

ICANN

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 3, 2016
11:00 am CT**

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Sam, remote participant, can you hear me?

Sam Lanfranco: Just a minute.

Man: We should all be...

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Tapani, we can hear you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Hi, Maryam.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Good evening. Good morning. Okay so good morning, good evening, good night depending wherever you are. So we actually have - started by having a welcome and introduction and we've been going through the agenda but

haven't (unintelligible) - our agenda for this meeting rather than looking at main meeting agenda yet. So you haven't missed much.

Looking at - well we were looking at the GNSO review and we have a session on the possible GNSO future sessions. We don't know what the possible future sessions (unintelligible) will be so that will be interesting discussion.

Rudi, can you say a word or two about your ideas of the GNSO future?

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: ...everything we've been doing...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...but just a quick of what the idea is.

Rudi Vansnick: The idea is to look into what - based on the review comments and proposals have a look into what are the challenges that are going to come to the GNSO in the future - near future and a long period. Essentially also based on the fact that we have the IANA transition in front of us that is going to request input from the community if things have to change and forget that there are bylaws that are actually going to change at ICANN level and that can impact quite a lot on how we operate.

I think that we need to have a clear view on where do we want to go with the GNSO. Actually what I've seen is that GNSO is rather an operational entity, has no strategy because we are just getting stuff on the table and we are not able to define ourselves what are our objectives for the strategy we have for the next few years. I think that's quite important in order to be able to produce

policy that fits in the future. And it's not only fitting in the past. But that's at least what I had in mind when I brought up this topic.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Rudi. So we have an interesting discussion about that then. We will not go into this (unintelligible) constituency level meeting but basically it will be just figuring out what happened before and what to do with it within ourselves.

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: Sorry, just to go back to Slot E. So are we anticipating that CSG will come to the table with a set of ideas as to what they think their futures - the future might be for the GNSO? Do we have a sense if that's the case?

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, Tony sent me over quite late just before my departure of the flight, some slides.

Matthew Shears: Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: And that focuses essentially on more the historical aspect of review and what went wrong, what is not okay. But my view is rather looking into the future. Good to see what's the path and why are we there (unintelligible) today. But I think it's time to look forward and see how we can change things in the future.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the record. My concern is very simple, also based on the last review is that we're using the reviews for internal policy making. I think that is

wrong that the reviews are used to strengthen certain constituencies position or certain other position. And I think that's absolutely (unintelligible).

We need to find a way where we do actually a review based on what would eventually (unintelligible) future challenges, identify then work our way backwards instead of settling old scores or trying to rehash old policies. And I think that is something we really should be aware and use that session (unintelligible) not to rehash. To be absolutely honest, I am ready to hold Rudi if we do a rehash of our (unintelligible) enough of it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so sound like we have interesting discussion. But we don't actually (unintelligible) we do not have any NCSG consensus we are pushing for, we are just disgusting possible futures.

Matthew Shears: Open debate.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. But going other sessions in say Thursday when we had a constituency meeting (unintelligible) we have a reception and then at a Friday we have a meeting with senior staff. And that's still a bit open what we are talking about there but there have been some suggestions that we should be picking up because we will also have to find out who can be available. It's been asked to have somebody from the legal stuff present. I was hoping for Robin to come but...

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: Did I misread that Farzi was going to be joining us at some point in time?

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: I don't know if he will but possibility remains but I understand it's not very likely.

Klaus Stoll: I think David is coming.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: ...what people are there - there's a retreat.

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: I know they'd been there. I didn't know they were still there.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, Klaus for the record. If we are talking one of the items is to consult with ICANN staff and basically to tell them what we think is going wrong or going right. And I think that we should change that not only that we talk to them but they (unintelligible) real opportunity to tell us what they expect from us and what - how we can make that a two-way street and not a one-way street that they really would insist on.

Rudi Vansnick: Well as I sent the mail to Tapani also is - I think what - essentially for newcomers could be interesting is what does the ICANN staff expect from the volunteers. That's what work are we going to do, what the rules, what are the formalities about their expectations from our community so that we can better fit into when they ask for something.

I'm just taking the case of the visa issues and travel issues. It looks like we are - they are not understanding what we ask for. And we don't understand what they are telling us how to do or what to do.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, so basically it has someone - agenda item would be to talking (unintelligible) ICANN staff expects so as volunteers and vice versa so we can work better. And if we want to talk about travel and visa issues we should invite Joseph De Jesus to come and talk to us about that.

Rudi Vansnick: But also Benedetta because Benedetta is in fact our direct contact person. Joseph is at the top but...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: But I think it's Benedetta who knows all the issues that are happening in between.

Woman: She's attending (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah.

Woman: So...

Tapani Tarvainen: But Joseph is in LA and should be able to come to (unintelligible).

Woman: Yeah, I know two more contact persons in - ICANN staff but I have to look up their names. I don't know if they're...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Anyway so the travel stuff is one thing and the general cooperation and how to make sure that we understand what we want from each other. Okay, Robin is joining us.

Matthew Shears: Hello.

Tapani Tarvainen: Welcome, Robin.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Hi.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, other stuff I had in the proposal (unintelligible) I don't think we can (unintelligible) would know that (unintelligible). And I don't think he can be available but remotely he should be possibly.

Matthew Shears: He lives in New Zealand.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I know but we have to check...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...wake him up.

Matthew Shears: I was thinking about the time difference, yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

Matthew Shears: I think seriously if you can pick a particular - identify a specific time we can ask him.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

Matthew Shears: I can't make any promises of...

Tapani Tarvainen: So that's one thing (unintelligible) be interesting for - we do not really have a good understanding of what the ombudsman office can and can't do for us so this is something that - and we have some (unintelligible) yes, Avri.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If we start out by saying really he can't do much of anything and look at it, he can basically put an opinion piece out on something. But more than that I'm not really sure he can.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: That was my response too, yeah.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Matthew Shears: And if he isn't available would Marrakesh be okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: What he is good at - this is Avri again - what he is good at and has helped us with several times is negotiations with like the CSG or with another. So if groups end up - if it was an (unintelligible) NPOC or NCSG and CSG or NCPH and CPH he's good at that and that's certainly within his powers and one of the strongest things he can do.

Rudi Vansnick: But you can never take a decision...

Avri Doria: Yeah, but he can help us take a decision...

Rudi Vansnick: Informing us on what can and cannot be done.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, so check if he can give us a brief presentation and ask some questions and so that's one item. And I guess that would be enough on that. Since Robin is here I want to check (unintelligible) suggested we ask ICANN legal stuff (unintelligible) someone else and so about DIDP processing and how ICANN legal determines if a PDP is within ICANN's mission.

Robin Gross: That sounds great.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we get someone - Adam, can you check with some of the legal (unintelligible) someone else from the legal that would be available to answer...

Adam Peake: Adam Peake speaking. Yes, I will ask and I looked around the office yesterday and I think the whole team is in Singapore. But I will check when they're coming back.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Yeah, yeah (unintelligible) on Friday. I understand that is some of the new (unintelligible). And I don't know who from the staff would be best for talking who wanted to talk generally about what ICANN staff expects from the volunteers and vice versa. If not - nobody else then Adam will be (unintelligible). You might want to ask someone else better.

