

ICANN

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 14, 2017
2:32 am CT**

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Everybody. Let's start. Let's get started here with our actual sort of agenda, which we don't have. What we basically need to do now is plan for the future, meaning the next few hours. The first presentation we have had some kind of plan who is talking about what and we have to finalize what topics we want to raise with Göran in the afternoon.

I understand that the (unintelligible) wants to breakout from here at some point so we start without but so let's try to get this done sort of fast. And even know this organization of chairs is not ideal for us and there's nothing much we can do about it, so let's deal with it.

So first the (unintelligible) session we're coming up. After 12 minutes presentation by each (unintelligible) for the (unintelligible). In this case, we can count ourselves as three. We want to - NCSG is not the (unintelligible) here but (unintelligible) set up that we have here three groups even though they actually overlap. I guess nothing prevents us from reorganizing this after 12 minutes into it instead if we want. Eighteen minutes for NCU (unintelligible).

At this point, we have those who are traveling here on NCSG slot. Our counselors and some substitutes, so for you, question, what topic does NCSG highlights those preferences for this year. Do we have any?

I guess I'll go through one by one. Avri, you're an NCSG traveler. What are some highlights, goals, purposes for this year. We want to talk about in the first (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I don't know.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, that's kind of bad. Matthew, you're volunteering something.

Matthew Shears: Of course, Tapani. Okay. So just two things I think we need to have on the radar or I should say three, two which are associated one of which is the likelihood of some of the work stream to work actually from the transition - the post - post transition work stream to work actually continuing perhaps longer than we thought and I think that one of our priorities should be to reasonably wrap up that work stream two work as soon as possible and certainly before September. So that's just one thing.

I think that many of us are involved in those and the other thing is will there be any exercising of community powers over the next year. Do we foresee that happening and clearly we need to be fully on top of that inter - from an internal perspective and procedural perspective but also in terms just of being engaged in that as a community. And then the third thing is just one that is going to be particularly, I would imagine, contentious or involve lots of discussion is going to be the auction proceeds and I think that is something that we also need to make a priority for this year. So just some thoughts. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Matt. Now Kathy just joined us. So the question here what is our topics for the first (unintelligible) session as opposed to highlights of those priorities and work plans for this year. And that's for each constituency it's supposed to be but we are basically splitting it three ways. We have NCSG, NCUC and then (unintelligible) which is kind of our division but still I am trying to find what NCSG will talk about first. And you're here (Nancy) as (unintelligible) NCUC and so ...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: Any ideas? Okay. Martin?

Martin Silva Valent: Yes, it's a question. First of all (unintelligible) to propose something. What do you mean by exercise community powers and what were you referring to?

Matthew Shears: I am referring to the new powers that the empowered community has as a result of the transition.

Okay. So whether or not - I - I - there's already been some discussion about whether or not there might be one upcoming challenge that may need to be addressed through that but obviously I think from our perspective it's more to make sure that internally we are ready to be able to do so if we need to do - if we need to engage, thanks.

Martin Silva Valent: And do we imagine any scenarios or - where we can be using this in - during this year or our first case scenario to use them?

Tapani Tarvainen: I think Avri did you want to speak?

Avri Doria: I just wanted to mention that one of the things that I was just reading yesterday is that we may have to exercise those powers indeed soon if one of the fundamental bylaws is about to be amended by the Board and I haven't followed through on it. But as soon as there is a fundamental bylaw that is amended by the Board, we have the - the community has to positively approve. So therefore it's not even we can sleep through the event and not object. If it's fundamental, we actually have to do something. So I think that will be out first - it looks like a fairly innocuous occasion for us to have to do it but it - and it's probably really good because it will force us to put the mechanism into play.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Ed?

Ed Morris: Yes, Martin, once WST is done, a group of us our planning on testing the new DIDP system by - and we're trying to figure out the appropriate document to request just to get the president down so we will be using it this year, we hope, especially when we get done with WS2 this year and the way some of these groups are going, I think we need to have our grandchildren ready to go because some groups just aren't moving at all.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for that, Ed. Martin?

