ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 3, 2016
3:30 pm CT

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Hi everyone. Welcome to the first NCUC (unintelligible), the NCPH intersessional meeting. My name is Farzaneh Badii and I'm going to chair this session today.

So we are going to talk a little bit about the work of the executive committee and first we will ask Rob to brief us on what CROPP is, and then we will talk about the bylaw amendments and then we'll talk about the incorporation of NCUC, and NCUC outreach. And then the third agenda item is the civil society engagement program, which we will ask Adam Peake to brief us on the latest development on that. And then we will ask Sarah Clayton to brief us on the - her research on ICANN and the UDRP.

So first we go to Rob to tell us more about CROPP and what CROPP is, the history, the background and all that. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you very much. I do have a document loaded in the Adobe Connect room, so I'm hopeful that folks can follow along on their screens until we're successful in getting the main screen up and operating. I've been made a presenter so I think I'll be able to play with the slides. Thank you, Maryam.

The CROPP program I think is important to note a number of different fronts. The CROPP acronym stands for Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, and it's a concept that was introduced three years ago now in response to a variety of community requests that came in as part of the annual special budget request process that had been established many years ago by the CFO and the Finance team.

The concept at the time of the special budget request process was for individual communities to come forward -- and still is, by the way -- to ICANN on an annual basis to share ideas, concepts, proposals, new ways to leverage or expand the services that they receive from the organization and where to utilize resources that ICANN already has to focus on a variety of aspects of the work of the individual communities. It could be outreach, it could be engagement, it could be policy development, a variety of things.

Generally, the special budget requests tend to focus on a couple of main areas. They are in staff support, they are in travel support, and they are in meeting support. And so over time, staff response to these areas began to see these commonalities and in particular really struggled with the ability to respond as much as possible to a number of individual requests that would come in from different communities on a variety of outreach and engagement type efforts.

Around the same time the - with our new CEO at the time, Fadi Chehadé, there was this growth of the regional team concept for engagement in different regions around the world. And so there was a real opportunity to sort of merge the two, and that gave birth to this concept called CROPP: Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program.

The second slide talks really about why this concept was selected or brainstormed, and it was really fourfold, one which was to build ICANN-wise more local and regional awareness to promote the recruitment of new members to the ICANN community to be more involved in the individual communities at ICANN.

Secondly it was to be more effective and engaging existing members of the community. This was something experienced by a number of different groups. There were people on the rosters but people weren't as actively involved.

And the thought was that by creating opportunities for more outreach and engagement by allowing members of the existing community to go out and reach out into those areas, there'd be more encouragement for, you know, the folks who were already here, not just reaching out to brand new people, under that classic sales concept that, you know, the customer you have is always cheaper to, you know, work and develop as opposed to going out and finding entirely new folks.

Third was, you know, just finding better means and mechanisms for communicating what ICANN does and what it was trying to accomplish. And then finally, as I noted with the development of these new regional teams, find ways that we might be able to link the regional strategies that were being developed in different regions of the ICANN world with what was going on in the individual communities.

And so that was the concept. The idea about deliverables was fairly straightforward at the beginning. It was essentially to provide travel opportunities, to, you know, again leverage the resources of existing volunteers and people who knew about ICANN, to play off the specific personalities, backgrounds, or just ways of operating from the individual

communities to give them flexibility to choose what they would do on an annual basis, not to be something that was directed by staff or initiated by staff in any way.

Secondly, to support other costs and expenses, the hotel rooms, the transportation, the ability to pay registration fees and the rest. And then finally the booking element, you know, funneling it through the ICANN travel process, imagining that that would be a much more efficient and effective way to pull everything together. We see that that is still a goal of the organization that we're constantly striving for, and I think we're even experiencing some of those challenges with this meeting.

One of the key aspects that had always been a complication I think for people who observed ICANN both from the inside and the outside was the concept of transparency. And a fresh new program like this would enable us to really from soup to nuts be able to identify what the goals were of the individual communities, all the way through individual proposals and ideas for outreach and engagement activity, all the way to how they were evaluated, and ultimately, how they were assessed by the individuals who went on these trips.

And the concept of transparency was to have a place on the community wiki where at any place and time, somebody could come and look and see what was going on. The idea was that individual communities could learn from each other. You know, one group might have one approach to outreach and engagement and another might take a different approach. And by seeing who traveled, what the proposals were, what some of the ideas were, there might be some more information sharing, best-practice sharing and the rest.

It also gave staff the insight into what individual communities were doing to get an idea about what some of the plans and ideas were. And as we baked

into the process those of who were responsible for the operations had nothing to do with proposing the trips or, quote, unquote, approving them. The idea was that it would be a collaboration between the community leadership that would have its own internal processes, and the staff responsible for the regional engagement strategies.

So there'd be a marriage. And in many respects, we almost looked at this as a - in some Machiavellian way, if you will, a way to force more collaboration and engagement between these new staff teams and community leadership. So those were some of the big picture concepts of the whole process.

We started the pilot in FY '14, continuing in FY '15, and now it's in place FY '16. Our hope is that the track record will demonstrate that there's value for the program to continue in FY '17, perhaps even taking one of the Ps of, taking the pilot element off and just noting that it's a community regional outreach program.

It's not clear that we're there yet. We were on a good trajectory. I think somebody in this room at one point just said to me recently, "Two points can begin to show a trend on the graph." From my perspective, I think, you know, three or four points on the graph begin to give us a much better picture of where the program's going. But at this point, we really only have two points to look at: FY '14 and FY '15.

Slide number 5 of the presentation basically shows the use of the program up until now through the last fiscal year. And I'll take one quick step back with the slide that shows the breakup of GNSO and At Large usage is that, again, this was a pilot program, and so the concept was not to be able to offer it to every SO and AC community. But when staff looked back and saw the

proposals and where they came from, most of the proposals came from either the At Large or the GNSO communities.

And so the decision was made let's focus on these groups, let's provide them with essentially five trips a year, made available to ten different groups, and you'll see basically, you know, who had the capability of using this. I'm enjoying seeing some of the reactions around the table as people look at the slides. That's why this is a transparent program. At any point in the last two years (unintelligible) and I hope this will help inform you for planning going forward.

So if you look at the first - well this is just FY '15, just giving you an example of what the program came up to and created sort of the momentum for continuing FY '16, is that out of 50 trips, you see that 40 were taken in FY '15. And we've broken it down between approvals, trips, travelers and I must confess I don't know at the moment from the budget perspective. I think that's whether the trip was within our overall budget.

And you see the general breakdown. For purposes of the group, you would look at NCUC, you know, you would see there were five proposals, five were approved, five trips were taken by five different travelers for 100% utilization in FY '15. That was under your previous chair's tutelage, and now you have a new executive team so I'm pleased to be able to give you a sense and background of all of this. So that's in general where things stand.

If you look of course across the various groups, some groups haven't used it at all or have made attempts to use it and it hasn't worked out. This is also a point at which I should say that, you know, there a recognition that no program or anything that ICANN does perfectly fits every circumstance. And I think this data sort of shows that. I mean for some community it seemed to

be a useful tool, others they saw, wow, it doesn't have a lot of utility to us either ever or where we are in this point in our development or based on our plan.

And so as a pilot program, we're always looking at ways to figure it out is it working, is it not, is this an appropriate use of funds. Because when you look at the special budget request process, that's essentially a limited bucket. It's identified every year by the Board Finance Community that says, "Okay we're getting to set aside X dollars for these special requests." And one of the things we have to do as the staff is say is the program being fully utilized or could these funds be better utilized somewhere else. And so that's a part of the process as we go forward.

Turning to Slide 6, and what we've done just to give you an example of the type of data that we collect, you see the number of travelers. And this is a comparison of FY '14 to FY '15. When you look at the At Large, regional At Large organization, they grew their use of the program by about 60% year to year from 15 in FY '14 to 24 in FY '15. Really what this reflects is an immediate almost utilization by the At Large community in FY '14 of the program.

When we introduced the program in FY '14, it was brand new to people. The budget came out late that year. It didn't come out until August. And so no one even really began to spin their wheels until the October timeframe. And so, you know, being able to identify and pull together this type of activity at least even in the first year was quite an accomplishment.

Now I would point out that the At Large community was very organized in terms of how they approached this. They created a CROPP review team. They already had an existing outreach and engagement subcommittee. So they were

able to immediately take on this capability and say, "Oh he's a resource, let's find a way to leverage what we're planning to do utilizing this resource." And as you can see from one year to another, they were able to utilize 24, almost, you know, all of their trips in the course of that period.

On the GNSO side we see a similar trend, just a much lower utilization in the first year. And part of this was a reflection from some communities saying, "This isn't what I asked you for. So I mean I'm not going to even be able to utilize it." (Unintelligible) perspective said, "Okay we're going to talk about this among ourselves now that we see this available." And it inspired a couple of the communities to actually begin to create the infrastructure, to create an outreach and engagement committee to figure out how they would bureaucratize this capability, which is always a challenge when a new resource is available.