Adam Peake: Well I think - Adam Peake speaking. I am from the GSE team. And the - Non Contracted Party's House meeting is really about the GNSO and the policy side. So I think it would be more appropriate if we try to find someone from that particular grouping as this is about...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

Adam Peake: ...you know, your work within the GNSO policy or primarily about where you fit within - as constituencies in that GNSO construct. But, yeah, we'll find an answer to it.

Tapani Tarvainen: We'll find someone to talk about that. Okay. Looking further down, let's move on quickly (unintelligible). Interesting (unintelligible) supposed to be cochairing with Greg about third rail issues. And I really don't know what - who will be talking here. The third rail, if I understand correctly is a New York expression for dangerous stuff.

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: It refers to the electrified...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

Matthew Shears: ...get burned.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, so if you have idea so what would be burning issues in that then it's something we'll have to tread carefully about.

Matthew Shears: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: Adam Peake speaking. Did Greg Shatan, who mentioned this raise any particular examples on the call?

Tapani Tarvainen: No. I'll have to get in touch with him but I haven't been able to yet. So Rudi, you have some ideas?

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, we skipped the lunch session.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

Rudi Vansnick: I've been asking for that because we don't know how the meetings might be or are going to be handled and organized in the way that we can still do drop (unintelligible). It's first part is of policy work but the second part is also doing outreach. How does that fit in a four-day meeting schedule? So that's the reason why I've been asking if we could have more input from the meeting team on how are we going to be able to organize ourselves in having meetings in four days while we are normally doing that in six or seven days.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. So we'll see about that. Then we have the final AOB session. We have - if somebody comes up with something we want to bring up in that just let me know in advance and we'll try to (unintelligible). Okay but those are what we will be talking in the next two days so we won't - so then here let's (unintelligible) this meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Adam.

Adam Peake: Sorry, Adam Peake again. Go back to Rudi's point about the meeting arrangements, A, B and C. Was anybody from this grouping a part of the review team that decided on this course? Because this was a community policy, not staff. I mean, staff is obviously is implementing it so you can hear the implementation point of view from the meetings team but it can be equally

important to hear what the rationale for it in the first place was and that would be community members, I don't know who from NCSG was on that particular group. But that point of view may be important.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Adam Peake: Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Marilia, (unintelligible).

Marilia Maciel: I just made contact with (Ed). Apparently his flight was changed again so he's stranded in the airport. But he mentioned (unintelligible) plan for this initial question. He said that he did not talk to (Phil) yet so we need to check with (Phil) what we have in mind. But he said that the idea was to use (unintelligible) came out in the (unintelligible) about the kind of alliance that noncommercial interests had with commercial interests regards - with regards to the not using the URS for new legacy (unintelligible).

And he was saying that the goal would be to say that in the policy sometimes we do not have much in common and to focus more on the (unintelligible) than on the policy discussions that we have because the house structure for policy discussions does not make much sense.

My personal opinion is that although I think that this, this will come in the discussion naturally (unintelligible) way to frame the session because we are kind of regarded from (unintelligible). We do not have anything (unintelligible). This will come up at the end.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Marilia Maciel: We have difficulty to work together but I don't know. I'll try to think about it in talking with him.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay good. Any other comments on this matter?

Matthew Shears: Actually I think - I absolutely agree with Marilia. I think that that is a kind of a negative way of approaching this. And have we, forgive me for not knowing, but have we tried to reach out to the policy entity on the other side to speak and to work with them in the past? I mean, how is that - I don't know so I'm just asking.

And if we haven't then maybe if we know we haven't then maybe it's a good thing to suggest rather than saying we have nothing in common, we should make the effort to try and see if we do have something in common.

Tapani Tarvainen: The (unintelligible) mentioned here is actually an example of when it has happened but it's been rare. So it's a good starting point. We can sometimes have a common interest with them so we (unintelligible) identify them what (unintelligible) with them when they were (unintelligible).

Okay. Okay I think that's enough for the preparation for this.

Matthew Shears: Sorry, Tapani...

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: If those who have - if it would be possible, and people would feel comfortable with it, if those who have received (unintelligible) material for the various sessions from individuals in their house (unintelligible) for the meeting on

Thursday and Friday if they could share them so we could have a sense up front of what's being maybe proposed or discussed that'll be useful.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay that would be good, yes. Okay but that I think (unintelligible) of all the stuff but we'll be talking to him in the future to hear but that was the overview, yeah. Okay let's look at our next agenda item here. This one has been popping in and out and a number of people all over have been raising various concerns here is that funding - the non-commercials by nature, which means also we don't have much money.

So how do we fund this? And funding, for instance, also involve transparency that we don't know how we got funded or how others are funded and so forth. As a brief introductory remark I might say that when I updated my own SOI a while ago and tried to figure out which background organization should I mention here, I represent Electronic Frontier Finland in NCUC and NCSG but they don't actually fund me much because there is not much money to go around.

I work at the university which lets me use working hours for this. They don't fund me otherwise and I don't actually even report back to them other than saying I've been around this - a perk you've let me do to keep me happy rather than something they (unintelligible) so I'm in a rather unusual position here that I'm reasonably independent more or less. I don't have - I'm not building a career there either (unintelligible) so it doesn't really matter for me if I succeed in anything at ICANN or not other than for what I think is useful and what's good.

But mostly (unintelligible) something to get funded for this work so end up doing all kinds of arrangements which may not be so simple and easy. And so I'm (unintelligible) to start with (unintelligible).

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. Sam Lanfranco for the record. I'd like to separate out two things here. One is how individuals (unintelligible) I'm an academic but I'm not here as an academic. I represent (unintelligible) a not for profit organization which doesn't have a penny to fund me for anything. How I survive (unintelligible).

I'd like to separate that out from how do the services and structures of NCSG (unintelligible) an ecosystem within the ICANN (unintelligible) group, how does it fund itself. Where does, you know, are there funds in particular from ICANN that go to segments of that ecosystem? And if there are I'd like to see more transparency around that so we have some idea of where resources are coming from (unintelligible) what.

I happen to know - I talked to Milton and I'm familiar with this as an academic that the NCSG discussion list, which is hosted by Syracuse, is like a lot of the discussion lists that I host for the university simply says do it, we don't care. (Unintelligible). I don't know if that's generally the case, not generally the case but I'd like a little more transparency around sort of how these things - how the various services get supported.

(Unintelligible) we have that as a base to begin making at least intellectual comments or informed comments if not decision making about how ICANN is supporting us or not supporting us. And keep that a bit separate from how we individually participate, right?

(Unintelligible) there if ICANN were a national government some of us may actually end up being a position where we would have to declare ourselves almost - not really but maybe really as lobbyists. It may turn out that we're here in - we're technically under the rules of one government should they say, well you're a lobbyist, now either you're here for goodwill. But I'd like to

keep those two things separate sort of how the ecosystem is begin supported and by whom just so we have a sense of the help there (unintelligible).