Martin Silva Valent: Well, I agree that it would be good to learn to use these tool but when you have more control and not so - so strong - so that when we actually do have to take it for more power struggle we really know the basic steps. And that was just my comment to follow on Matthew and the other one that we were talking about they said we did - yesterday with Kathy is that we also would like to have more focus on or helping the right protection against the working group.

I think we are having like the one of the biggest debates among (unintelligible) and then the second one is how can we keep the one that registered in (unintelligible) not taken away and we are needing some support there, so (unintelligible) today (unintelligible) agenda.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Tapani. Among the priorities that we have for the upcoming months, I was just wondering if we should pay some special attention to the report that has been issued on community TLDs. It seems that it has resonated with different parts of the (unintelligible) community. I understand that Neils and others have organized a webinar recently that was very well attended so I think that maybe there is more awareness about the importance of this issue and how we can correct the failures of the process in the discussions that are taking place in the new subsequent procedures working group.

So maybe community applications is something that we should pay special attention to. Another thing is privacy. If I understand as well that there are movements including from different parts, the (unintelligible) the NCSC to organize a full-scale meeting on privacy issues, maybe there has never been a moment in which there was such recognition from different parts that this is an issue that needs to be tackled, so how can we sort of take this meeting to the next level to be not just a meeting that we discuss things ...

((Crosstalk))

Marilia Maciel: I heard from (unintelligible), I'm scared but also do something afterwards. In terms of outreach, I was wondering - we always keep repeating how there are certain areas that we need to do more outreach. Africa, Latin America considering that we're going to Africa, should we work with (unintelligible)

holder engagement. Should we work with (Adam)'s team to do something special for the upcoming meeting that does not consist only bringing people for meeting before the ICANN meeting or holding cocktails but really do a more full-fledged planned outreach strategy for Africa.

Another thing that is coming up is the TIGF in Geneva. That maybe is important for different reasons. Maybe this won't be an IGF necessary for doing big outreach at first because it will be in Europe, a developed region and Geneva is very expensive so probably to be a smaller IGF in terms of scale but it will be a very important one because many organizations do have headquarters in Geneva. So strategically speaking, ICANN is there - is there moment coming for us to have a discussion on how we can collaborate better. This is coming up in different shapes. The CSED is discussing this never ending working group on enhanced corporation.

Of course I don't think that something concrete will come up from this working group, but maybe since there will be such a movement, institutional movement that we converge towards Geneva we could think about some activity sponsored, supported that I can sort of provide the platform of facilitate some dialogue for organizations that are based in Geneva. Maybe that will be something to see.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Marilia. Sam has been wanting to speak for awhile. Okay.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco. I am here was a substitute for Stephanie who was too sick to come for NCSG but I'm also in (unintelligible). So what I will do is three points that I want to make that follow up on things and I'll be wearing both of those hats.

The first is with the work stream 2. Being involved in one of the work stream 2 is fairly closely, following it a lot. It tends to cycle. The convergence on getting going beyond certain questions and converging on where you're going is not only painfully slow, it's against our interests. It's against the interests of the not-for-profit, non-commercial stakeholders. It's in the interest of people with whom we might have a disagreement.

Anything we can do to speed that up, whatever is going to come out of it is going to be semi-flawed anyhow and need to be revisited at some point in time anyhow, so how we expedite not just consensus but convergence to get the consensus is very important there. That's Point 1.

Point 2, the same issue with respect to the auction proceeds. Keep in mind that the working group now is just working on the framework for setting up the framework before it addresses what the auction proceeds should be used for. It's not in our interest, anybody's interest for that to go on for a long time. It needs - it needs to be - again, there needs to be a process of convergence. This is the first organization that I've ever been in for whom there is no - nobody concerned about how fast or how slow the clock is ticking. It is quite exceptional. The WTO would still not exist if ICANN was putting it together.