And so ultimately what we've seen up through the first two years was an increase in utilization, some indication that certainly supported doing the program again in FY '16.

Slide 7 is an interesting one because it shows generally where the trips took place. And so you get a good sense, and we had a certain degree of comfort that, it did enable various communities to reach out to various parts of ICANN. Remember when you look at these numbers, we only had a total of 50 individual activities, if you will. And so there's a nice spread if you look at FY '15 as opposed to what it was in FY '14. And some of that again reflected learning experience on the part of the various communities.

Again, I'd point out in terms of contrasting the At Large effort and the GNSO effort, the At Large effort is a collaborative one where you have very focused regional orientations of the various communities, and so there's this built in

bureaucracy and infrastructure. And that's something that doesn't really exist on the GNSO side where, you know, you're not organized (unintelligible), you're a much more diverse groups in that respect.

Now we learned and saw things were going well in FY '14 up till FY '15, but we were also seeing a number of different behaviors that were of concern to folks who were observing this program from afar, either at the board level or from the senior staff level. And that is what was beginning to happen and what we perceived as happening is that a number of groups, because we were being very flexible about this, said, "Well, you know, we just want to bring people to an ICANN meeting."

Now they said it with very legitimate points of view, saying this is an opportunity for people to see our work, it's an opportunity to encourage new leadership. But when we looked at it on balance, there seemed to be a -- particularly for a number of groups -- a heavy reliance on, "Well I'll just utilize my five trips to bring people to ICANN meetings," which wasn't quite, at least in the original vision of some of the brainstormers, the way to resolve or step forward.

Moreover, we hadn't really seen any or had any real understanding what the goals of each organization were. So in other words the chair or the executive committee would say, "Yes we've approved this trip and this is an important conference for us to be a part of where someone can give out materials, or we've got some panel opportunities at this place." But they were sort of one-offs. So we really didn't see the full arc of understanding.

This became a real challenge for the regional vice presidents because they played the role of, you know, being the evaluator, if you will, of the request. So the goal there was an individual comes to the leadership of a community,

says, "I would like to go on this trip, I think this is important. You know, we can meet people, we can recruit people or whatever." The executive committee would go through whatever process, and we have, you know, ten different groups with six different processes.

And once (unintelligible) there was a checklist so, you know, there were participants who were responsible for entering the data on the website from the community. That would get in. The regional vice president generally would then have the opportunity to review the request. And I think it's fair to say that probably 80-plus percent of the requests were granted. Why? Because it's a pilot program.

I think the regional VPs recognized that this was an opportunity to increase collaboration, work together, really understand what was trying to be accomplished in the individual communities. And so they were granting trips without the benefit of seeing a bigger strategy.

All that's a longwinded lead up to the fact that for FY '16, one of the modifications to the program was to say, "We're continuing eligibility just for GNSO non-contracted constituencies and for RALOs. But in order to sort of trigger the release of the resource, an individual community has to show an outreach and engagement program." It doesn't need to be 60 pages.

It can be two pages, but something that outlines a framework and a perspective about how you as a community think you are going to approach this, how the CROPP might be one piece of a much broader outreach and engagement strategy, recognizing that the regional teams have some of their own resources that various community leaders have tapped over the years to say, "Oh, would you like me to speak somewhere or what would you like me to do?"

So the concept was, again, somewhat Machiavellian in the sense that, "Oh well if a community wants this then they'll make the effort to put together a proposal and develop a plan of action." And maybe that will last more than one calendar year, but that will continue on and on.

And I'm pleased to say that it seems to have worked from that respect. I think we still need, and even this late in the year, there's one community that has not submitted a plan. I won't call them out. It's not you guys. You're fine.

The other aspect of the pilot feature was some pushback from communities to understand that five trips are not enough. Well why? Is it only travel, what else can we do? Something we saw over time was that individual communities wanted to focus on just a single event.

And so we created a toggle feature this year, potentially an election, for each community to say, "Okay I'm going to utilize the travel aspect of CROPP" or alternatively, "I will choose to, as a community, work on one particular event in the year." And ICANN sponsored that event to essentially provide what was needed for it up to $10,000, which is generally the equivalent, if you look at the individual trips.

For budgeting purposes as we looked at each trip, we figured on average total expenses of a three-day, two-night trip, so two nights in the hotel, getting to the event, coming back, again, on a regional basis, it's not someone from the United States flying to Africa or someone from China flying to Europe, but someone within the region to keep costs contained, our average was around $1,800 a trip, which are factored in the various pieces.

In some continents, you know, in some regions like Europe or the United States, the average trip was going to be $900, but in Africa or Latin America, the trip was going to be more expensive, probably in the range of 2,500, 3,000, simply because of how many stops you had to go, how many trips you had to take, to get a visa, or something like that. So we factored in an average, and that's sort of how we approached it.

So again, this year there was the concept of toggle, choose event or choose the trips. And then finally, just wiki improvements. We learned over time in terms of how people were operating the program and filling out the forms, we would get bits of feedback, you can improve it this way, you can have a better experience filling out stuff that way, and so we were able to make adjustments to that.

So what are we doing in FY '16? Well an important element of this throughout has been to look back at each subsequent year. So one of our focuses this year was producing an evaluation report of FY '15. That's now up on the wiki site, and you can see basically many more statistics than I just provided to you in this short slide presentation.

Very important to see that we get 100% participation in the community strategic plans. We aren't at 100%. We're at 90%. That's a pretty good track record so far. Managing all the FY '16 submissions. And you'll see in a moment we have not had as much pickup as in FY '16 as we have in the past. And utilizing these things, that's what we're going to do for FY '17.

So let's look them at NCUC, where are you guys. (Phil) submitted his outreach plan for - that you all put together back in the I want to say the November timeframe, maybe a little bit earlier than that. So that was in, which, you know, triggered the availability of the resource. In submitting that

strategic plan, he toggled that we're going to take advantage of the trips function, not of a single event.

And so where you are now is that there has been one trip proposal. It's been approved. It actually just finished a couple of days ago, the Ninth International Conference on Privacy, Computers, and Data Protection. And that leaves you at this point with four remaining for the rest of the fiscal year. That's through June 30.

One twist to the program that's very important from our collaboration with the travel team is they need at least six weeks; they would like eight. But we negotiated with them to make it six. We need to have the proposal in and approved by the regional vice president six weeks before the event.

And the challenge there is that there's U.S. government security checks they have to do on the traveler, there's, you know, better rates that we can get on airfares by scheduling things earlier, there's visas that have to be obtained from time to time. So all that fits into essentially saying between now and the 20th of May of this year, we have the ability to come forward with proposals for trips. The 20 May deadline is important, but that's really only if you've got a trip that's taking place on June 25, 26, 27.

What you may have noticed in terms of me talking about this, I keep using the term trip, because that's functionally what it is. But we like to look at it more as an activity and it's part of something that is connected to your annual strategic plan for outreach and engagement. So presumably for those of you weren't a part of putting together the plan for this year, you'll want to go back and look at to get an idea about where the community wanted to be, what some of the goals and expectations are, and then I think what you're looking to

do is merge, you know, individual trip proposals for members of your community to what you're trying to accomplish as a group.

And what's very important is, depending upon where you're looking at a particular event, a conference, a tradeshow, some other opportunity for speaking, is too early in the process collaborate with the regional vice president or his or her regional team in the area where the event's going to occur. Because what you'll begin to find is there may be another event that you can do some leveraging.

There might be some other things in terms of information sharing in that you're suggesting something that the regional team wasn't even aware of. And so the information exchange helps. And they can give feedback and say, "Oh that looks really good, but did you consider this other opportunity?" So again, the idea is to increase the collaboration.

I don't know where we're going to go in FY '17 other than to share with you that we're somewhat concerned about the uptake. If you look at just the GNSO, and I put that here on Slide 10, we've only got three trips total that have been - I'm sorry, just two trips total that have even been proposed on the GNSO side.

Right now we're probably around 14 on the At Large side, and I'll be very interested to get feedback from all of you, either now immediately or over the next couple months on, you know, how this fits in with where you all want to go from an outreach and engagement perspective. You may come back and say, "Yes, we just don't really see a use for this."

The challenge there is then where else does the resource go? And the deadline for special community budget requests this fiscal - for FY '17 is the 15th of

this month. And so proposals that come in at the point, are going to be considered. I don't know how many we're going to get this year. Last year we had 57, something like that. The year before that we had like 65.

So I mean then that becomes really an issue of seeing what's the right breakdown and what's the right breakup. At this point, I think there's an inclination to continue the program again next year. So that would give you another year and a half of experience with this as your current leadership team. So that might be something that you want to look at or think about.

That's the sort of brain dump, nonstop monologue. I'll stop there and see if any of you have specific questions, because we could talk about this for two hours, there are enough pieces to it. But that's sort of the bigger picture. I hope that's what you were looking for from me.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: (Unintelligible) just to give kind of background information about CROPP and what it is and what now - so we are going to announce for a CROPP proposal soon to the NCUC members. And we have - the EC has come up with some kind of criteria. For example, if a person has an allocated CROPP before, they will not be eligible until at least other proposals have been received.