And the other one of how individuals, you know, how I get here, who watches my dog when I'm gone, you know, who feeds the animals in the barn. That's a separate issue.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Sam. So we need to get some kind of (unintelligible) with ICANN to figure out so okay...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, you go first.

Matthew Shears: Yeah, I mean, for me the main question (unintelligible) is there - there was a difference between the stakeholders (unintelligible) can support the travel - have interest support the travels. Academia (unintelligible) fine to get support, but not easy. And so (unintelligible) is near impossible to travel to participate without support.

For the first suggestion for me my point of view is that (unintelligible) difference for - to travel from business sector by ICANN, for example, then the civil society can be, for example, (unintelligible) some budget and the larger part of (unintelligible) civil society and academia and the small part of this (unintelligible) stakeholders because the other stakeholders have condition to support themselves. I don't know if this (unintelligible) what's on the table.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: My comment is exactly in your line. I think we really need to make a point now to explain to ICANN look, you have something in your mind, a business model (unintelligible) so called volunteers, which means if the volunteers come from the public sector they're getting paid through an organization; if they're coming from a university, if they're coming from the states, everybody (unintelligible) commercial sector, everybody got the backup.

There is one group in your multistakeholder who hasn't got that option. And you need to find a way to support that troop. Because to be absolutely honest what's happening now is that you can't participate, you can't be a stakeholder (unintelligible) can't afford it anymore. And it's not only to afford it in the sense that you say okay I need money for travel. You are in the position where you spend 15, 20 and more hours a week and you basically having trouble with your job.

I'm not asking for any kind of salary or whatever for ICANN volunteers. But what we ask - should ask for is to say, look, there is a specific situation and please accept that. The first step would be to get accepting that there is a specific situation. And another one that we basically get this as expenses reimbursed for what we actually do.

And I find it extremely, extremely dangerous for the multistakeholder model and also (unintelligible) multistakeholder model (unintelligible) on the ability to pay. The other thing, which I always try to do but I think I'm on the wrong with it because, you know, I do a lot of fundraising in the private sector and things like that with companies. And often I'm getting told, okay, Klaus, if you get ICANN to support - to say that they are like that program (unintelligible) we help you. So I came up with an idea of saying okay, can we do joint fundraising?

But I came - basically I got short shrift from ICANN because ICANN says okay (unintelligible) policies, it's doing this, and that and it's going into the wrong place. But I think really to make long things short, we should first of all, tell ICANN this is our situation and please accept that. And then start working on finding some kind of getting really the expenses - the real expenses reimbursed and certainly to be aware that what we are doing now is very dangerous for ICANN.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, so basically you are pointing out that ICANN should be a democracy and not plutocracy so is how much money you have to...

Klaus Stoll: Exactly...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...only thing determines how much (unintelligible). Of course in some level that's unavoidable. Money speaks and we can't help that but we can try to push for (unintelligible) with less (unintelligible). Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Yeah, Sam Lanfranco again for the record. Another dilemma here as part of this is - as Klaus pointed out, is it's not just funding to get to Point A, it's time. And one of the particular problems that I face inside NPOC is that ICANN's metrics are to say how much - is the constituency participating in the policy development groups, how much is it participating in other things, which is very important but within NPOC one of the dilemmas that I have is that our constituency, unlike say academics with NCSG who are interested because that's what they're interested in, it's what they do, the - much of our constituency is groups whose remit in something else. It's justice, health, development, whatever.

And so we're having to carry on working with them, talking to them, to say this is how this system related to you. And as far as ICANN is concerned, that's - that's not work - that's not ICANN-related work. So we have this extra mandate within our mission basically that does take a lot of time, nobody is asking for, you know, funding help on that. But it doesn't get counted in that metric that ICANN is using to evaluate participation.

Klaus Stoll: Yeah, I guess ICANN's point of view is that, well, that's something you do besides ICANN work because it's (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...later on my part.

Sam Lanfranco: Even when it has to do with ICANN's remit it's not getting somebody out there to be on an ICANN working group but it's dealing with awareness and engagement of them

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so the solution is not to say all the time well can't you use CROP funding.

Klaus Stoll: Yeah, okay. Klaus. Thank you. By the way a reminder do try to state your name when you're speaking so for the record even though...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. So any other comments on this general - this is Klaus - there's been some kind of ideas of what alternative funding models we can go for. Yeah, we go with that then. Okay. It's already 10 o'clock.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Maybe a last point is that actually our constituencies are structured that are not incorporated so you have already an issue of getting funding and being accountable and transparent is an issue that you cannot really solve if you are not incorporated. We're still a group of volunteers organized among ourselves without any legal structure around. And I think that's one of the issues also when you get funding from some corporations or companies or even public sectors, government or whatever, it makes this really difficult because you don't have a real (unintelligible), your (unintelligible) is at ICANN.

Tapani Tarvainen: Right.

Rudi Vansnick: At the end.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Klaus, you're (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Yeah, Tapani, you seem to be closing that topic. And I really would like to know what are the next step. Are we done with that topic or are we going to do something about it? Are we requesting a meeting with ICANN staff to explain what the situation is and to look for solutions or to - is this topic just done?

Tapani Tarvainen: If you have some suggestions I'm open. But the one thing we can do is to bring it up on the Friday session with ICANN staff if we want to.

Klaus Stoll: Yeah.

Tapani Tarvainen: So put that on that. And do we want someone specific from ICANN staff to talk about it? Would you want Xavier explaining us how it's impossible or someone from (unintelligible) who wants to - or someone specific. Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam. I have a comment here because - it's not exactly an answer to your question. But it's prompted by a lot of the work I've done (unintelligible) I've heard discussion in the background about (unintelligible) saying well maybe we have to incorporate, maybe we have to become a registered not for profit. That carries a very heavy administrative burden, the documentation, the tax regulations and all of that.

And I'm wondering, and this I would put to the staff when we meet with them - if there were a way in which ICANN could have part of it that actually does the administrative work so that - because I've done the (unintelligible) this group gets some funding for something but they can't receive funding directly, it goes to this administrative organization that handles the funding and the disbursements and everything and so forth.

So I would - if we can (unintelligible) trying to set up a bunch of NGOs within the constituencies that are basically ICANN NGOs, I would hope we look at alternative models of solving that problem.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes of course, there is the concern here that not - are we part of ICANN or are we independent entities negotiating with ICANN? And...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah...

Sam Lanfranco: ...contract an agency to administer your...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, of course. And also...

((Crosstalk))

Sam Lanfranco: ...for legal purposes.

Tapani Tarvainen: This also applies to the question of funding that the more money we get from ICANN the more dependent we are on them and...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, so this is a concern here. But - but the conclusion here let's try to - we'll talk about this stuff on Friday and I hope Adam can identify somebody from ICANN staff who will want to talk about that or (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: ...have a word with Robin to come up with...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay so that's one issue for Friday. Okay now I will hand over to Klaus, you have some specific ideas about what kind of things we want to look at, right?