The third point is in terms of outreach. This is a - and here I'm putting my NPOC hat on. I just came back from Dakar and the not-for-profit people there had two very simple comments. We can't afford a website. What's in it for us to be an NPOC. Two very legitimate questions. So in terms of my work on outreach, both inside NPOC NCSG I can't and elsewhere is working with them, working with some stuff from Source Forage and South Africa, to take somebody who's got nothing, no budget, how do they get there from here.

In my personal opinion, PIR screwed up big period. I won't even elaborate on that. Screwed up big, which is they didn't understand. So if we're going to do outreach, there has to be a win in it for them, not just a win it for ICANN to be able to check off on a box, yes, we're multi-stakeholder. We have five new members from North Africa or East Africa or West Africa or South Africa or Botswana.

Outreach has to be about empowering them in the internet, as citizens of the internet and then as citizenship in the internet, which is my other flag. You know, you're a citizen of this internet ecosystem, what rights and responsibilities should you have and how do you get there from here and especially since internet governance now is much bigger than ICANN through a whole bunch of levels, how do they get there from where they are. How do we help them get there instead of just flying the flag.

The last one is that I'm working with an outside group and our fable some kind of green paper at some point at how ICANN should think about academics period. It hasn't got a clue. It kind of fishes around this way and that way. Well, I worked with the International Society for third sector research. They've got research networks all over the world. Latin America, Asia, Africa, Europe. They're prepared to have a dialogue about how to incorporate internet governance in their graduate programs, all the graduate programs. Not a couple of select ones here and there and what it is - what their research agenda should be looking like.

You know and ICANN would have a role in that instead of saying let's invite some academics from Southern California or Geneva to have coffee and a donut, not from donuts but a real donut. So those - I guess those are the four points. Let me - let me list them. Speeding up work stream 2, getting rid of

auction (unintelligible) , outreach and academics are a wonderful resource if you know how to use them and they are a terrible resource if you don't.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Sam, now we are just trying to come up with the short - we have a fairly short amount of time just to list basically what our stuff will be. Trying to figure out - actually do we want to do this strictly three 12-minute sessions or should be pick out the topics because I can't quite figure out if this handbook topics or NCSG topics so okay I have (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: I think all of our topics but there are also constituency topics and I really would like to use this 12 minutes to explain what's going on in (INVOK). Why we can't do any outreach and am extremely grateful to Marilia and Sam that they are bringing it up because it's all somehow connected.

The thing is we are supposed to do outreach and the outreach should come from the community. When we're trying to do outreach it's basically staff driven. You know what happens to the outreach event we are now planning for here. We were setting up an outreach for not-for-profit organizations here. This was agreed four months ago with the global outreach department. We are doing the work. We are getting the people together and then we are informing - we were late as usual but we were informing about developments and then two days or three days before the event, we were getting an email, sorry, we didn't put the procurement form in and your event ICANN will now cancel it.

At the moment I think I really would like to use this 12 minutes to put some of the things on the table from the perspective of NPOC but internally I would say these are not just NPOC problems. They are general problems we all have to deal with on the NCSG level.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Just one more comment. I'm a little bit surprised about how the talk with Karen or Göran is shaping up because I've been in one of these leadership calls just a week ago and I know what he is trying to present which is very, very important but basically from the 17 minutes we have, there are 65 minutes of presentation and then 5 minutes listening and I don't think we should use this not for - for - for sent but for sent and receive.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. Sorry. So you will be taking 12 minutes out of our slot for NPOC. That's fine. Stephania and at this point a question for (unintelligible) how will NPOC want to take your 12 minutes except that you will be taking that, just cutting (unintelligible).

Stephania Milan: (Unintelligible). I actually that we can go constituency to like present from constituents as well because I believe if NPOC wants to highlight some of the things about themselves and strategic goals and everything, I spoke the farthest, so if you come to NCUC priorities you can give me five minutes so I will outline what we spoke about and then just all (unintelligible) jump in. But I believe we can go constituents. We do not have to now provide the general kind of, you know, from NCSG because we are different things.

Tapani Tarvainen: So you're suggesting we could simply do this by two 18-minute sessions, one for NCUC and one for NPOC and NCSG at this point because ...