So if you have any questions - yes, Avri. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: We created this plan that we need to have this strategy for CROPP-ing, that we need to have that has been -NCUC discussed and...?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Avri Doria: We do?

Farzaneh Badii: So basically what we are going to do, I have drafted an e-mail to the EC and asked the other members what sorts of criteria we should have in order to allocate the CROPP.

Avri Doria: But that's criteria, that's not our outreach plan.

Farzaneh Badii: So our outreach plan, one of the criteria is that they should have concrete outreach plan. So when they - when a member wants to be allocated CROPP, they should...

Avri Doria: Oh, it's per application not per organization.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Well - no, no. Inside NCUC, the executive committee has come up with these criteria. But we have been allocated CROPP already. We have four (unintelligible) that we can use.

Avri Doria: I'm confused.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Maybe I can help on that?

Avri Doria: Yes, my question was does NCUC need to have an outreach plan that our criteria are then applicable to or does each person applying for the CROPP need to have an outreach plan that's pertinent to the trip they want to take?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes to the first - yes and no. Yes you as an organization, as a community, have a plan.

Avri Doria: We have an outreach plan?

Rob Hoggarth: You have an outreach plan, and so I just put the link in the chat. So you've got a plan that's been submitted and filed, which opened up the resource to you. You've already had one person who went through whatever process you've had or that (Bill) had to submit it and has taken a trip. We haven't seen the assessment report yet. The trip only ended like two or three days ago. So that's done.

                  What you all choose to do as an executive committee now going forward is how will you evaluate individual proposals, what sort of structured do you want to create as the NCUC to have people provide input and come to you with proposals. I would presume that you would look at your existing NCUC Strategic Outreach and Engagement Plan as a way to evaluate those - getting a little feedback.

                  So I think that's the approach that you would take for that. You don't have to (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: So it's my ignorance. I didn't know we had a Strategic Outreach Plan. I guess we did.

Rob Hoggarth: So I would just otherwise observe, as long as (unintelligible) detail, so he doesn't have to come up with anything from the NCSG level.

Farzaneh Badii: (Unintelligible).

Man: Hi Rafik.

Farzaneh Badii: Hello Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: No? Can you hear me?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, I hear you.

Man: We can.

Rafik Dammak: Good, okay. Thanks everyone.

                 So regarding the CROP, I think because I've presented an experiment that we
                 are trying to allocate a travel slot to WHOIS who can propose kind of
                 (unintelligible) plan, so it's not just traveling to some event, but really to do
                 more kind of consistent outreach work.

                 And I guess our first experiment was last week in Brussels with Monica and
                 trying to have a kind of side event when it's possible. So we tried to get some
                 (unintelligible) from there and try to replicate that for the other slots.

                 So we have only five slots, so that's quite the scarce resource.

                 And my question is, is it possible to extend that? And I just want to highlight
                 that NCUC only and NPOC have the CROP slot, but not NCSG, so.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, thank you Rafik. I'm not sure what you mean by extend. I mean to give
                 you all the perspective of the perimeters, ICANN finds its various programs
                 on an annual fiscal year basis. So the resource disappears on June 30.

The hope and expectation is that -- again through the special request process -- we'll have discussions with the Board Finance Committee in April and they will authorize the program for another year.

The idea of doing that in the April timeframe is so that communities can be planning things for July and August and not waiting, you know, for the white smoke or whatever to come out of the chimney to say, "Oh, we can start planning." The idea is to give you all more consistency and understanding ahead of time in terms of what resources you will have.

So my hope is that you'll know -- in the April timeframe -- whether you'll have an FY17 resource. But unfortunately, we can't extend the budget dollars beyond June 30.

So there's an event, for example, on July 2. You can't utilize FY16. That's going towards your FY17 allocation because remember -- the fiscal year is not the same as the calendar year.

I'd like to make one - did that answer your question Rafik?

Farzaneh Badii: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: No.

Rob Hoggarth: Sir.

Rafik Dammak: So what I was saying is that - yes, yes. First troubles brought -- and basically -- that (unintelligible) of some kind of (unintelligible). And I was thinking if

there was an incline to extend, to have like six, seven or eight travel slots -- not just five.

And what I said, for example, NCSG doesn't have one. For example, we work at a stake called the (Group Level), but NCSG doesn't have any CROP travel slot; it's only at the constituency level. So that's what I was asking.

Rob Hoggarth: Oh, I understand. Thank you.

Again, this was introduced as a pilot program with the focus being on the groups that asked the most times or had made cases for the need for travel. Anything in the future is possible in terms of potentially expanding the program or retracting it for lack of use.

I would suggest to you that given budget guidance that I have seen -- particularly from a Staff perspective -- we're currently in the upcoming fiscal year looking at at least a flat budget in terms of current operational activities. So it would be unlikely that we would be able to expand CROP.

If we did expand CROP -- in that rare circumstance -- it would be at the cost of not granting other resources somewhere else in the mix. And I don't know what those are because applications don't come in until the 15th of February.

So I would think -- just in terms of your own community planning -- you'd probably be looking at the same level.

As you know - and I don't know if you saw the slides Rafik -- based upon the statistics today -- it doesn't look like the trips are going to be utilized. And as of last year, even the GNSO didn't utilize them fully.

If there were a community that would appear to be eligible for more, it would be At-Large at the moment. Whether we would expand GNSO or look to ccNSO or RSAC or SSAC, I think that would be doubtful too. I'm just being straight with you in terms of what I'm seeing in terms of budgets and what I personally expect.

Farzaneh Badii: Thanks a lot. Matt?

Matthew Shears: Yes, Matthew for the record. So just look at Fiscal Year 15 numbers, we only have - GNSO has a 56% (unintelligible) in Fiscal Year '15, right, 56%?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, (unintelligible).

Matthew Shears: It's a real shame that we don't manage this at the SO level rather than at the individual - at the group level simply because we could have a situation where there might be a set of applications -- a greater number of applications than (unintelligible).

And as we see from those numbers, we got no applications from ISPC. So it might be useful to think of it rather more as a pool resource rather than - and that way, we might actually be able to get some additional ones if it's not being used by others.

Rob Hoggarth: That's an interesting suggestion and it might surprise you. It's not entirely novel in that on the At-Large side, they were looking at that at one point. Where, you know, one of the (railos) -- in a particularly year -- wasn't going to utilize their resource. And so there was some discussion about -- some negotiations. I get one of yours this year, and, you know, I get an extra one next year trading future draft pics or whatever.

But certainly from a Staff perspective, we're very open to that -- particularly as we look at FY17 in terms of suggestions.

The idea is to put a resource in your hands that you're going to be able to use. And if certain community groups aren't using them, then it's basically something that's going unused.

And so as somebody who works with the operations of this, I'd be delighted to try to make a case for that, obviously with whatever documentation or stuff that you've got to show. So thanks for the idea.

Farzaneh Badii: Avri.

Avri Doria: Interesting idea. I think though -- with the look of it -- it would have to be at the NCPH level -- not the GNSO level -- because the stakeholder groups of the NCPH don't got none.

Man: Yes, right.

Avri Doria: So it may actually be an NCPH conversation to have and...

Man: (Unintelligible) certainly us being here for those conversations.

Avri Doria: That would be the place; that would be the level to do it at I think. You know, stakeholder groups may want to say, "What about us," but that's a different.

Rob Hoggarth: Right. And please feel free to utilize the FY17 budget process. I mean I know you all have many other things on your plate.

But in terms of comments with respect to that, I think a number of you who were watching it saw that in the budget process for FY16, there were comments made at the GNSO Council level to make sure that certain things were done or accomplished. And in that case, folks made the pitch in their comments and budgets were adjusted to reflect that. So that's entirely possible in this case as well. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, great. Thank you very much. So we spent a lot of time but I think we have some good information now (unintelligible).

And so we are going to - this (unintelligible) is going to issue the call for a correct proposal to NCUC members. So if you have any specific outreach plan or event, then you can - well, trip, then you can send a proposal to us.

So now we go to...

Rob Hoggarth: Pardon me, can I make one last intercession. It's just you currently have two individuals -- they are Peter and Rafik -- are your identified pilot program coordinators who can play the role of entering the information into the Wiki who can help you coordinate that work. So I just wanted to make sure that you knew that you do have some individuals who are already, you know, are plugged in a bit to the process.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, okay, great. Thank you for saying that.

Okay, so now for the travel (unintelligible), I just wanted to update you that we have - NCSG has a budget of $4000 USD -- up to $4000 USD for ICANN meetings for NCUC members and their specific criteria that NCUC members should meet in order to be allocated that -- travel support.

Any specific question on that or comments on this? We have issued the call for travel support recently and we are still receiving applications. Anything? Great.

So - and then - now we go to bylaw change. Oh.

Matthew Shears: So we have (unintelligible), we have travel support.

Farzaneh Badii: To ICANN only.

