sort of an association – or perceived as, which he has gone through great lengths to tell me that he's not.

So I said to him, if you're very interested, why don't you join NCSG as an individual and get to know the stakeholder group. But he's doing some pretty amazing work in his country and helping with social Internet issues and stuff like that, so that's why I told him to apply.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, LinkedIn page tells that he is the president of Internet Association of Kazakhstan. I know from the past we don't have a problem with ISOC chapter members. That's also not what we do so this is not a problem.
Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: So Internet Association of Kazakhstan would be a chapter of ISOC?

Tapani Tarvainen: I am not quite sure actually. That's my guessing.

Monika Zalnieriute: So that might as well be a business association, no?

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. That was the problem we were having in terms of approving him for NPOC.

Tapani Tarvainen: But as noted...

Joan Kerr: Just for the record I did tell him to please state his non-commercial intentions.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, when you look at what he describes as his interest here, this kind of work does fit with our (purview) but it's a bit unclear what level he does that. And of course on the other hand in some countries like Kazakhstan there's non-commercial - steady work is sometimes a bit complicated. So - well, and he's around here by the way.

Woman: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: I actually invited him to come to this meeting but he may have missed it.

Joan Kerr: Might I say something? I did ask him to please specify the non-commercial aspects of the organization, and I don't think he adequately did it here. So if we could ask him to specify and to focus on that more info. But he is doing some substantial work in his country. But, you know, we have to know what he does that's non-commercial.

Monika Zalnieriute: I agree with Joan, it's just hard to know, you know, working on drafting laws on intellectual property copyrights, that might - you know, on which side of the game? Nobody knows.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we'll give him a chance to explain himself more. I wish he would have come here, you know, but... Actually if you do bump into him around here, talk to him and fill in what... I'd say if we don't have a consensus of approving him anyway, so postponed pending more information.

Then we have (Abacad Hussain Adum). This gives a long interest statement. Take a moment to read that. I'm noting (unintelligible) points out he's participated in several forums (unintelligible) ISOC Chad, IGF Chad Youth, IGF Chad. Organizer and ambassador of Youth IGF. Gentleman reporter of (access) (unintelligible) and focal point.

Trading workshop on resident DNS infrastructure and DNS security and DNSSEC concepts. Working with the (NSEC) task force in Chad. Past president. That's more like (SSSAC) or something but, so opinions?

Monika Zalnierute: Monika for the record. I think this is as good as it gets.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes, I approve.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, agreed. I will approve as well, so approve pending Monika and Joan - Robin and Poncelet later, correction. And that was the last new individual (unintelligible) directly, right?

Let's move to new organizations. We have three applications and one of them is more than a bit unusual. Okay, let's look at the first one – International Centre for Leadership Development Nigeria. And you have to click on the applicant to get more information on that.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Tapani Tarvainen: I see three, but let's... First do you see the International Centre for Leadership Development Nigeria?

Woman: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay let's look at that. They have a Web site which doesn't work. Am I seeing the same? Is anybody getting the Web site to work? That is pretty much a rejection grounds. Web site must work because otherwise we don't know what they are.

So let's drop them a note that please let us know when you fixed your Web site and we'll reconsider because we need to see what the Web site is like – unless there's an obvious typo or something that somebody can pick up, but Maryam?

Yes, okay, seems there's simply a typo in the address but can we trust that guessing what they're doing? So I would rather tend to say that please clarify if this is your Web site.

Woman: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Instead of have to guess and then it's not totally obvious. It's kind of bad for us to make a decision on that basis. So...

Monika Zalnieriute: Sorry, Monika for the record. But is it just that it doesn't display to me or something or these organizations did not fill the country or stated mission or how funded or size? That's all empty. So they didn't fill it in or maybe it's a mistake because it's strange that the three of them would not fill anything. I'll ask Tapani. Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, sorry, I missed that.

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes, so just a question. So all of these three applications, applicants did not list the four questions, like country, stated mission, how funded or size or is it a mistake in our system?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes they are not displayed in the summary page and that is a mistake in our system. If you click it open you'll find that.