Stephania Milan: Well, we can distribute it between three. Why not? If you - if you want to have the NCSG or (unintelligible) why not. We can start from constituency and go to the stakeholder group level or vice versa.

Tapani Tarvainen: It's just to avoid overlap so we know we're done - talked the same issues - Stephania?

Stephania Milan: Just a second back to your original discussion without the priorities and the topics for this (unintelligible), I would just like to add a few that (unintelligible) but I know some people are working on that. They (unintelligible) the governors by contract. I'm looking also at more longer term as it becomes (unintelligible). So in relation for example to content regulation and more then when we look at, you know, that (unintelligible) coming up for some of the review teams, there's going to be two review teams starting, they (unintelligible) do we (unintelligible) stakeholder group with that and one of them the (unintelligible) callout. Probably there is also an opportunity to strategize a little bit face to face as opposed to doing it (unintelligible) last minute in semi-private channels.

To complement what Marilia said about privacy the counselor Europe has an event at ICANN privacy days or something in Copenhagen, so maybe (unintelligible) discuss what our interface with that given they have grant plans as far as I understand so in terms of people they want to bring to an (unintelligible) for the first time. Data protection folks and then they (unintelligible) capacity building which is something that relates more specifically to how we operate as a stakeholder group.

It's great to see at this table a lot of new faces and lots of new people that come today to this session for the first time. How do we make sure that we get these people up to speed and then more on a personal level how to we make sure that we actually survive - I mean we actually properly (unintelligible) to ICANN when a lot of us has also jobs and while we are up against people with different resources and that sees society, how can we empower each other, build on each other's schedules, work some expertise in order to be more effective and then last side comment on outreach, I would like to see collectively a reflection on how can we do outreach with (unintelligible)

sources as well. Like last night, for example, it was someone from a private party, from Iceland (unintelligible). Was not (unintelligible) anything. It was my own private housing if you want to friendship something like that. So that's probably even more effective sometimes. This sort of interpersonal contact. This person was very happy after last night because she got to talk to a lot of ears. So (unintelligible) type of mechanism instead of always bringing the issue of outreach back to initial funding.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I think Ed was next.

Ed Morris: Thanks Tapani. I think in terms of dividing the topics, things like outreach, diversity, things like that, that is in the realm of the constituencies. I think for the NCSG topics, we should stick strictly to ICANN because we don't really do outreach at the stakeholder group level and I would argue that the constituency level we often don't do ICANN. So I think at least as an SD supported traveler, I think what I'd like to do for the SD slot is stay within the realm of ICANN. Match topic is a good one. (Unintelligible). I am going to add to that one would be a modification of what Stephania just said in terms of the policy by contract which would be as a priority attempting to save the multi-stakeholder model from the (unintelligible) by ICANN staff.

That involves a whole bunch of various mechanisms by which staff is directing policy rather than responding to the communities edict. The second one is a little bit more insider but would be a big help to us this week. We're creating on counsel the GSNO appointments policy. That's important long term for how we get our members into the groups, into the working groups where we actually do the policy. Susan Kawaguchi and I came up with an initial policy that we applied on an ad hoc basis to the SSR2 appointments and from an NCSG perspective it worked great. I mean we get James Gannon as a

guaranteed spot. Naveed was in the second list of candidates and we only had two candidates there.

Unfortunately some of the other stakeholder groups are looking at this and thinking, well, gee whiz, they did a little bit too well. So there are proposals this week to change it and I think how I phrased it is one of our priorities is to create a fair and balanced appointment policy at the GNSO level. And that would help us going into the council meeting this week to let the CSG know this is our priority. They're working with us by and large against the interest of the trajectory party houses here but we're opposed to the CSG in that the CSG wants to have constituencies rule the world here, the user list, and so I just want to make it a priority so they understand a fair and balanced appointments policy is a priority because if we can't get our people on the working groups and review teams, more less, and we can't get people on the internal teams, we really don't have any value because that's where the action is. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Ed. Kathy did you want to speak?