Matthew Shears: Yes. Are there are any other sources of support for NCUC?

Farzaneh Badii: To go to ICANN meetings? Travel? So we also issued - Rafik recently issued a call for proposal for FY17 if I'm not mistaken, so we can ask for additional budget requests for various projects. It depends if they get approved or not, but Rafik has already sent the email out and asked our NCUC members what they want to do, if they have proposal. And he has also added the Executive Committee Members proposal in that.

That could be, like as I said, (unintelligible). Yes, Rafik?

Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay. Hello. Yes, so if you're asking about the travel support for NCUC, I think we should ask Rob if it is still there because each constituency with the GNSO support -- special budgets and things like that -- they provide three travel supports for each Executive Committee. So it's possible to make request to extend or to ask for more travel support.

But I would ask him directly -- Rob -- for more details because, usually, the final (unintelligible). I'm finding the final team tended to reject those kind of requests to extend the travel slots.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik. Yes, there are a couple of different levels here. One is - and I think Matthew's question went to what exists today. And so Rafik, I think, has expanded on that.

You've got CROP, you've got, you know, whatever the regional teams have in terms of their individual budgets, in terms of moving forward with the regional strategies. There's an ICANN speakers bureau where there's consideration being given to supporting experts within the community to come to different events to help explain what ICANN does and talk about their communities.

As Rafik notes, there is some core budget support that goes to ICANN Public Meetings. As you know, you've got an allocation for your counselors; you have allocations for the stakeholder groups -- as Rafik refers to in the constituency -- for leadership travel slots. And I think you're right Rafik; it's three per meeting. So those already exist.

Again, as you see, they're divided up between attending the ICANN meeting to do the business of ICANN, and then more outreach or engagement things to either promote the NCUC or ICANN or try to bring in more people.

All of these things -- for the most part with the exception of GNSO Council support -- came from prior special community budget requests. As Rafik notes, the track record isn't perfect 100%. You don't submit a request and immediately get it because there is competition with other groups, and various budget eddies and currents from year-to-year that impact things.

But many of the resources that you have available to -- now as a community -- we're the product of past community requests.

And so to (unintelligible) point, as you're thinking about, you know, going forward, what, you know, what improvements exist that you can be looking towards in terms of the work that you do -- supporting your work. I think additional travel in the short-term is going to be challenging just because of budget pressures, but there is the capability to do some of those things.

Marilia and I just chatted very briefly after the last meeting that, Rafik, you got a note from David not too long ago. And I know this has been a pet project of yours just between now and the end of the year, a pilot project that's being introduced to help in terms of document production support; either to help educate your members to make them smarter about a particularly issue, to help you with the actual drafting efforts, potentially to facilitate your meeting, or whether us to provide some other briefing support.

So between the March and June timeframe, there will be a time limited, sort of an opportunity for us to test some of those capabilities out. So that's something that we might be able to continue going forward.

So again, there are a number of these thoughts and ideas that come up over time, Matt, that I think you should be thinking about prospectively. But at the same time, to respond to the type of question that you asked, we're also working on a new Wiki space area, which basically is a collaboration of Adam's team and my team that is going to inventory all of the resources that are available -- particularly as new Executive Committee members come on board.

Yes, it's almost like, "Well, what do we have? I don't know." And you almost have to learn from the very beginning.

And so what we're trying to do is create a resource that says, "This is what you get." You've got Miriam who supports you from the secretariat standpoint; you've got document and production support; you have travel support; you have outreach and engagement. Something that just gives you a sense as to what's available so that you can think about it, consider it, and then perhaps strategize or collaborate with Staff on how to get the best use out of it.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, thank you very much.

So we go to our agenda item to - we are going to talk about bylaw changes. I think that's Avri's favorite subject. But I'm going - well, we are going to stay passionate about it I guess.

So we talked about this during the Executive Community Meeting in January and we thought about what should we prioritize with regards to bylaw changes. And we thought that would be NCSG's charter conformity issues. So we need to discuss that.

Then Bill has created a process revisioning for the bylaws, and I put that in a Google Doc. And we have that and we need to comment on it.

And (Aaron) is leading the group that wants to be involved in the bylaw changes. And - so any comments on the bylaws amendment? Anything that you want to be considered? Avri?

Avri Doria: No, (unintelligible).

First of all, my only passion was to see it brought into line with the NCSG charter. And that was not so much from a -- we had to be tidy -- type of perspective, but I actually believe it remained a threat or risk to NCUC to have a charter that didn't fit within the SG. And if the Board Review Committee was ever to decide to review these charters, it's just a mess.

So that's the reason I've been pushing; not because I felt we needed a new charter, that we needed a different set of processes or anything like that.

Now - so my preference would have been for a really quick but get the charter to match -- let's get it correct -- and then that.

Being as you're opening it up to further changes, I think you have to look at what kind of changes the NCUC -- as a whole -- want. Does the NCUC want to be doing more comments of its own as opposed to participating in NCSG? And does it want to remake itself a policy then?

If it doesn't, then yes; you need to look at, you know, you're PC and whether you have one and whether it's real. So that then becomes an issue.

If you open up the issue that you're going to be doing commenting, then what's the process for it? You know, if somebody is going to be speaking in NCUC's name, what gives the authority to say, "I've got the NCUC behind me, or I've got, you know, consensus but some opposition, or I've got strong support." Are you going to get into that whole set of criteria of how you actually determine what level of support NCUC is giving to a particular position. So then it becomes really a complicated piece of work.

I still go back to - what you really needed was a charter that matched the NCSG.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, great. I think we all agree on that. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I could be strongly influenced by the AP that is starting on off on (RBS)
which needs to be a dog's breakfast in terms of who signed up. Many of them
are putting on their SOIs but they're non-commercial. They're not non-
commercial and they're not members; we don't know who they are.

And it sort of surfaces the whole issue of, okay, who is NCUC and what
authority do they have to speak? And I'm sorry to embark on this pet-peeve
that I have at the moment, but who is funding them and what projects are they
working on? Because we have a member -- and I'm not going to mention any
names -- who's on the GAC, who's vision of what the (RDS) should look like
is absolutely the antithesis of mine.

Checked them out, and at the moment, why can't he speak as a member of
NCUC and say this is our views. Absolutely no reason why not, right.

So I think we need a little more discipline in terms of how we reach a
consensus view. Everybody can still have their own view of course, but who
speaks for the organization? And the bigger we get, the more that's going to be
a problem.

Farzaneh Badii: So Stephanie...

Stephanie Perrin: And how do I ask these guys -- who are saying they're Non-Commercial -- to
(unintelligible)?

Farzaneh Badii: I just think that we consider to change the bylaws amendment.

Stephanie Perrin: I kind of think so. Where else would it go?

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, great. Well because we have considered - you have a lot to talk about tomorrow about the issue you are raising.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, sure. I think Rafik...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) clarification?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, sure.

Avri Doria: What do you mean by saying, "They're saying they are Non-Commercial people," or they're saying they are not members of the Non-Commercial (unintelligible)?

Stephanie Perrin: They are (unintelligible)...(unintelligible).

Let's be clear here. They can be an independent expert in the Non-Commercial sector...

Avri Doria: Right.

Stephanie Perrin: ...and not be an NCUC member.

Avri Doria: Right, and that's okay.

Stephanie Perrin: And that's okay as long as it's clear in their SOI.

Avri Doria: That they're not...

Stephanie Perrin: Right.

Avri Doria: Okay. So they're not saying they're NCUC.

Stephanie Perrin: Some are.

Avri Doria: So then you should be able to point out - the ones that are lying about in their SOI, you have a recourse path too. You go to the chairs, you go to the liaison. I know that could be not very helpful. You go to the Council and say, "These people are lying on their SOI."

I think there's less you can do about the people that say, "I'm a Non-Commercial expert."

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, great. So Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks (Unintelligible).

So I wanted to comment first what Avri said. So yes, I think the focus first is really to align the NCUC bylaws with the NCSG charter because of the timeframe, and we trying to do that -- most of all -- (unintelligible) to give a track may be one or two month weekend focus on that. And we will have time of discuss with the OEC.

And then I had discussion with GNSO Staff about this, and - to learn about other group experience. So the different groups have been approached, but it's mostly done at their level. And then they discuss with the OEC and the Board and so the OEC doesn't want it to be involved with (unintelligible) like what

we had that experience with (unintelligible) like four years ago. So that's kind of a factor to have in mind.

The other point is I want to maybe clarify to Stephanie. I think the issue about people stating that they are Non-Commercial is not a kind of - I don't think it's (unintelligible), let's say, intention. It's the problem with the SOI form because it's asking people to select a constituency or stakeholder group, and many people -- who is from outside ICANN -- they think this is not necessarily a word about the structure of the GNSO and they think that maybe they can be Non-Commercial.

It happened at SO people. They are not NCSG member and they leave them as NCSG member, and realize at that point to GNSO Staff.