Monika Zalnieriute: Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: But for the first one there is an obvious typo in the Web site. But guessing that even though it is really obvious it's a bit questionable. Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam for the record. If you search for International Centre for Leadership Development Nigeria, it will take you to the correct Web page. So there's a typo obviously. There's an I missing from the beginning of the URL.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay I guess that's sufficiently obvious typo that could live with it. I see, yes. Can you find the Web site now, adding I in the beginning? Opinions at this point? And did you find the...?

Monika Zalnieriute: Yes I have a question on that. Maybe it's a cultural sort of distinction how these organizations are described but for me it's not clear what this leadership development means because it is registered with Corporate Affairs Commission. So it is business then.

Maryam Bakoshi: That's where every company is registered, so whether you are non-commercial or not you have to be through the CAC.

Tapani Tarvainen: Not only companies but organizations.

Maryam Bakoshi: Organizations, anyone has to register through that.

Monika Zalnieriute: Okay, thank you for clarification.

Tapani Tarvainen: So what do you think?

Joan Kerr: The funding, it says sponsors and donors who...

Tapani Tarvainen: Should we ask for summary of what kind of donors they are? Because it could be just a shell doing everything or it could be individual members. We would like a bit more detailed explanation of that. I guess you're right, Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes and Felix Iziomoh, he is an NCSG member, so he's a contact person there as well. So is anybody - I don't know if he is in the meeting or – Felix? Do you know Felix? Okay, he's an NCSG member so obviously he's part of the organization.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay does that change our view here?

Monika Zalnierute: Well overall this looks then good to me. We can ask for sure about the funding if we're - you know, if we really want to. Or let's say on the condition that your funding is this and this we approve or whatever.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm not quite sure we formally can do so that we approve if. We have to ask and then approve it.

Monika Zalnierute: Okay, okay, I agree. Then let's ask especially the word for Joan. She represents NPOC.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay so the questions we want to ask did we get your Web site correctly because you mistyped it apparently. I guess we did but we have to just ask. I think that's something we formally would go to ask always that we cannot rely on that kind of guessing if there is an obvious error in the application that is correct.

And then clarify your funding sources that how much of it comes from what type of like commercial companies, governments, individual members about (unintelligible), some kind of (unintelligible). So please clarify a bit your funding, okay. Next we have (Mushtarak).

Monika Zalnieriute: So I opened the Web site and you have to translate but there is nothing. It says "book chair, book hall." Looks like a sort of a library, little room, reading room for rent. I have no idea. Give me your opinion.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan? I get a lot of stuff in that Web site but it's all in Arabic which I don't read.

Monika Zalnieriute: But what else do you see? Like do you press on these book chair, book hall? Oh it doesn't translate to you? You can just press...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes it says contact form and... Yes, it does look pretty empty.

Monika Zalnieriute: No. At least personally I don't see much.

Tapani Tarvainen: You look at the stated mission. (Mushtarak) is a co-working space where informal community of techies from varying backgrounds and interests meet. (Mushtarak) is a space that organizes events and hosts community-run events by different tech groups and initiatives.

(Mushtarak) hosts a wide variety of events from workshops and using wikis, etcetera, etcetera. So a collaboration space but how does that relate to GNSO policies is unclear to me. Opinions?

Joan Kerr: I don't have it on my page.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well anyway, Monika. So that gets your point on (Mushtarak).

Monika Zalnieriute: I am not convinced.

Tapani Tarvainen: Shall we ask for more or reject?

Monika Zalnieriute: I don't know, maybe Joan can say her opinion's stronger on this issue. I would perhaps reject. I don't see how this - and it doesn't even say that it's

like a non-profit space. Like it could be a space for rent as well. It's not just clear what it is.

Tapani Tarvainen: So Joan?

Joan Kerr: I agree we should reject.

Tapani Tarvainen: So flat out reject. Okay. The third one I find rather strange because (Unintelligible) has been NCSG member since forever. And representative here is a young man kind of recently joined. I'm not sure what he's messing up here. So we'll drop this as superfluous because if he is already a member. I'll have a talk with (Jessie).