Kathy Kleinman: Kathy Kleinman and first I'd like to introduce the person next to me. This is Mark Nasidy). He is my fiancé. He can go upstairs and be an observer and so I wanted to ask if anyone objects to his being in the session he can go do that and log in remotely but otherwise I wanted you to know who he was and a great supporter.

Tapani Tarvainen: We are happy to have you here (Mark).

(Mark): Thank you very much.

Kathy Kleinman: So what I am going to be saying echoes what you've heard around the room. So we have a number of goals and priorities this year. I'll add to our list

compliance, the unbalanced compliance reporting but of course the PDPs that we've heard about from Martin and others, active and coordinated participation in the PDPs is absolutely necessary and isn't - it doesn't exist in all PDPs right now but we've got the three, the rights protection mechanism, subsequent procedures and the RDS and registration directory services.

We've got just a few people here we need to be able to support them better. Education. We should turn outreach into education. We're doing a great job in outreach but it's the in reach, bringing people in and that's an educational process. Again, you've heard this from others. Just adding it and supporting it. But one of the questions I have for our goals and priorities is that one of the things that we should be thinking about is what we need to do our job better. What staff, what support, what research because that is - we need logistical support.

Other groups are getting some of it and how do we get more of it so that we can do our jobs better on the substantive and procedural side. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Sam? Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: I think we are doing lousy on the outreach.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, as Ed pointed out outreach is actually more constituency, at least has been so far, so. Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thanks. I wanted to comment actually on two things. One that Matt said and one that Ed said and actually compounded what Matt said. I think on the WS2 and this isn't - I've had conversations with other people about it so I may be taking something they were going to say but ...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes, you. But was thinking about it. The rush to finish WS2. The rush to finish WS2 puts us in danger of doing it sort of haphazardly. It - it plays into Ed was responding to. The way to get it done quickly is to have staff do it for us, have staff write a lot of it. So meeting schedules is often very much the inducement for staff help and I truly believe that they are just trying to help. You know, we set a schedule, they're doing everything they can to push it. Now, there may be other - if you get into some of the work we're starting to see in WS2, the staff accountability, you may start to wonder what motivates the help and what motivates the method in which the help is done. That's another issue. But that is also the indication of an issue that is not getting cracked quickly.

We've been added in WS2 staff accountability since the beginning and we're just now beginning to get some of the information that gives us a hint as to what it means to be these staff. Wonderful life to be staff but, you know, what it means to us for there to be staff. In terms of outreach, I don't agree with the flat statement that says outreach belongs to the constituencies and not to the stakeholder group.

I do believe that the constituencies are doing more on it, that at the moment it is not the stakeholder groups highest priority but I do personally believe that is the stakeholder group with the constituencies that should be doing outreach. The stakeholder group allows for membership by individuals and such that are not aligned with either of the constituencies and, you know, the original concept in the stakeholder group was rebuild a stakeholder group that can have many - it has two, it could have more constituencies as people wish. So while I agree that it isn't today's priority for the SG, I just wanted to put in sort of a book mark that says but that doesn't mean it won't ever be. The SG does

have a role in outreach. It's quite specific in its role in outreach in terms of cooperating with the constituencies and with ICANN in doing it but you know so agree in terms of today's priorities but not in the long run. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Avri. Tatiana did you want to speak?

Tatiana Tropina: Yes. I was just going to say again it's not about NCUS now on the stakeholder group priority. I would like to say if they're talking about writing up work stream 2, we have to say that our highest priority is not compromising on the quality of work that is being done and has to be done. While wrapping it up and finishing it quickly because they already saw, in some of the drafting teams of the work stream 2, how the quality was compromised when people were trying to get documents through. So this would be a priority. Wrapping up, finishing it up but not compromising the quality, like really put in some job (unintelligible) for the sake of quality. That's my add on to what (Mark) said.

Tapani Tarvainen: Oh, Joan. Please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Hi. It's Joan for the record. I just wanted to pick up on something that Kathy actually mentioned, which I really like. The idea of outreach and looking at it from an educational point of view. And I would add to that that if we can have a strategy or priority of working together, even if it's for the short term where we've identified the priority as a stakeholder group and then as a constituency and at least for the short term, work together to go out and educate the public or people involved in domain space but I think education is not enough.