So I think the change can be done at the SOI form first, to make it possible for people to not select a constituency or stakeholder group. So that's what, I think, one of the reasons for this confusion -- of constituency or stakeholder group. We can let know -- of GNSO Staff -- about who is not our member so they can clarify that.

And at the GNSO Review Working Party, I think we covered this kind of recommendation to work more centralized. That's why and to kind of check them against the different membership lists of GNSO constituency and stakeholders group.

Since this is not centralized, it's not considered data (sic). So it's not always easy to do, but (unintelligible).

Honestly, I don't think that people are trying to kind of lie or there is no bad intention. But it's just how the GNSO is sitting. The SOI led the people to this kind of confusion.

Farzaneh Badii: Great, thank you Rafik.

So I'm going to go quickly to our agenda items in cooperation of NCUC. Our expert is not here, so I don't have anything to cover now. But think about it as a topic. I mean it's an important thing. There are advantages to incorporate NCUC. But we don't have commenters on this agenda item; he didn't make it.

So if there are no questions or any comments, I can just go to the NCUC Outreach Plan and Membership (unintelligible).

Okay, so for the NCUC Outreach Plan and Membership (unintelligible), I was - so Joao, would you like to reflect a little bit on your activities in Membership (unintelligible)?

Joao Carlos Caribe: Not right now. We decided to give the (unintelligible) the leadership of the (unintelligible). Just talking today with Farzi (sic) about this, we have a lacking of (unintelligible)...(unintelligible) and we can go.

I just explained enough to (Naveed) that we can also gather --- as a group -- activities. So I'll go (unintelligible), and we can decide what to do.

The big idea, we need Naveed, Walid, me. (Unintelligible) and Naveed made a call about their membership affair. The search was (unintelligible). The next step is just to combine the information on the research and share this information to make the plan. All right?

I tried to contact Naveed today, something (unintelligible) for you.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, great. Thank you.

And so we also need communication for Twitter accounts and other accounts for like communication like social network and stuff. Are you in charge of that?

Joao Carlos Caribe: Yes. I have access to Twitter account; I have access to the blog.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay.

Joao Carlos Caribe: I got the access for NCSG, a group on Facebook. I don't know why. You were the creator, no?

Farzaneh Badii: Probably.

Joao Carlos Caribe: I think so. But are just NCUC here. The NPOC to work in (Unintelligible)...

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Joao Carlos Caribe: ...NCUC (unintelligible) a communication strategy if we have anything. To publish on this Web site, the link for the missing headquarters and description, is not the (unintelligible). The idea for example if we can work together to make that brief, two, three part (unintelligible) on the meeting and (unintelligible) on the post. If two more on this way you can link to record and getting to transcript of the meeting.

The same for Twitter. Any stuff you can tweet. Any stuff you can tweet. There was a lot of stuff. Any - daily news can make some kind of feed just raising a tag just to collect. I do it under Twitter accounts. The feeds that can collect information (unintelligible) by yourselves.

Just (unintelligible) for the NCUC. NCUC on the social media are working to slow. It appear it not working.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay so we need to plan for that. So we have to come with a plan. Any comments from the members? No?

Joao Carlos Caribe: Not exactly the platform. We need to framework to - a way to act - a workflow for this. Just easy we can do it, that's all, Twitter, what can do it. This, this, this. I make some (unintelligible) on the last meeting - this meeting on Washington was on the Avri remarks I sent a mail to the list with the what we can do to improve the communications. The grass root communications.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay.

Joao Carlos Caribe: Okay?

Farzaneh Badii: Yeah great, thank you. So our next agenda item is (unintelligible) engagement plan. And Adam Peake was supposed to...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii::   I did that.

Robin Gross: He went - he just had to go downstairs...

Woman: He might be...

Woman: Just Skype him when he needs to come back up to do his thing.

Farzaneh Badii::   I did that but he's not answering now. So we can go to Sarah's exciting study on ICANN DIDP and she has some very, very interesting results of this DIDP. And she'll show us. I have asked them to put your presentation in the Adobe. Yeah. So I don't know.

So we are waiting for a couple of our members to come back. And we will start shortly. So, Sarah, go ahead and start.

Sarah Clayton: All right...

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: Yes so for those of you that don't know me already I'm Sarah (unintelligible). I'm a PhD student at (unintelligible) at USC. I used to be in the NCUC a while back, like the end of 2012, start of 2013. I had to leave because of a conflict of interest when I took my position at Com Laude and Valideus in London. I worked there for 2.5 years or so before I moved here to go back to school so I'm glad to join you guys again.

And, yeah, my (unintelligible) technology, deep web and all kind of fun stuff. And this work (unintelligible) and I were doing kind towards the end of last year and just doing a general DIDP review. And I took the data and used it in a communications network (unintelligible) so this presentation is basically the output from that class and the results that may or may not be useful to you, may or may not be interesting to you, use them as you wish.

Woman: If you can speak a little bit louder because they can't - they have trouble
                    hearing you.

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: Is this...

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: Okay. Okay so I'll probably gloss over some of the academic stuff because
                    it's not very interesting. But, yeah, obviously the findings have an implication
                    for enhancing ICANN's accountability, transparency, blah, blah, blah. And
                    you know what the DIDP is I presume. Don't have to go over that.

                    So, yeah, (unintelligible) sort of comparing the DIDP to the Freedom of
                    Information Act because as you guys are going through a kind of review of
                    the DIDP, I mean, I know ICANN isn't a government of but it is of sorts in
                    that it has power over something that we the people need. And so, yeah, the
                    Freedom of Information Act afforded public access to information unless it
                    fell into one of nine exemption categories. And these exemption
                    (unintelligible) privacy, business and government interests.

                    But these exceptions were really, really (unintelligible) and the DIDP's
                    exceptions also were argued as being overly broad. And it was (unintelligible)
                    was reformed in 1974 because all of these exceptions were used as an excuse
                    to, yeah, so federal officials could avoid disclosing information. And I kind of
                    feel like that's a good parallel to maybe how DIDP defined conditions of
                    nondisclosure are used in ICANN today.

So, yeah, a lot of the critical commentary that I've been reading on the various email lists and whatever (unintelligible) DIDP suggests that ICANN uses its defined conditions of nondisclosure in a very similar way to how government was using their own exceptions in the 70s.

So you guys know what - the response process. So and these are obviously the 12 defined conditions of nondisclosure. I presume you're very familiar with most of these if not all of them of how the process works. So I'm not going to spend too much time on this.

So as I said I did a network study for our communication networks class. It didn't have to be done this way, it's just because I took the class it could have been - this analysis could have been done using a number of sort of different or kind of statistical matters. Like I say only the networks class that forced me to conduct it in this way.

So I connected up all of the requests for information. I did 91 requests between September 2008 to September 2015 and connected them with a shared defined conditions of nondisclosure so each node in a network was a request - a fast response - and the connections were the defined conditions of nondisclosure.

So I was looking at (unintelligible) is essentially a mechanism whereby you'd say (unintelligible) nodes of the network that share similar kind of attributes likely to share similar connections, similar edges. I have two hypotheses. I looked at both word count and (unintelligible) within individuals and organizations so organization types or type of individual like a registrant for example.

So my node list was 91 nodes - so all of the requests up until September of last year. I defined the affiliation. Similar categories - one limitation was that certain requests could have fit into more than one category. But I did my best. And the edge lists were all of the shared conditions.

So this is a network that I ended up with. Very, very complicated. As you can see same (unintelligible) been looking at and to analyze it was very burdensome. So from there I - the conditions of nondisclosure up into four categories. I ignored the Internet security and stability category because there were no other sorts of conditions that could apply to the same group.

So from there I looked at four different networks with all of the requests that shared sort of each category of condition. Feel free to stop me at any time if you have questions by the way.

Woman: These categories...

Sarah Clayton: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...based on California law, federal law or...

Sarah Clayton: No these are ICANN defined - so, no these categories are not ICANN-defined. I defined these based on the conditions of nondisclosure, the conditions of nondisclosure are defined by ICANN.

Woman::   When - the ones on the right hand when they say confidential government information, I don't recognize that as a (unintelligible).

Sarah Clayton: Okay so...

Woman: ...how ICANN defines it?

Sarah Clayton: I sure think these 12...

Woman: Okay.

Sarah Clayton: So A, I believe - A...

Woman: The confidential ICANN's own cooked up...

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: This is ICANN's own right here.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thanks.

Sarah Clayton: So, yeah, I ran some - I sent around graph models on the data which basically it basically was a statistical test to see if anything is going on that wouldn't happen by chance. Right so there's something that's statistically significant going on here.

Woman: So the (unintelligible) individual defined conditions of nondisclosure, there wasn't too much to be seen from that apart from the fact that you're more likely to receive a condition if the - a larger number of words in the request so that's pretty boring.

Where we get - we get some more interesting where if you look at the ICANN stakeholder working groups when they make a request they're more likely to receive something in the burdensome category which, I mean, yeah so it's like, you know, let's get all the email correspondence from this date - between this date and oh no, go away.