Klaus Stoll: No I just want to raise one issue. And sorry if I read a little bit from a...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: ...some piece of papers which I scribbled on the plane over. I really want to highlight something about our policy making. And Sam already mentioned this is what I've come to very unpopular and unsexy topic, quite simply the need for civil society (unintelligible) and capacity building in what we are doing.

Because what - when I'm looking around the table and we mentioned that before, is we all are heavily involved in the policy making and we are at working groups and we are writing comments and we are doing a lot of things and we are taking a lot of space, that is what expected of us.

But I think I want to highlight that there is also another aspect. And when we do more of this, when we're all sitting around and I in our working groups and writing our comments, I think we still have to think about (unintelligible) what is really the authority on which we speak and where - what can we do basically to strengthen that authority and to strengthen civil society authority in the multistakeholder process.

Because the reality is - and I know you heard me saying that 110 times but it doesn't make it less wrong, Internet governance is a country where 99% of the population doesn't know that government even exists. And that is, I think, for us a really really basic problem.

And as we don't have an election-based mandate, if we don't - as we don't - are not people who are voted for, I think we have obligation as a whole, as a group, to really trying to engage and to build awareness and with (unintelligible) those groups in civil society who we call our customers.

And I found that very, very important also, for example, to give you a very straight forward and actual example what we are dealing with. We managed in the last year or group in the (NGAG) managed very very well to get human rights on the agenda of ICANN.

And they did a brilliant job. But it gives the impression and sometimes the end user, the people who are using the Internet and civil society thinks, oh they take it all for granted. That is now something given. Whilst everybody knows that civil rights and human rights are under threat permanently and we have to defend it again and again. And the only thing which really strengthen our policy is if we get this knowledge and we get that awareness onto the grass roots. The same thing with the security and stability; basically everything we are doing.

And to make long, long things very, very short, you know that NPOC made a decision really to go the long haul. That means NPOC said okay, we will try to be part of the conventional policy making as good as we can. But in order to build up a - operational concerns not for profit constituency we need to go the long haul and start with the grass roots and work up which means yes it will take longer to get a large amount of member. Yes, it will take much more resources. But I think it's much more healthier process.

And why I'm requesting to have this session, have this five minutes to talk to you, is quite simply I think we really should think as the NCSG, as the NCUC and as NPOC together to do more of this kind of basic outreach and awareness building because this is what we - what is really strengthening the overall process.

That's all. No more.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you for that, Klaus. Any comments on that? Because it's so conclusive that everybody is happy to have heard it (unintelligible). Okay, Matt.

Matthew Shears: Yeah, Matthew Shears. I think it's - I think that is right. I think that's what we should be doing. I'm just curious to know how you define grass roots? Because when I think of grass roots I think of the broader public. I think of organizations that do polling and surveying and the (unintelligible) like type approach to what I think of as grass roots. So I'd be interested to know what you think of grass roots.

Because if we're talking about other civil society organizations that are interested in some of the issues that we do we do do reach out - outreach to those organizations. So for example, on the accountability and on the IANA transition, there was a lot of that outreach. And some of those organizations are now involved in that commenting on a regular basis. So what's the - where do you draw the line?

Klaus Stoll: Even going lower than that. You know, we did last year the research on the use of NGOs - European NGOs of the DNS. And the (unintelligible) 60% of the NGOs registered to domain name lost if in the first three years of their existence, for several reasons; mainly legal, maybe administrative and things like that. I'm talking about even that level.

We have to - we have - I'm really strictly talking within the DNS. It's not about - it's - there is a huge need, for example, to emphasis - emphasize, for example, to all organizations in civil society and all individuals and in civil society say (unintelligible) is a value for you.

To give you an example of that, Sam is gratefully did something very well on that last year. For example, to say there is, for example, a difference now - nowadays, a lot of civil society organizations are going away and I think 54% or so went away from a domain name base to a social media based - social media based presence for their organizations in Europe. This is, for me, for Internet governance, a very, very big problem because this - they make themselves vulnerable.

They give their right to decide what's on their webpage, how to use their webpage and so on, away to a company. They forgotten what a domain name really, really means for them that the domain name really gives them a voice and it gives - yes it's more difficult but it's important. So to answer your question I'm going even lower than that.

Rudi Vansnick: If I may add?

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Well I think there is a clear result of the lack of understanding by NGOs. Look how many dotNGO (ONG) registrations we have today, a bit more than 2500. This is something I cannot understand why is it so poor in registration because NGOs don't understand the value of a domain name and most of them they are guided to more commercial (unintelligible) because the marketing behind (unintelligible) the other one, the more commercial and stuff, because that's where they played - their playground. And I think that's where we need to do a lot of work to give them understanding why a domain name in itself is more than just a number plate on the Internet.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: It's much more. It's a branding. It's trading your organization on the net is done through a domain name and not through Facebook. And it's because the markets - the industry - the Internet industry is pushing the NGOs in a different way. And I think it's our task to address that. I see now, it's not the commercial way you have to go.

First be present so that you are seen and that it's owned by you, not owned by a third party. Because that's what I see most of the cases, TLDs, the dotOrgs that are lost within the period of one year, two years, three years when you look into it most of the registrations are done on DNS (unintelligible) ABC because an NGO doesn't know that they have to register it with their domain name and not with registrar's one. And that's how many are captured.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Yeah, I want to dig into this just a little bit deeper. And that's that the Internet - the stakeholders in the (unintelligible) system and in the stability and security of DNS (unintelligible) I think of them not just as stakeholders and the ones who have a more technical interest in this of course are there. I think of them as the notion of their citizenship as members of the Internet ecosystem.

We're in the United States the US used to teach, I don't know if they still do, courses in what they called Civics. You went to school and you had a course in civics which was what it mean to be a citizen, how the government worked, so forth. It may have vanished given the way the US is structured now. I don't know. It was both about self interest and responsible citizenship.

And part of what I see my job and the task inside this space (unintelligible) constituency group that I'm in is going out and talking about that. You know,

for example I'm talking about that in the middle of March in Cuba. Cuba is struggling with a whole bunch of issues around the Internet. Its technical people are extremely good. Its hardware is extremely weak. It - so, you know, so it's kind of getting both Cuba in the sense of the government, which is quite (unintelligible) and other groups in Cuba.

Okay what's our stake here and not just in our interest and in trying to help the policy but as citizens (unintelligible) and that goes way beyond what we've been able to reach before. And it - citizenship does (unintelligible) the DNS and some things that Klaus mentioned but that's the - that's the tunnel that I see as we need to drill down and why?

If the multistakeholder model is going to remain legitimate, and if it's not going to have a weak wall where somebody can come after it and say no, no you're an elite group (unintelligible) we have to get out to that larger constituency. They have to at least be aware. And we don't deal with them that's what we, you know, we know it's going on and we support it. If not I'm afraid that ICANN will always have a very weak wall in the edifice of its multistakeholder model.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you Sam. Other comments on this?

Carlos Reyes: Sorry to interrupt. Maryam would just like me to remind you all to identify yourselves for the...

((Crosstalk))

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco.

Tapani Tarvainen: So, Matt.