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam for the record. Joan do you remember the conversation (Raul) had? And if this is an NPOC – just to be sure – it is an NPOC application. So basically what he wants - yes it's an NPOC application. So he wants this guy to represent – (Jessie) to represent NPOC – or sorry represent EFF in NPOC.

Tapani Tarvainen: EFFI.

Maryam Bakoshi: EFFI, yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: But ICANN confirmed that EFFI board has not approved this thing and I would recommend that NPOC does not approve it either until I get back to them.

Maryam Bakoshi: Right, okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: But in any case for NCSG point of view, it's superfluous and we will ignore it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay cool.

Tapani Tarvainen: And then let's go to technically it's in that rejection but discard as superfluous. It's duplicate. I'm not sure if we can make a technical difference for everyone. We have had these duplicates before. We just discard them so it's not technical. But... the rejection. I'm not sure but we have basically just dropped those. We have had old members applying before.

Maryam Bakoshi: Old members joining another constituency?

Tapani Tarvainen: That's something we do not discuss. That's up to the constituency.

Maryam Bakoshi: To do, okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we do not take a position here for NPOC, whatever they are doing.

Maryam Bakoshi: For NPOC, okay, great.

Tapani Tarvainen: But for NCSG point of view, this is superfluous and we'll discard it.

Maryam Bakoshi: Cool, okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, let's see, we have pending applications. We have some (unintelligible). Let's go back to individuals and pick up the category or status pending. You can find that. We have a surprising number of those too. Okay. Now Maryam I'll have to ask you if they get any detailed replies for these.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: (Freddie Manilung), any replies?

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam for the record. So on the screen you see the responses from (Christopher), (Yoseph), and (Sareb).

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay like going in order from (Freddie Manilung) we got no response so we drop him. Then we have (Yoseph Abugratarif). Did we get response from him?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes he's the second one – second response on the AC room screen.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. He's an ISOC Chad member. So opinions? (Unintelligible) why am I not seeing it. Okay, in the middle of the screen you see (Yoseph) reply, the Adobe. Opinions? Wants to join the group because it's a non-commercial one. That's good.

I can show ideas and experiences. That's also good. As a member of ISOC Chad I've written several activities in DNS area and was a Webmaster by background and need some experiences to achieve our goal. We as non-commercial organization ISOC Chad. We had an ICANN (unintelligible) in 2016, how the group would help me.

I know that we had some ISOC chapters as several members as well but this is an individual application. This sufficient for us Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: I think he answered the question.

Tapani Tarvainen: So you approve.

Joan Kerr: Yeah.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, let's approve him pending Robin and Poncelet later. (Saraba Dubi) from India is next. Also a reply in the screen as you can see.

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam speaking. (Saraba) is an ISPCP member, so that's a no.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay is an ISPCP member, so that's a clear grounds for rejection without any further discussion. And then (Mohammad Slimustafah). Oh please reply to her explaining that that's one of the main rules that you can't belong to two different constituency or stakeholder groups.

So (Mohammad Slimustafah) is also up there, the first one on that Adobe screen. That reply is rather brief. But there is a LinkedIn page. Trying to find out that LinkedIn page because from that PDF it doesn't work.

Okay how we have a LinkedIn address. Let's take a look. Independent Consultant, (QFIG) Africa. Not all that much information here but nothing suggesting much of a commercial interest either. Opinions this is satisfactory or...? Otherwise did you get the LinkedIn page open? Meantime my original interest statement which is kind of curious.

"My interest in Internet governance is working together in bringing control to the propriety from hackers, fight against cybercrime and (unintelligible) knowledge of good use in the Internet."

Now that we have the LinkedIn page in the Web form as well we need that up here. Yes, that's kind of - it was for less than a year. And now just coordinator for Youth IGF Africa, which is reasonably non-commercial I think. So opinions? Monika?

Monika Zalnieriute: I think sounds good enough.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes I think it's - I approve.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, approved pending Robin and Poncelet later. Next (Rod Harumfu) from Mauritius. No reply. Actually, do we have any of the others have any replies?