But and also (unintelligible) are less likely to receive a condition in the burdensome category so they might be - that might be because they're requesting really specific information like we want this exact report and not going to offer a request - put in requests what ICANN would perceive to be burdensome amount of information.

And those compromised (unintelligible) integrity is concerned. Again, ICANN stakeholders groups and working groups are more likely to receive this condition. Registrants are less likely to receive this condition and that can be put down to the fact that registrants obviously they don't really understand ICANN perhaps which is probably - that's the only explanation really they're not interested but it's only concerned with intervening.

And, yeah, ICANN stakeholder groups, working groups are people that really do understand ICANN (unintelligible) and these conditions (unintelligible) under the compromise ICANN integrity category .

And while we're here all these other sort of organizations they weren't statistically significant. Looked into them and there's no - yeah, nothing statistically significant that came out for them only for those two groups.

And then if we're looking at the confidential external business information category, again, ICANN stakeholder groups and working groups are more likely to receive this condition and for Internet nonprofits are less likely to.

So I think that pretty much (unintelligible). And I'm word count across every category, the longer the word count the more conditions you're likely to receive apart from there was one big exception which was the Center for Internet Society. They got nine defined conditions of nondisclosure and they got every single defined condition of nondisclosure apart from anything (unintelligible) individual. But they got absolutely (unintelligible).

But they had a really low word count - they had 93 words in their request. I did word count because it like a quick and dirty way of rather than coding all the words. Yeah. That would have taken too long.

So, yeah, even those it does affect the number of defined conditions of nondisclosure, DIDP requests received, it's not a good predictor for everything. So, yeah, overall the results support the idea that (unintelligible) high word count received more defined conditions of nondisclosure which may be not that surprising. And individuals and organizations that fall in the same category and industry sector in - under certain categories they do receive similar.

Now you can use these results - what you wish. I don't know whether this is...

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: Okay. Yeah, I don't know how this will help you or if, yeah, if it will help you or how it might be used. I mean, off the top of my head it would be something like you want to narrow the defined conditions of nondisclosure, adopt policies that may - don't look at requests that say like okay well this request falls under all of these conditions so therefore we're going to require them all, it's more on a case by case basis.

So, yeah, do they impact policy development at all? ICANN uses its defined conditions of disclosure, it's mandatory rather than permissive. This - I'd argue this needs to change. Maybe look to the Freedom of Information Act and what they did in the 70s and how that's kind of evolved and how they narrowed their exceptions. And, yeah, they should be worded as narrowly as possible.

And I think I'm done.

Woman: Thank you.

Sarah Clayton: Thank you.

Woman: That was great timing...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I have interest in understand more (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I have a couple questions.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, I snuck my hand up in the middle. Okay. I think I really like - first of all, is this available and public for anyone to use in any argument they wish to put together? Another question would be as new ones come in is your stuff set up to automatically be able to...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...a new one that just came out today for example, and see how it fits. And, third, are there any patterns of what could be seen as discriminatory behavior against any particular type or group?

Sarah Clayton: Okay I'm actually - I'm going to have recap some of those questions. My paper actually just got accepted for a conference yesterday so I don't think I should be handing anything out just yet.

Avri Doria: Oh for the presentation or...

Sarah Clayton: I'm going to be using a lot of this in the...

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: But I'll have to check the terms and conditions with regards to that conference. But I personally can't see any reason why I wouldn't be able to share this. I mean, I've obviously shared it with a few of you already so...

Avri Doria: No, okay thanks, I just wanted to know that.

Sarah Clayton: Yes, the test can be rerun. Yeah, because I mean, when I wrote the paper I think by the time I finished up there was about six or seven new requests that had come in that obviously I hadn't accounted for.

Avri Doria: So can we rerun the whole thing or can you just incremental run on the new ones?

Sarah Clayton: Well I used...

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: Sorry?

Woman: It changes all your numbers.

Sarah Clayton: Yeah, it'll change all the numbers.

((Crosstalk))

Sarah Clayton: Yeah, so I used a - like a programming kind of statistical analysis package called Statnet within a program called (Arc). And that's reading essentially a CSV file. So all I really have to do is update the CSV file and rerun everything. And we find out what's statistically significant so the ones I highlighted in yellow here for example, they're significant. All of the others you can pretty much ignore. But over time they might become more interesting.

Woman: Okay great. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Really, really interesting. Thank you. Mine are more sort of qualitative questions. I'd like to know who does the exemption. There is no appeal mechanism, correct? Or do we have...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...reconsideration and you can also probably (unintelligible). But as well (unintelligible).

Woman: It is, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Did we also have the criteria did they appeal or not? I think we - oh no, they may have the criteria, okay.

Sarah Clayton: I didn't look into that for this.

Woman: I think that's a good idea.

Sarah Clayton: But there was something in a spreadsheet I saw that one moment in time that had...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...we wanted to know if their requests for information - the person that requested it was in parallel in RFP or reconsideration for another case. So that if ICANN doesn't want to just provide the information because they don't want it to be used against them in an arbitration - in the IRP.

Stephanie Perrin: No, the other question is once they've been released to one party are they available easily to everybody else?

Woman: Yes so it's public.

Stephanie Perrin: So they put them up in a Website.

Woman: Yeah.

Stephanie Perrin: You can go in there and you can examine them. So if we wanted to second guess the exemption strategy we could do that.

Woman: So which we also have in our criteria is that if they say - if ICANN says okay I will publish it, we - the second question that we ask is whether they actually publish it. So we go and check for that as well. So we are - we were working on this since September. And we are going to kind of like finish up the cases as well. And perhaps publish the - kind of like a report. And we use some of Sarah's research as well on what gets rejected and all these things. So you are going to see this research outcome I was thinking Panama I hope. We keep saying. But, yeah, so there are other criteria. And...

Stephanie Perrin: There's a whole team of you guys working on this.

Woman: Ed Morris and Sarah and I and (unintelligible) started today.

Stephanie Perrin: I didn't put my hand up. But I did (unintelligible) just before I retired send - like I did Freedom of Information, I was an access information coordinator with many governments way back. And then I went into the biggest procurement department in Canada as coordinator just before I retired. So I would love to see how ICANN (unintelligible) with a big purchasing organization in terms of releasing contracts.

Woman: Oh that's very interesting.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...private sector because all the time they...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah, so that's an - I think that's a good message that we can use, yeah.

Stephanie Perrin: Yeah, so if you could even just pull out the contract requests and send them to me I can compare. I have a nice little collection of...

Woman: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: That's really good.

Stephanie Perrin: Yeah, you know, once you get the hang of it you can see what they're exempting, right.

Woman: Yeah, exactly. (Unintelligible) it's your turn.

Man: Oh.

Woman: Yes, you remember...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...remember me. Adam (unintelligible). So I need to underhand the - what been working on, not just - just for my understanding just not (unintelligible) I can understand what you're working, I just see this (unintelligible) it looks like the graph (unintelligible) that we talk about?

Sarah Clayton: So it looks like a...

Man: (Unintelligible) was the network - how to analyze the network connections.

Sarah Clayton: Yeah.

Man: Use this - just not exactly to (unintelligible) but to the methodology you - I wanted to understand and I wanted to learn more if you can share this for me.

Sarah Clayton: Oh sure.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, can share in this intercessional with (unintelligible).

Sarah Clayton: Yes, I mean, as far as (unintelligible) to sort of predict network ties, i.e. shared conditions. I didn't use any of the (unintelligible). But I can certainly share some interesting book chapters with you. And I'll see what I am allowed to do with regard to my paper with this conference, see whether I can circulate it now or if not now when.

Woman: Okay great. Any other questions? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...in terms of (unintelligible) not responding to a request for mostly (unintelligible). Do you feel like there wasn't a - a particular reason for disclosing information?

Sarah Clayton: I wasn't looking at that at all in my study. I was purely looking at the exemptions that ICANN was applying in their responses to requests. So to do

that that would involve a lot more analysis, delving deeper into the content which is something I wasn't doing so I was purely working with numbers and not words. So I think that will be next up.

Woman: Yeah, if we want to go into details that would be. Okay I am...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: We are - thank you very much, Sarah, that was great. So we are going to go to the agenda item Number 3...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Adam is on his way.

Farzaneh Badii: Yeah, okay.

Man: We can move to 4 and (unintelligible)...

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. We could do that. No, he's here. Oh.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Hello.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Okay so let's go to any other business and then we come back to Adam. Matt.

Matthew Shears: No.

Woman: Any other business?

Matthew Shears: Oh. I think I made a suggestion just to understand what the -where we were in terms of (unintelligible) right?

Woman: Yes. So we have received your application and also we have received a couple of other applications and we are going to analyze these very soon. EC members I think they are discussing this and it will be analyzed. For the policy committee I looked at the charter, it's - it doesn't say whether the term of the policy committee members like one year and should be - it should be extended or they should reapply. Yeah, Avri.

Avri Doria: I always believed that they served until they were replaced and it was up to the organization they came from to figure out whether they wanted to do it one way or another. We didn't put anything in the NCSG, they are appointed by the constituency, by some feature of their own choosing. And they are replaced by. So...