Matthew Shears: Yeah, Matthew Shears again. I think this is an important issue. But I guess I'm struggling a little bit with the notion that this is a policy issue which is I think the way you characterized it in the beginning. To me this is an education issue. And I think there is a - when I think about ICANN and policy I think about the policy development processes that we're going through, getting that information out, getting people to comment on those policy processes. But I think what you're talking about, perhaps, is a broader educational issue, the importance of understanding the value of the DNS and the importance of the DNS and one's responsibility towards the DNS, et cetera, et cetera.

So I'm not sure that that - I don't know where that fits within this construct as to where that responsibility for that education lies, and whether it lies in this ICANN construct or it lies somewhere, or if it's not already being done in different places. So I think we just have to, you know, we just have to be careful about how we think about where does this responsibility lie. I think it does lie partially with our respective communities, but I think it also lies elsewhere and probably is also being done, I would hope, to some degree.

Tapani Tarvainen: Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco. I agree with you, and that's why - there are two things, two quick things here. The work, you know, the work that I'm doing and others around me are doing is in collaboration with others. It is - there's a common cause there and it's not just an ICANN cause. And it's not asking ICANN for resources just to do that. But it's more than just saying how many people have you recruited for ICANN working groups. That's a long-term goal, but it may not be a short-term achievable.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you. Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the record. To answer your question is straightforward from my opinion. It's like establishing government and then saying all the voters are responsible somehow to connect with it. I think every government has at the same time policymaking reasonability but also the responsibility to enable all those who are - to enfranchise everybody.

And that's why I think it's a coward's way out, and ICANN is taking the coward's way out and saying, "Okay that's not policymaking." It is policymaking, it is in the heart of the DNS and in the heart of ICANN. And my pleas is just simply, as (Sam) said, it is very dangerous if we don't take care of that aspect, not only but also.

And my other plea is that we recognize that what NPOC and other organizations are doing on that front is as important as the policymaking itself because this is what underlines the foundation of the policymaking. Some people are good at that, some people are better than that. I mean - and I think I just - my plea is just for recognition and also for taking things serious.

One more aspect I wanted to mention -- maybe it's wrong if I do that now -- I think for example it's also one of these aspects where for example we are overlapping to the business sector. Because if you think that through, yes there is a huge market in the DNS which hasn't been developed. We don't need new gTLDs and so on, because a lot of people basically are not using the DNS anymore. We have to get a lot of people back into the system. We lost them out of the system. We don't even - you understand what I mean.

Why can't we use that as leverage to talk to the registrars and say, "Hey we see a huge business opportunity." And our interests on that sector and that action to get people back to a user domain name is in both our interests.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. Avri?

Avri Doria: I just want to throw a question in, which is I don't understand why it's in their interest to use a domain name. I don't understand why Facebook isn't as good as a domain name. I definitely think we need to be doing the right thing about domain name policy, because that's what we're here to do, but I'm not sure I understand why we need or want to be the marketers or the helpful marketers of domain names for registrars.

Because that was the one - most of the stuff you've said I've agree with. But the one point at which you said we have to tell them that Facebook is not the place. Why not?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Sam for the record. Whoever said...

Avri Doria: Oh sorry, this was Avri. I'm sorry.

Man: We know.

Sam Lanfranco: Avri, I have not thus far used the word Facebook. So I didn't say it.

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible)

Avri Doria: I thought I heard Facebook. I'm sorry. Okay, I knew I heard it and I had the wrong person. This is Avri. Please forgive me.

Sam Lanfranco: Just to clarify there, there are issues in the not-for-profit sector about data and privacy with respect to Facebook. I mean if you - depending if you're running a service in which your clients are coming to you, you're running a service in which your clients are handing off information (unintelligible). And for an NGO - for a nonprofit organization that's a questionable thing. So there are some issues there.

And in my other work, there's a big bruha going on India -- I'm going to be there in a couple of weeks -- with Facebook mounting a major campaign over Christmas on Internet.org, and the Indians clobbered it, really clobbered it very, very hard. And the Indian regulators are looking at it now. So there are - and it's right on the front page right now in India.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. I thought they had accepted free basic and working with the government of India on it quite, but anyway that's that.

Sam Lanfranco: But the point I'm making is that there are issues around these other initiative that don't belong at ICANN, you're right, but they do belong inside the organizations that we collaborate with when you're dealing with what we're doing. So we're - we get tainted by them but we don't try to drag them inside ICANN.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. João?

João Carlos Caribe: No just a question for Rudi. (Unintelligible)

João Carlos Caribe: Hi my name is João Carlos Caribe. I just (unintelligible).

Man: No my question, speaking about the survey, I looked at - well that's how to look at the Internet can move the NGO to the other side, which other side. Can

(unintelligible) understand you made this conclusion to have a link? This is a publicly accessed...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: We have reports. We can send it out to you.

Man: And share with us?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, yes.

Klaus Stoll: We sent it out and made it available public.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, yes.

Klaus Stoll: And the thing is what it showed for example is -- and Sam gave a wonderful speech in Singapore on that -- you really can quantify how the use of social media is damaging in the long term in NGO, how it reflects in the income, how it reflects in the freedom of speech, how it reflects in the security.

There is of course a good middle way. There is no problem with the NGO having a domain name and a Facebook presence. As long as it's balanced out, it's absolutely no bother. But we should go out and say, "Sorry, DNS has social civil society value, it's really, really a value in it that we really need to bring out more and say and talk about and say, look the DNS is securing your rights." It's not only a need to communicate, it's also a tool which supports your rights.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: A couple things. This is Avri speaking. And I should preface this by saying, you know, I do get paid by PIR sum for seeing .ngo and .ong do well. So when I say we don't have to help them sell their domain names, I might be getting myself in a pickle.

But anyway, I do agree there are advantages, there are social advantages. Now I think at the moment it's very difficult for us to say that ICANN protects their civil rights or their human rights in any sense. I think that's a stretch. I think there's a potential for it that the DNS can be. So I'm agreeing with that, but I think we go a little far when we say we do protect them. I'm not sure that we do.

Klaus Stoll: No I said -- Klaus for the record -- I said it's a tool.

Avri Doria: It's a tool that could be used.

Klaus Stoll: No, a tool that is already being used. It's a tool that's there. You just - it's not ICANN's responsibility to protect civil rights, but by - coincidentally ICANN DNS is something which actually doesn't - the effect is has is what I described. I'm not saying it's the responsibility of ICANN. It just happened that by pure coincidence, or maybe even some (unintelligible), we have a DNS system which enables all these things and is the basis behind a lot of these things.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Klaus. And there's one point I'd like to make also that this is - we are technically part of the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization, and all of this is limited to that. We would ask whether it be ccNSO stuff or whatever or so, or maybe At Large would be more particular, but I will not go in deep in that. Okay, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: This is Marilia speaking. I think you make a good point, but my impression is that this is directly related to the GNSO to the extent that we're reviewing the last new gTLD process and trying to see what we should change for the next one, and thinking that DNS is one way, one of the ways to protect the rights of commercial users and NGOs, I think that there are some things in the process in the last one that need to be reviewed and corrected and addressed, such as the various forms of application for developing countries, the issue of community education. So I do feel that what we are discussing here goes to the heart of (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I believe it does, or maybe even most of it. Okay. Any other comments on this?