Maryam Bakoshi: No.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we drop – we're just reviewing, listing them. (Rod Harumfu), Mauritius, and there's (Timothy Tabotabo) from Cameroon. And these have replied? (Sayad Mohammad Sajak), also no reply. Vrikson Acosta, he reapplied and we just processed him as a new applicant. (Gordon Adams), United States and no reply apparently.

Maryam Bakoshi: No (Gordon) these are the new ones. Remember we have the – when he moved from new to pending it would come under the...

Tapani Tarvainen: Oh yes, so this is this. Okay, so we have reviewed all the independent applicants then. Do we have any replies from organizations?

Maryam Bakoshi: None.

Tapani Tarvainen: So there are no pending organizations providing replies. Okay that's it for membership applications. Okay what is next on our agenda? Look at the election stuff next or...

We have actually quite a lot of things to do with the election but one thing we should do first I think is try to establish a timetable what we need to get done when. We don't need to have it by date, just get the first draft rough idea.

We want to have the names, the elections completed by mid-September at the latest I think. Maryam do you know if we need to have them earlier? What's the date likely to be the deadline when we need to know about travelers for example? When is that? The way we do this is work backwards, what, from the final deadline.

Okay but roughly what we do is from that deadline one week back will be when we want to have the election results out, just to play it safe. I expect that will be around first week of September. And before that we have two weeks voting period.

Some time to allow for candidates to write their candidate statements. That doesn't belong. After no more than a week. Then combination period like two weeks at least. And (quick) contact brings us to the beginning of August.

And before that we have to process the member check-in, activity check. We should get that started as soon as possible but realistically I think late July is the very last when we have to start sending messages out.

We're waiting for a reply from (Sistopia) contract if we can get it started. And this point I will think we will authorize Maryam to get it done if (Martin) says it's ready to go.

I will try to be online. I'm on vacation on the next two weeks but I will look every now and then and everything else. So Maryam you communicate (Martin) and if there is anything on - if it's obvious that okay (Martin) says this is easy, I understand it works, you give him a go-ahead. If it's uncertain, wait for me. I will not be offline more than five days at a time anyway.

Then we have some number of issues regarding the elections that have been discussed in the election reform mailing list which I trust you all are on. Let's speak to current discussion. We will not have a resolution for that at this time but I would like to have your views on what we can do about the "none of the above" as per our current charter.

The political decision and what was desirable, that is something we have to discuss with the membership at large. But the legality of it, how much we can stretch a charter, is something we can (unintelligible). Monika, you're a

lawyer. What is your take? Yes, Section 44 as well but 43 is the complicated one.

Monika Zalnieriute: So I've been trying to read it from many different perspectives and we discussed it yesterday with Tapani as well. But I'm not entirely convinced of the interpretation that must assign the votes must mean that every voter must vote for the least number of available seats because that sounds pretty weird.

Looking back at the context and the surrounding sections it seems to me that this was introduced as to say that if you have more - let's say the organizations have more than one vote, for each they have to just assign them all for the same candidate, that the votes cannot be divided.

It looks very weird though that this was also stated to the first one with the individuals because they have one vote. So it looks weird to say that you must assign the one vote for each candidate.

It makes sense where it's two or three or four, whatever. But it doesn't really make sense for one. So I don't know. I talked with Robin. She said that this was precisely their intention to make sure that the votes are not divided. And I'm not entirely sure how, you know, what exactly the intention and whether this is relevant what they intended or not.

But I'm not entirely convinced that this means that I have to vote, that if there's three seats that I have to vote for the three candidates, you know, like that's the difference. I think that as for the organization, it says that if I have two votes each or let's say four votes each, all it says is that I have to assign four votes for each of the candidates, not two and then another six for another.

That's my sort of understanding of it. But I would say it's pretty fuzzy. The language is not clear. And for me it would appear that the one section above it says that the executive committee designed the system or whatever. So

according to my understanding – because it's not very clear – it is for us to decide how in fact we should run this election system.