Woman: I like that better because we were going on and on about we don't have PC for a while, while we had Matt.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I thought there was a full PC. But - because NCUC could have said at any point these two are no longer ours and you've got to wait until we give you new ones. NCUC could say that and perhaps have in some sense been understood as saying that and sort of saying oops, we got to pick new ones.

And at that point then a chair of NCUC could decide oh okay those NCUC ones don't have approval anymore. But owning - as far as I'm concerned from my understanding of that particular charter it's totally up to the constituency that appoints them to decide what their terms are, when they come, where they go.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I think it's better for them to stay on until we analyze again. Okay. I see Adam Peake so I will go to Adam Peake for...

Adam Peake: Yay.

Farzaneh Badii: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: okay, Adam Peake please update us on NCUC - no, sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: ...engagement process.

Adam Peake: Where is it?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Anybody object to turning...

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: So thank you very much. Adam Peake for the record. Yeah, we've been trying to find out how this engagement program will work and it's been interesting for start. I think what is moving along slower than hoped is we should have, so we're behind schedule, we should have a civil society landing page available which will be the initial home for generic civil society to arrive at in ICANN who will have, because they're set up but not yet, live (unintelligible) civil society to receive announcements about activities related to NCSG, NPOC, NCUC and At Large.

We will have a wiki space to host information and there is some information being gathered. The initial things that we promised was a catalogue of previously created contented by organizations that we've identified as civil society. And that means information that you have created as NCUC, some information from NPOC and some information that's available from the At Large.

And it's really trying to draw together not all the work that you've done in terms of contributing to PDPs but the work that would be interesting to any organization that wanted to know what was going on in ICANN. So if you looked at this catalogue of information then you would find things that may - you would hopefully find attractive, that you'd find a reason for wanting to participate in this ICANN activity probably. The other is a list of events that's coming out globally that identify it as being primary interest to civil society, some of the - some of which are events we know people are attending already or events that people may wish to think about. They might be the sort of thing that you would look at and consider for CROPP funding or some other types of (unintelligible).

The other has been to talk about trying to develop a newsletter and the original thing was that we were trying to do a newsletter before and after an ICANN meeting. The advice has been particularly from the Communications Team, which are running newsletters for ICANN, don't start to do that until you're sure of the content you're going to receive.

And so the idea to propose one seemed like a good one but once you make that commitment and once you've issued the first newsletter, people really are going to expect a second one. So it's probably not a good idea to start running before we even know we could walk basically to use a cliche there.

What we've been trying to do is also, and this has been something that is problematic and ongoing is defining what civil society is within ICANN. We've had this discussion for a long time. Civil society is a term that has been used in ICANN I remember for many years.

It's been an official document at least since 20013. You'll remember some of the infographics used civil society. The At Large is finding it difficult for their construct the way that they operate to know what civil society means to them.

And they're having discussions about (unintelligible), which makes it difficult for us to even brand the strategy confidently at the moment for civil society because half the groups or some of the groups that probably are civil society are unsure if they wish to be civil society. And you can see discussions about that particularly in the At Large call of the end of December, either December the 20th or 22nd.

So this is something we want to discuss in Marrakech. And to do so (with yourselves) either at the - well, the NCSG level and with the At Large and try to understand what do we actually mean by civil society in ICANN.

Perhaps we have to drop the term and go back to the not for profit and non-commercial. That given my background is not the way I would approach that because some of you would be civil society since the earliest days of (unintelligible).

So - but it's a concern for the At Large. They're established as a multi stakeholder organization and their strength is that they are a multi stakeholder body. So they are concerned that splitting off in any way is splitting off into a sort of subgroup and anyways it may be detrimental to them.

So where we are now is we've been moving along with some events, which is one way to try and just do things is - to move things forward is just to do things.

I was very pleased with the event that's been mentioned already with the one that Rob referred to, the first use of CROPP, which the full issue for that is Monika some months ago asked - had a discussion and wanted to attend the computer's privacy and data protection meeting, Brussels.

And she asked if ICANN, and this was to Jean-Jacques Sahel as a - as the Head of ICANN Europe. Would he be willing to sponsor a session there, which he did. So there was a cost of some thousands of euros to have a session, which we have an event. But that's a good use of regional engagement funds.

At the same time Monika needed to get there and the request went to the EC that she use CROPP funding. So CROPP funding provided her support to get to the meeting. And then (further they) organized a meeting at the ICANN

office for NCUC outreach on the Wednesday of that meeting (that) people went to. So we had a combination of different uses of funds.

One - this is probably a good time to say that the civil society strategy does not have unique funding attached to it. It's part of the greater global stakeholder engagement funds.

So if you want to use these funds, then this is the type of thing you would do is say we've got an event going on wherever it may be. We would like to - could you support something? It could be simply a cocktail.

I know there's always been a lot of jokes about drinking (and other things) but people do come to cocktail events. And it can be - if you're going to an event, then holding a civil society cocktail reception can be a good way of attracting people and making - have a conversation about the work of NCUC or NCSG.

It may be that another event we supported was one in Nairobi in January, which we worked with the African Regional Team and got about 45 people (unintelligible) Grace who's going to be here shortly spoke. Local ISOC Chapter, which happens to be in ALS was also supportive of it.

And so that was another outreach event. And of course very one of these whenever you hire a room and facilities cost money. And this comes out of the general GSE funds. But if you want to organize events of that kind, then we'd be very supportive of trying to do it.

Another was a meeting in Amsterdam at the end of last year that Niels and (Stephie) organized and Jean-Jacques went and attended. And (Louis Fies), the new Board member joined remotely.

And again, it was just an outreach event. All of these things cost a few hundred or 500 euros or whatever. That's the kind of resources that we think is probably quite useful. And if you want to do that type of event, then we would be supportive of it. And that's the way we're sort of moving forward at the moment.

And as we get these sort of online facilities and new Web page to make resources available, then we'll be able to publish the outcomes of it, whether it's a report or a transcript or the notes of a meeting or whatever it is (that we use) to better explain what civil society is doing in ICANN.

So that's sort of what we're doing. It's not going forward as quickly as hoped. But it will move forward. The other thing I suppose is I would like to talk to you about creating content.

We've spoken about creating pamphlets and e-pamphlets and books and so on. And I think that that - my personal view is that if we can explain what you have done over the years in ICANN and what you are doing now in ICANN then that becomes attractive to other civil society organizations.

They can actually see that it's not just a mush - that's not very fair. It's not just a mass of work that happens in the GNSO. It's specific work on human rights and the importance of that to accountability and the importance of that to the reform of ICANN.

It's not just privacy in Whois. It's privacy that affects the work that, you know, we do more broadly. And that will be attractive to an organization interested in privacy policy whereas the whole gamut of GNSO policy is probably off-putting. It's such an enormous amount of work.

But if we could highlight the things that have been done, rights protection mechanisms, then that I think will attract whereas at the moment just saying look, GNSO is probably more off-putting than it is attracting. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: I'm just wondering with respect to this funding, is there transparency about how the money was spent?

Adam Peake: There's no build as such. We don't - we haven't said that X hundred euros was spent on a particular thing.

Stephanie Perrin: I think it would be good (unintelligible).

Adam Peake: Probably would be.

Stephanie Perrin: You know. Like I didn't even know that we had ICANN funding until I saw (Andrea) - had a chat with him afterwards about (unintelligible). You know. So good to know that there was CROPP funding behind that or outreach or whatever it was.

My next question is it's very interesting that ALAC has this fundamental problem getting whatever it is. It seems to me that we're talking a lot about human rights and fundamental rights.

I'm becoming more concerned lately about fundamental unfairness, which doesn't really fit into the declaration, you know. Probably in there somewhere but, you know, unequal power. And that certainly fits with ALAC and for what it does.

Do we need to redefine (how) civil society looks at itself? And it might also help this fight with NPOC over whether we're all about fundamental human rights or whether we're all about various other things. So that's fundamental fairness.

Speaks I think to what I understand is there mission. I don't pretend to understand it well. See where I'm driving here?

Stephanie Perrin: I don't.

Adam Peake: No. If I - because I think I'm misunderstanding you. What I was thinking is that no. No.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay.

Adam Peake: (Sorry).

Stephanie Perrin: So let me take a...

Adam Peake: Good. I was going to make a guess, which would have been dumb.

Stephanie Perrin: ...let me take a sort of current example. I mean one of the reasons that I donate my time to this place is I don't want to see the rights of an individual to participate on the Internet (foreclosed by NE). And that includes something like the famous Facebook (foray) into India with the packaged deal.

I see that as a fundamental fairness issue. Yes, it's better than nothing perhaps but it walks us into a monopoly controlled with Internet access area. That's way beyond the human rights angle and fundamental rights. It's about keeping the Internet accessible to all.

And certainly when I have talked to Sam, who I understand more than some others of the NPOC about NPOC's concerns, the operational concerns are do they - are they aware that their domains are being snapped up already and they won't even own what their business is. That's a fundamental - my fundamental fairness issue.