Woman: Sorry. So are we talking about policy committee work?

Tapani Tarvainen: No we are moving on there as soon as we...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Because I thought (unintelligible) policy alternative funding model. So.

Tapani Tarvainen: I've been rambling a little.

Woman: Okay. Sorry about that.

Tapani Tarvainen: That's fine. Yes so we get somewhat the impacts of the issues and so forth. So let's move on (unintelligible) unless somebody wants to still saying about the - okay, Klaus (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: I'll ask the same question as last time. Klaus for the record. So what's the follow up on this?

Tapani Tarvainen: So since we already decided to talk to staff about the funding problems, we can bring this same issue if there's something you think or you have something else you want to suggest as a follow up.

Klaus Stoll: For example, do we have a way that NCUC and NPOC (unintelligible) in that area specifically or the NCSG makes it one of its tasks to do (unintelligible) DNS. (Unintelligible)

Tapani Tarvainen: That's actually our final agenda item here, so let's get back to that. Okay, but let's move on to the policy committee work. Farzi, did you have an idea of lead on that?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Actually -- Farzi for the record -- I would like Matt to give us some ideas on...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Yes just give us ideas about how you function on the policy committee, what are the shortcomings and as we discuss also how we can train the next representatives on the policy committee.

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears for the record. So I think we do need to look again at the policy committee. I think we have been successful on a number of issues and probably mostly related to the accountability, from my perspective anyway, from the accountability and IANA work. Much of our responsiveness as a committee has been a little bit last minute on a number of the policy issues that we tried to address.

So I think we need a better mechanism in place for identifying what those policy issues are and agreeing how we're going to tackle them up front, which does involve more interaction with the broader community as well. I'm talking about NCUC and NPOC, for us to be able to understand where our positions on particular issues should be. So we do need to kind of factor that into the timeline for the policy issues.

I am not a very good example of a policy committee member, because I specifically joined with the intent of following the accountability IANA tracks because those are the areas that I'm really engaged in this space to follow and to participate in. So I have not been contributing as much as I probably should have to the other areas of work.

But I think that kind of, from my perspective, highlights a challenge that the committee needs to address. In many ways, we need resources on the committee who can take responsibility for and address policy issues specifically.

So from my perspective in terms of if we're talking about the review of the policy committee, it would be good to be able to identify what the policy issues are in the upcoming period and for people within the policy committee to be selected really to take a leadership role on those particular policy issues and policy areas. I think we can appoint people to the policy committee but we may not have the expertise necessary within the policy committee to address issues that we may have to address within a period of time.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Matt. I see Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri speaking. I have - had the fortune or misfortune to have been on the policy committee since it was started. Now I'm no longer on it, I'm just an observer. I've been kicked off the list. In fact I think I was even semi-accepted as an observer under the rule of previous council members may be invited to stay.

One of the things first of all that the policy committee is allowed in its current definition is an invitation onto the policy committee as observers, any specialist that the policy committee feels is needed. So that opportunity already exists.

The problem with the policy committee that I've seen since day one is that everybody's too busy to ever do it. We've never had a chair, and even when I - and I include even when I was alternate chair, we never had a chair -- and I include you as well -- that was able to pay enough attention to it, that drove it well enough, that kept it organized, that got the work done.

Some have - all the ones that are chairs have had their ups and down, times when they actually got something done. I'm not saying that none of the chairs ever got anything done, but by and large there has not been a consistent chairing effort. And I include us all, you know, and I did hold the role of alternate chair for a year.

So I think that's part of it. I think that what's there is usable. The problem is finding the chairperson who can actually drive it, finding people letting themselves be driven and making them the champions for work getting down. Getting the interpretation out that it's not that they have to do all the work, but they really have to drive the work. And so I think the tools are there but I don't think we're using them. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Avri. As for chairs, not doing everything (unintelligible) policy committee here and there's also when considering the difference of task sharing between the policy committee chair and NCSG chair.

Avri Doria: Those are different chairs. And in fact the charter is very specific that the NCSG chair may not be the policy committee chair. And so when the NCSG chair got forced into that position, that was wrong.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, and even though the NCSG chair's a member of the policy committee ex office here, but the policy committee chair should have the main responsibility in pushing that one. Okay, Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the record. Avri, would it be helpful to implement a system that might be looking like this that you have a group of people which basically are the scouts, scouts meaning people who identify policy issues. Then you have a group of people you can call the experts which basically experts in the specific topics which you trust like Stephanie on Whois and that way they can blindly go and (unintelligible) people who really - and then somebody who the chair, who basically doesn't do policy but manages the system and keeps people working on it.

And if we implement a system like that, that's might just give it a little bit of working structure. Because I find it very, very difficult to get involved in everything. I really would like somebody, or a group of people, telling me these are things coming up, these are the things I want to get involved, these are the people I can go to, and separately who manage the system. Because the problem is we can't be everywhere and we can't be experts of it all.

On the other hand, if our policymaking is so intricately entwined, one affects the other, and suddenly you're in an area you have no idea about. And so if maybe a structural system of what I just pointed out, might help.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus.

Avri Doria: But the PC couldn't arrange itself that way.

Klaus Stoll: It's just an idea.

Tapani Tarvainen: I must say that I might find this point very much pertaining to myself as a chair, I'm not an expert, and I think just trying to keep things moving. But I have Marilia and then Rudi. Okay, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: I suggested about to Rafik about one year ago was that I think that the role of the chair, as you mentioned, has a lot to do with the information and making sure that people have the information they need if they want to be in the role. So for instance, what I said to Rafik a year ago was just do like a spreadsheet which we could easily visualize what are the policies that are open and the discussion, what are the deadlines for the public comment, who is the person among us that is responsible for the topic.

So it's for instance Stephanie and you know who you can contact if you want to be involved, and links to the person or the comment that they presented. Because sometimes I have a feeling we that we write good text about things and then the person that was reading the text just goes out and we don't have access in the Google Doc anymore. So what is this, and we write it again.

So I think that of course there in the one side we need more manpower to write the public comments. And on the other side I think that information

management and organization with regards to information would help us a great deal and could help people that we just throw inside the working group and the topics to make sense of what they see and how they can find what is relevant and how they can get in touch with the person that's leading the topic.

So Rafik by then said he said I have already tried and that did not work. But I think that maybe it's time for us to try again. We're trying to organize ourselves in the GNSO like this, like thematically. But it would be nice if we can put this online somewhere so people can just have an overview of the information we receive in the GNSO and the project list that is not necessarily a spreadsheet with all the details. But the working lists and the action items helps us in the GNSO to get organized. So I think that information management could be helpful, and it's one of the suggestions that I've received from the chair.

Tapani Tarvainen: I have Rudi next, then Klaus.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. What I would like to propose is in order to group our competences and experiences is that in the policy committee we should have at least what status is another discussion, probably observer, but at least all those who are participating in working groups should be part of the policy committee so they can in some way bring in experience, knowledge, things that are going on in the working group, into the policy committee so to have a better understanding what the critical issues are.