That's sort of my legal understanding of it because it doesn't give precise instructions. So at the end it seems to me that it is for us to decide how it should be spelled out for - you know, for clarity and for once and for all.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Of course in the end it's for us to interpret this but we have to get an interpretation that fits their given text here.

Monika Zalnieriute: I agree with that, yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: That part you mentioned that is against splitting votes, that is clear that organization voting for two or four votes cannot split those. But the other part, when you look at the individuals, the only way I can read that is that they indeed should have – they basically have to cut both (unintelligible) candidates out of the pool of however many. I don't see any other reading of that.

And for organizations that interpretation is also consistent with that. I'm not sure you say it's strange/weird but it is a viable way when you have say three seats and five candidates and you have to have what three candidates. I don't find that unreasonable enough to reject on the base that it's being weird.

And I can't read this – especially the individual case – in any other way. I can say we could read it so that whether we could allow abstention there, how much touching what that would be then. But I do not really see how we can allow people to vote for more than - more candidates than there are seats for in any way, even in the approval of (unintelligible). We can clarify these rules, try to interpret them, but we can't override this.

Monika Zalnieriute: No I don't suggest we override anything, but there is nothing to be overridden because it's not clear what it means. That's my sort of understanding of it. It's not exactly clear whether it talks just about the division of votes or whether it talks about anything else because it doesn't say in these provisions anywhere else how - and it doesn't say anything about the extension or not just like you say.

So that's what I mean it's up for us to sort of make the system sort of more clear. But I don't think it prescribes or as you say anything to be overridden because as I'm looking at it, it's not clear what exactly the system or the ballot should look like. It doesn't indicate that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay I guess we'll have to wait for more discussion and get even more legal opinions before this thing.

Woman: Just to ask a question, when do we have next upcoming elections?

Tapani Tarvainen: Just discussed it. Weren't you listening? It should be starting end August. So the rough timeline which will be adjusted when we hear when we have to have the results is that we start nomination period in August, beginning of August, less than two weeks.

Then one week for candidate statements. Then two weeks for election about last week of August and results at the end of the first week of September. That's the tentative timeline which we'll have to adjust as we - it's counting backwards from when we need to have the results which we don't know yet but that's the tentative timeline.

And that means that we should get the member check-in process started in July. It has to be completed by the beginning of the voting, so it will have one month for that. But ideally we should get it done before the nomination period even starts. But technically limitation is the beginning of voting.

Monika Zalnieriute: So my - if I can express one concern – because it would appear to me that whatever we would decide and especially if we choose something like we propose, that we're going to get a big backlash like we did last time during the election process when we did design the nota in some other way that was desirable by the NCC people, like when they did the petition and all that.

So I just wonder how we go about this because if we design the system that is for example it requires people to vote three whatever - if we have three seats to vote for three candidates, you know, something that you propose, that we're going to get all this backlash and how do we deal about this because we don't want to again have interrupted elections with all these petitions and all that.

So I just wonder how do we address that? Maybe then me and Robin could try to contact the constituency before that. I don't know. Like what are your views on this? Because I know pretty sure that if there will be no nota, we're going to have a backlash.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes well that's the very reason I set up this election reform mailing list and we are trying to fight it out there and try to find some kind of consensus among the interested people from the membership. And Robin is there as you know and you are there and so you follow the discussion.

And we'll try to hash this out now we have a month and a half or so to go. And we'll try to find out all the - even actually I believe that the charter was mostly written by Avri Doria. I will have to ask her what's her take on this. So we'll have to work some kind of a consensus.

Actually we have to have full consensus of the executive committee on this. If we don't, then we'll have a sort of Constitutional crisis about the election. But for now we try to keep it moving in the election reform mailing list.

So at this point we have no further agreement on this I think and we don't need to but that's where we'll talk about it.

I want to point out that we have lots of - some other concerns that I also posted earlier into the election committee, the election reform mailing list. If you look at the May archives there's only one message.

Monika Zalnieriute: Right, Tapani, could you send a link to this mailing list so that I share it with people that they can register on that?