And when it comes to ICANN's accountability as a public body that administers this, then it's core to their accountability mission in my view. Fairness is beyond anything else.

Woman: Adam, did you understand?

Adam Peake: I did.

Woman: Okay. Great. Did you have any response?

Adam Peake: No. I don't think...

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: ...because civil society...

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: ...strategy.

Woman: But it should be core to that. Right? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: No. That's all right. That's all right. Kind of building on what I think Stephanie's kind of getting at. I'm not sure I understand the rationale as to why ALAC would have an issue with (this interim) approach. And nor -- maybe I'm speaking out of school here -- but nor would I have a problem with the civil society landing page incorporating ALAC.

The intention at the moment - sorry. Adam Peake for the record here. The intention at the moment is that it would do. What we tried to do quite explicitly with say the - well, At Large structures, which the basic components of the At Large and the (ralos) and the At Large itself can be technical organizations. They can be - they're all based on the individual user.

But some of them are very clearly civil society organizations. And the At Large own beginners handbook identifies civil society organizations as being potentially ALSes.

So I - we thought when we were trying to define civil society within the strategy - we thought that any ALS that's self-selected as being civil society should be allowed to join and participate in this strategy.

There's no particular benefit per se for joining the strategy. You know, there is no massive funding source available. You're just participating within a community of interest that is suitable or relevant to you. That's the point of it. So it may enhance your volunteering in some way.

And but it's really up to them. And that's the point is that some of them feel very passionately that the At Large because - one of the At Large's fundamental strengths is that it is a multi-stakeholder entity and has avoided the sort of siloed approach.

You know, it's supposed to be cross cutting. It's supposed to be horizontal across the organization, so. But that's not for me to decide one way or another. That's their debate I think. And they're having it.

Farzaneh Badii: Great. Rafik has two questions. I don't know if he wants to talk or if he wants me to read these. Rafik. No. I think he wants me to read. Okay. So - okay Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. We can hear you.

Avri Doria: I think he's always doing an electronic clearing of his throat.

Farzaneh Badii: Maybe we better...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Electronic clearing.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Rafik, we cannot hear you. You trying to speak? Okay.

Man: Why don't you just read them?

Farzaneh Badii: I think I'm just going to read his...

Rafik Dammak: Hello.

Farzaneh Badii: Oh yes, hi. We can hear you now.

Rafik Dammak: So okay. My (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: No. We can't hear you.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: You're breaking up quite badly.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. You're breaking up.

Farzaneh Badii: I think (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. So I'm going to ask Rafik's question. So Adam, what is the deliverable plan for the next three months? And the second question that - what is the allocated budget for...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Oh. Using the existing one does not bring that much. Just new label of old stuff. Rafik, I read it. You can go.

Adam Peake: Okay. So the idea is we should - we will - (stop). We will - sorry. It's Adam Peake for the record. We will have a - sorry. We will have a...

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: Okay. Adam Peake. Sorry. So within the three months question. So as I said, there will be the landing page. There will be the first attempt at having a working civil society mailing list. We will start having I hope some publications with your help to make some outputs available from civil society

that can be more useful to - more useful to the sort of global civil society community.

I don't agree with you that these are just more events as normal. I think we've seen a significant uptick in events taking place that previously haven't taken place and...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Adam Peake: ...and that will continue. Rafik, we really can't hear you.

Farzaneh Badii: I don't know that he's actually still trying. It may just be...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: That's true.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Rafik, cannot hear us. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...expected for the next three months. So I mean - you expect to deliver for the next three months?

Adam Peake: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. So...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: ...transcript. Thank you. (So sorry). Okay.

Adam Peake: All right. So to try and - yes, to continue with that...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Because Rafik cannot hear us. So I'm just going to ask...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes. I don't want to touch that.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Okay. Cool. Go ahead.

Adam Peake: So we are - we're planning to hold a Webinar before Marrakech, which
                  hopefully will be in cooperation with NCSG, NCUC and NPOC although they
                  are waiting for them to agree.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Adam Peake: And to do the same as a post...

((Crosstalk))

Adam Peake: ...review. And the - there's a proposal to go ahead a call for papers and...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: But well, he is...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: If you wanted to use the existing funds then - and you - it's part of
                   (unintelligible) that there's no - it's a big part of the allocated too. So you
                   should argue against that and back up your argument (every day).

Adam Peake: The point of it is is to try and identify in the regional GSE groups that there
                   would be a certain allocation of their outreach funding that should go
                   specifically to civil society.

                   So it has become a increased priority within the regional GSE teams to look at
                   and engage on civil society events. And all of them are doing that. We see that
                   particularly, for example, the event in Nairobi. And I don't think there's been a
                   specific civil society event that have taken place on the African continent
                   before; at least not outside of an ICANN meeting.

                   The same thing is happening in the Asia Pacific. There have been events in -
                   there was an event in Manila not too long ago. And those will continue. The
                   idea of trying to make sure that when we have a fund like CROPP, it's not just
                   idly being used but is trying to fit within other resources so that you take
                   advantage of one monetary spend and to build extra value. So things that are
                   complementary.

                   And that is really what we're able to do because as we keep on hearing today
                   when staff speak our budgets are flat this year. So any money you take from

one thing will - that any money that goes to one thing will be taken from another source and it's basically flat.

And in terms of continuing this, I particularly want us to move forward and see if we can do a call for papers of some kind and try and encourage people to put in some new ideas into ICANN.

How that will go forward will need to be discussed I think with the community rather than - we're at a stage where we're trying to identify a call group of volunteers who will help drive this program forward and with a call - first call for that meeting to take place - I don't have my calendar available. I think it's through the 19th. Friday, February the 19th sounds right.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Good. Thank you.

Adam Peake: Anyway.

Farzaneh Badii: So we have five minutes and then we have to adjourn. Stephanie, you have a question.

Stephanie Perrin: Well, I know I just sound like a one trick pony here but I'm back on transparency especially with the (state) funding. You know, we have people who are NCUC members who are also government representatives. I've been one myself.

So the qualification for applying for funding to attend things and do things in my view we need to get a much deeper (acceptation) from people as to who they're recommending and where the funding comes from because they've already got some kind of funding. But they don't want to take it out of their

office budget. And they're just going oh, well ICANN can pay for me to come to that.

That is not fair to the civil society people who are in (unintelligible) little organization or (unintelligible) who are funding, you know, their retirement fund.

Not to be grumpy but, you know. And I don't think we should get down to bank accounts and all that...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...but there's a happy medium between just accepting the - accepting people's word that they value that they need the money to go somewhere and where we are right now.

Farzaneh Badii: That there should be (definitely) more transparency. We can discuss that tomorrow as well. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think you need to be careful with that. First of all, once you start dipping in, how deep are you going to have to peek into people's financials? I also think you have to take into account that even if people do have money to pay for their office and to pay for their food, they may also have their funding designated for various functions.

So that even if they've got lots of money to fly business class to ITU events, they have no money to attend an ICANN event.

Farzaneh Badii: But that's (something we have to discuss).

Avri Doria: And yes but I think at a certain point it's a declaration. Are we going to believe all declarations? Are we going to have to investigate declarations? How far do you need to go in terms of doing this? And I'd be, you know, and then with the fungibility of money, you would say yes, they may say that but you could spend it, couldn't you.

So it's - I think it's a problematic area to get into. I think it's really good to say we have an expectation that when you come on ICANN money to serve civil society's purposes that's what you're there to do.

And I don't know that it matters so much as what else they may be doing in their lives. I don't. You know, and so a certain expectation of behavior, not necessarily a deep dive into their financials.

Farzaneh Badii: Right. Thank you.

Adam Peake: From my point of view -- Adam Peake speaking -- it sounds like something that needs to happen at the Executive Committee level or your internal level. And I do agree that as we think more about funding, we should be more transparent in certainly reporting that something has happened.

A lot of these events tend to be somewhat ad hoc. So it's very difficult to, you know, if there's an idea for something, it's very difficult to run it through the NCUC executive to see if it's a good idea to do it going forward.

That could be - I could see problem with doing it that way although there should be more notification from us that things are happening but yes, I think reporting on what has happened is.

But it's really a matter of getting these things going forward. You know, reporting (frequently on) an event in Amsterdam before we have the actual means online to do it. I mean there's nowhere to put that information right now.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Adam Peake: And sort of we're a bit out of synch with it but I do think you're quite right. We will make sure that that...

Farzaneh Badii::   Okay. Great. We are out of time now and we should - okay, I'm going to wrap up. Thank you very much for attending NCUC session. And don't forget to look at CROPP. We have announced that all the (unintelligible) your request that you need to comment on and also the bylaws changes is very important if you can also volunteer to work with us on that.

And yes. And we also - we will do more work on ICANN transparency and the (ITT). Thank you. Any other questions? Oh no. We're not going to take questions.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii::   ...for attending. And goodbye.

Man: Thank you.

END