I think that we need to go back to the grassroots and see what are the people in the working group doing, what are their problems, why are they not really able to do what they want to do, and bring that back into the policy committee so that you have a back and forth interaction that helps our participants in the

working group to be more performing and at the same time the policy committee has a better understanding what's going on in the working group.

Because that's where the policy work is at the end created. It's all the discussions, every meeting we have, is the basis of the final discussion, the final decision, and the final recommendations that are going to the council. So if we start from a wrong bottom process, we will always end up in a wrong process at the end.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Rudi. I have Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the record. Marilia, maybe we should add, for example, I have - my problem is for example if I'm getting asked do this, do this, do this, then do this, wouldn't it be easier when we talk about your spreadsheet that I on every proposal, I indicate I'm prepared to work on that topic, to work on that topic, and that topic, and don't even come near me with that topic. So that we have a group of people who actually write the comments and can be a little bit accountable.

Because if you're disciplined enough, you just indicate two or three things that you really got time to take care of that, instead of being blocked basically by a big - I mean doing two or three things is possible. The expectation to do 12 things just blocks you and you do nothing.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Klaus. I have Matt.

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears. I think, to respond and to endorse Rudi's point, is that at the end of the day when we're down to the wire and we know we have to deliver, we do deliver. When we did the analysis recommendation by recommendation

of the accountability proposal for the third draft, everybody, you know, chipped in and wrote a substantive review of that section.

So I think the will is there. I think what may be missing is the structure. And I think that there's - yes, if you're in the working group and you're contributing to the working group, then there should be an expectation that you will at some point in time be asked to contribute to writing something if that's necessary regarding the issue in that working group.

But I think the issue - so I think the will is there and I think we can deliver, even though it may not be particularly well organized, but I think we do, I think the issue more is how do we structure it so that we have - and give ourselves enough time to be able to respond to consultations or, you know, PDPs, or whatever it may be, you know, in an appropriate way so that gives us time to actually confer and to get a full sense as to what the communities want to say. So I think structure is a key issue.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Farzi?

Farzaneh Badii Farzi (unintelligible) speaking. So yes, I agree that we need to group the competence and the expertise and all that, but as long as we don't have enough trained volunteers, we cannot really get - because people get busy, they might not have time, so we need alternates, enough people that we can use.

And Matt came up with the idea that on the policy committee we have instead of one alternate we have multiple alternates so that we can train the volunteers so that if the principal person cannot write up a public comment or a word comment, others can. So I think that's something that we should think about. I don't know if we can have multiple alternates as a policy committee method.

Tapani Tarvainen: I think the rules would allow that that we can have multiple vice chairs and whatever. The problem is finding people to do that. But I definitely agree that in any kind of process where we can share the load and avoid the dependency of single people, we know that when one person is sick or something, everything collapses, is not a good situation. So anything to help that is definitely a good idea.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Farzi speaking. So that would also help new people that I have seen that they come and apply to become PC members, but they don't have the experience. This will allow them to kind of gain the experience, look at the process and learn from Matt for example, and then later on we can rely on them.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that's a good point that we need to have some way of bringing new people in, whether that could be meaningful to say invite newbies as observers to the policy committee or something, something like that we might want to discuss. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Well what I feel is that what we are missing is a kind of guidebook for our volunteers in how we work, what we do, when do we do the work that we need to do, where do you have to knock on a door to get support if you don't you're doing well. I think that's something we are missing today. That's the feeling I have. But there's no guide here.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Rudi Vansnick: Well I'm willing to take the lead to start kicking off this process. We need it. If we don't do it, it's something that I'm hearing -- I'm now ten years in ICANN, a bit more -- I'm hearing this all the time.

One structure that did that well, and we can learn a lot from, is ALAC. They produced a guidebook for newcomers, for people that were willing to work in ALAC. And I have a sample. We could use part of it. It's also in about - Adam Peake has been proposing as a guidebook in the civil society world and how to operate, which part of I've been writing down too. So it's not really new, but we need it yesterday, not tomorrow, I think.

Tapani Tarvainen: Farzi?

Farzaneh Badii Farzi speaking. Yes I mean they can just go on the website and you can view it page by page.

Woman: Yes we can do that.

Man: Okay. Adam wanted to have...?

Adam Peake: Yes a couple of things really. First is follow up on Rudi. Rafik has an ongoing task that he mentioned not too long ago I think on one the lists that he wishes to produce a newcomer's handbook, which I think includes the things you're talking about, Rudi. He was talking particularly about drawing together a lot of the information that already exists on the GNSO website about participating and so on.

And I'm just looking there at the moment and there's, you know, there's a transcript from a February 2 newcomers of how to participate in a working group. There's enormous amounts of materials available, it's how they're made available to us that's important. And that really comes back to thinking of what Avri was saying in the first place.

And my - when I heard you speaking, Avri, I wondered if there was something of a systemic problem in the information that is widely made available by the policy group of the GNSO, you know, every PDP is summarized on a monthly basis in a quite succinct way.

If that could be transmitted better amongst the constituencies so that people could easily see that yes there is a Whois RDP something, something, something, and actually tells you what the RDP means and then you can more easily identify whether or not you want to participate or you can start even recruiting people on the basis of work that's going on, for example. It's sort of - I don't know. Is there a better way to, for us, the staff, to present this information to you might be one question. Would that help you? Because if it is, then that's what we - what ICANN tried to do.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Adam. At least one thing that staff should be providing us is clearly coffee, but.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Sarah?

Sarah Clayton: Sarah. I think as a relative newcomer, it would be good to have like an assigned mentor to work with me and to learn what they do and to learn one thing at a time and not try and jump in (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: This is Marilia. I think that Rafik is following our discussion (unintelligible). He reminded everyone (unintelligible) not a long time ago. And he proposed sort of a timeline to get us organized to produce public comments. And the

timeline it was more about like a schedule. And in the schedule he predicted that the time it would take to start (unintelligible) if a webinar is necessary, where (unintelligible) to develop (unintelligible).

And I think that maybe could be useful for us to revise (unintelligible). But I'm not sure if people (unintelligible) ready when he sent it. So maybe it's useful for us to (unintelligible) so we can review the information. And he proposes some tools such as, for instance, when a public comment is open, we could have someone volunteering in the wiki page that has been created for the thing.

I'm not sure if you would update the wiki and how you do that. Well maybe it's my mistake, but I never use the wiki. I don't find it particularly practical. That's why I keep going to something like a spreadsheet. But I mean, the important thing is that we agree with the collaborative tool and we're going to get everybody to use them. He suggested (Trello) as well. I don't know if...

((Crosstalk))

Marilia Maciel: ...and I think they're having the discussion now. Maybe it would be good for us to take a look at Rafik's suggestion.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you. Yes I was actually - the prefix proposal was actually very nice but the time was poor because it was just before Christmas and everybody was out. So that is a really good point to bring it up. Avri? I think you had your hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes hi. This is Avri speaking. Some of the comments are a little old. One, in the comparison to ALAC we have to remember that they're more like at the GNSO level, not at the NCSG level. And indeed the GNSO does have an

incredible amount of information about how to do and how to get involved and how working groups - and they constantly have these webinars thingies.