Tapani Tarvainen: I sent it to the NCSG (discuss) a while ago, I can just when we are starting this. But I'll put it in there. Okay I put the link to the one message I want to highlight now in the Adobe room. Beginning of that is actually less urgent but what I wrote earlier, the number of things we should be doing.

For example, who is doing that? Elections are the responsibility of the chair with the AC oversight. But if the chair is a candidate, should we delegate that task to someone else?

And there are some limitation rules, particularly with the eligibility rules are fairly clear but the regional balance and gender balance rules are not. In case there are borderline cases we should try to work out details.

For example when regional balance - we should make reasonable effort to ensure regional balance and to the maximum extent possible there should be no more than two of any region.

So I take this, I would think something along the lines that if there is a tie in the outcome at least that resolves it so the less - underrepresented region gets it.

But in the case of say there is only one from every region - somehow that should be even situation. Okay, particular case that some region would get

two seats and one would get none, is that enough to override that less represented region gets it even if the more votes go to the one from the more represented?

So I'm not proposing actual solution here but this is something we need to work out. I'll put it on the mailing list and actually here in this election reform list. We'll be moving onto this.

And gender balance likewise. As it says again that we should try to get gender balance. In general I think that we would read it that this fits. A tie case at least would favor the underrepresented gender even in the minimum requirements (unintelligible) met so we get the three/three from that way.

But under no circumstance clause is rather strong language. And if there are not enough candidates to make it even possible, what can we do? We can either say we can't do what's impossible or we could do even like if we extend the nomination period forever until there is or something to that effect. So that's kind of possibilities.

And again if it turns out that there is a tie that can't be resolved by either gender basis or regional basis, which shall we prefer? I'd like to come up with a nice rule that covers all these borderline cases so we don't have to deal them after the fact if it happens because that's ugly when we know who the candidates are and then deciding the rule which supplies this. So we should have rules addressed.

So we'll have to go through these things. And one more thing which not actually mentioned here – oh yes it is – somewhere in the voting process I have an item that if an organization is represented it was also an individual member, can they vote in both roles?

This has come up a number of times before. There is nothing against it in NCSG rules. And it has happened. We have precedent that we have been doing it this way.

I actually had a little talk about this, how this applies to GNSO operating procedures which had this clause somewhere – (62, 6D) for reference. Not legal or natural person should be a voting member of more than one group. And group is defined as either constituency or stakeholder group.

I talked about this interpretation of this with a number of ICANN staff -- Amr, Marika Konings, and Mary Wong -- and they all tend to agree that this is not as hard as it sounds because we could not apply it literally.

I make three cases here just for reference. First is that we cannot read this meaning that no person can be a voting member in both NCSG and its constituencies because our charter actually requires them. And those rules have been approved by the board and whatever else (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Tapani Tarvainen: So there it simply doesn't apply. We (unintelligible) domain that is not binding in a case where it doesn't make sense. As for the question at hand that individual member and organizational representation, the reading that the voting member would be the organization as an individual, so there is no conflict there.

I'm told we already have run out of time as it were. So I'll note that I'll bring this issue up on the election reform list and explain these issues there. But that's something we have to clarify. Basically the response I got from Mary Wong that we can do it a number of ways as long as we are clear what it means (unintelligible) interpretation.

And this means we don't have time for our last item, constituency review, so - and, Joan?

Joan Kerr: I just have a question regarding constituency review. Can we submit an updated version? We've already - we have additional information.

Tapani Tarvainen: Of course. From the last item I just point out that we simply – if we got to get a response from Rafik and I spoke briefly with Ed and we just moving on they will be working on those procedures and will get back to them later.

But the constituency review we'll have to postpone. We'll try to work on it on the list. But I'm glad to hear that (unintelligible) focus is providing more information so it makes it easier.

And since we are out of time – as we just discovered, late – thank you everybody. Let's close this up. Any other business, anything anybody wants to put on the - into the future or comment, anything? No? Okay, apologies for being confused about the time limit.

I thought we had ten minutes more but - and so did our secretary apparently. But if we don't, thank you everybody. We'll carry on with the items in our next meeting. And stop the recording, thank you.

END