So making sure that we get people to actually attend those things and use those things is a good idea. And I think they're fairly useful things. So that's the first one. I'm not saying we may not need some of our own individual stuff. I think the mentors idea is a great one.

I think getting a mentor that's willing to be highly involved is hard because then again - but certainly having an - and I think that the list that Stephanie's been trying to get of sort of the batch of mentors and mentees hanging out on the list where it's a question and answer, as opposed to our normal ribald, let's make fun of each other list. But it's actually a mentoring list is a good idea, so that you have both people being mentors, people asking questions and so on. So I think that's great.

I think we also may find, going back to encountering the first point I made about ALAC, is that on these issues, these things, whenever there is a, you know, policy issue of the day, they put together these ad hoc teams that, like a working group, that meet every week on that issue until that issue has been talked to death.

And, you know, so those are the kinds of things that perhaps when we're getting into the, you know, the transition or the new, you know, domain system or the new, you know, whatever, the new Whois -- I forget the proper name; we've been calling it by the wrong name so long -- when we get into those things, we could actually do for a short period ad hoc meetings to talk it to death. And then when it's time for the NCSG to make a decision about something, we can have those meetings again to talk it death.

So I think a combination of things may be helpful. I don't know how much stuff we actually need to write now. I think there's an immense amount of stuff out there that we have to learn to use.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. I have Klaus and then I'm closing it. Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: I'm a little bit wary about the idea of having another handbook, because the point is quite simply let's be honest -- and present company included -- if we ask staff to write a handbook about the issues on hand, it is - it will be completely gibberish for somebody on the outside who has no idea what ICANN is all about, and it will be in ICANN academic language to ICANN academics, or whatever, but not for the people we really want to reach.

If something like these materials are done, they should be actually done by the community itself and not by ICANN staff. And just as a little caveat on that one, because - for example we are doing in the pathfinder series some comments on the IANA transition. And we did something, we asked organizations who have nothing to do with the IANA transition to comment on it and how they see it.

And suddenly we found out that there are aspects and there are areas we never even talk about in the transition, which is really, really relevant and makes the whole thing very interesting. So I think we really should include more of the outside and the people we are talking to instead of trying to do everything ourselves, and especially by letting staff do something which is completely irrelevant. Sorry to say that, but whatever I see coming out, including the new video on Internet governance from George Washington University, it's forget it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. At this point, I must note that we have five minutes left.

We are - we can extend by up to 15 minutes if we must, but I think everybody's started drying out of like coffee and whatever, so let's try to keep it short. So I give one more word here from Robin and then we'll see if we get to our last item.

Robin Gross: Robin speaking. So the idea of the guidebook is good but as long as people are not in charge or do not foresee a future that they will be in charge and have to use, have to provide public comment or help with the process, they will not just go on our website and read the guidebook.

So I think we need to kind of have a process that can - that tells these people that in the future you are going to be in charge. And if you want to look at a guidebook, you can look at that and see how.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you, Robin. Before I hand it over to this last item, a few points of order that we have the afternoon session for NCUC has postponed. It's going to start at 1:30. So we'll have 30 extra hours - 30 extra minutes. However, I'm not sure if you want to talk later.

But anyway, so currently for lunch we can - there is a cafeteria here but if you have time I propose going out and (unintelligible). We have no organized lunch here. But let's go to what we have is the final issue. We have actually been touching this already several times. That's the need for (unintelligible) awareness (unintelligible).

Okay. So we haven't done that. Okay? In that case, we have three minutes for any other business in this meeting.

Robin Gross: And then we're done?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Matt?

Matthew Shears: Matthew for the record. Is there anything that we can - any of the 11, is there anything that we need to work on for the Thursday or Friday meeting? And is there anything where we should have substantive input?

Tapani Tarvainen: That's a good question. The agenda is (unintelligible) we don't really know what's going to happen. But we did touch on this in the morning on what we are going to have. So if you have some things we want to bring up in any of the sessions we're having that we did not already touch up on or whatever, let me know anytime it comes to you and we see if we can work it in.

Okay, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Well the first meeting that I came last year, my idea was that we would get together (unintelligible) because we were very diverse, to have a moment to talk and try to align or at least have a sense of where we stand in terms of substantive discussions that (unintelligible).

I know that it's a work in progress and actually still trying to find a model, and maybe for this particular moment it's more important that we discuss process, the GNSO review, but I think that it's kind of a missed opportunity if we don't discuss substantive issues. It's not like we're going to shelf them. They will have their proper moment to be discussed and analyzed. But if we try to see

where other people and what are their priorities and sticky points, I think that will be a useful moment to (unintelligible). I don't if I mean to...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes actually. We definitely should talk substantive issues. And while looking at the agenda for tomorrow and Friday, the exploration of common issues tomorrow would do perfectly well to be substantive stuff because what we have as the next one is process procedure to staff decision making. So I guess that - the session tomorrow where actually you are now co-chairing. You are most welcome to bring up substantive issues here.

Farzaneh Badii: No, sorry. Can I ask you something? I'm just going ask a very like a question that you will find that I have no clue about in this meeting. So I tend - are we going to talk about, for example, that inspection rights, how important is inspection rights, for example, for the commercial stakeholder group, or do they care about that?

So one of the things that, for example, I think we had - we didn't have an agreement on and they didn't really care about, and this is my interpretation was that they didn't really care about the inspection rights being in the CCWG accountable to recommendations. Like they worked on it, but one thing that was really worked on together, I think, was the - so it was more about the limitation of ICANN mission.

So when we were working on it, I think we were kind of like aligned and our interests were aligned. Is this kind of like the nature of the things that we are going to talk about, or is it more like about other issues?

Tapani Tarvainen: We can talk about any issues basically that we see as relevant to what will be NCUC, whatever topic we can find. This thing is common to us in the NCPH, or why not also this is something that we have to fight about. Okay, Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: In danger to be boring -- Klaus for the record -- could we talk about what I talked about, the need for more awareness (unintelligible) on the grassroots? Because I think that's a common issue and it's based on a substantial issue.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes it's a common issue but maybe that's one of the issue where we stand on very much the opposite sides of the fence with the commercial people because they want to spend money.

Klaus Stoll: As I pointed out, this is a commercial opportunity for them.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. That's exactly what I was thinking. But yes, I'm not opposed to getting into that.

Klaus Stoll: Seriously.

Tapani Tarvainen: And if you...

Klaus Stoll: I'm willing to talk about that, no problem.

Tapani Tarvainen: Marilia, you have a volunteer to talk about something in the session if you don't have anyone to talk about the other ones. Okay? Anything else or shall we close this session here?

So we are two minutes past...

Man: Where can I get coffee?

Tapani Tarvainen: Coffee is the next item, but that's outside the official agenda. So let's call this meeting closed. Thank you everybody.

Woman: Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you.

END