I think we have to educate people and then engage them and then measure the impact that that particular action has. I think that's what we need to do. Even if

it's for the short term that we then have information to then design programs for them to further engage in. That will be my comment on that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Joan. I think Marilia wanted to speak.

Marilia Maciel: It was actually a follow up question to Tatiana in terms of (unintelligible) mechanisms for following up the implementation of work stream 2 once the work is done because I think that one of the things that happened in the last round with it, the (unintelligible) is that there were tweaks in the process that could have been inserted into the process if only we had the follow up mechanism to understand what was going wrong before. So maybe would be dealing with more concise round of discussions now if we could have incremental changes. So is there something being (unintelligible) to include in work stream 2 for us to have some control afterwards?

Tatiana Tropina: I don't think that we are on that page yet but what I can tell you is that in this direction Marilia that we discovered in the work stream 2 work has not been done well in the work stream 1, you know, what I mean and this is why I am trying to be so conscious about the quality of work that we are doing in the work stream 2. We have to get it some time, a second thought because there was a rush in the work stream 1 and now when we are looking at different documents and different tasks, we see that they are not matching sometime, that they were not well thought although in a good face with the best intentions and I believe that here, you know, we have to think a bit more.

We have to think about the consequences but again we don't have enough time probably for Matt told that would compromise between time constraints and the quality of job.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Ed?

Ed Morris: Thanks Tapani. Further to what Avri was talking about in terms of outreach at the SG level, I just want to at least let people know as we attempt to re-boot the finance committee because the NCSG has no money. It's hard to do outreach with no money. I have put in supplemental requests for a little bit different type of outreach and that's a joint event with a (GAK) member at an embassy in the site, I guess it's the next Latin American meeting to try to do outreach not only to the general population of the area but to the diplomatic core in a specific city along with our members.

So it's a different sort of outreach but I put in the request for that and we'll see where that goes. In terms of WS2, it's complicated. The more we prolong it, the fewer members we are going to have active in the groups. We - I have group meetings which have three people show up. So I've even stopped having the meetings. While I attempt, I know this sounds like it should be easy, to get ICANN legal to respond to a letter. We're in month four and getting our tri-chairs involved in that and there's politics up the rear end.

We have \$1.4 million to spend on outside legal fees. Our tri-chairs don't want to spend \$1. So we're dealing with internal pressures as well. They're under a ton of pressure that we spent too much money on legal fees during work stream 1, so they don't want to spend anything during work stream 2. We're under pressure in that our best staff member left for the NTIA and we've discovered that the name (unintelligible), she did the work of five members.

Quite frankly, if you put me in charge of ICANN, I'd fire myself, I'd fire the head, I'd take the Board's salary and I'd hire (Grace) back because her leaving set us behind three to four months and I've got to be honest. The staff we have on WS2 is subpar. On counsel we have brilliant staff. We have incredible

staff. But the staff that we have on work stream 2 and I'm speaking as I report to her, is not very good and not very helpful.

I was lobbied -- you'll love this. I was lobbied by a staff member on the ATRT2 issue, ATRT3 issue to make sure that my view was the right view which is that we should have a limited scope. That should not be what staff is doing but they are. It's a problem. Thanks.

Man: (Unintelligible). All the time.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: But I know at this point ...

(Female): Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: ... we are running a bit out of time and try to keep on topic which is what are we going to do talking about the next (unintelligible) and not ramble onto what substance but just what are we going to talk about. Okay, So (unintelligible) please go ahead.

Woman: So just a very concrete suggestion. Do we have a map of the volunteers we have in working groups? I think it would be interesting to have something like a questionnaire for 2017, mapping which at (unintelligible) level which are volunteers in which working groups. That would make it a lot easier to sign volunteers and to help them get engaged, know who they are going to talk to and so on. Following up on (Dillon)'s point that we need to have a plan, not only talk about outreach but map it out and do actions.

Tapani Tarvainen: So that's a topic for our current year. That would basically mean organizing our work better . Definitely worth it. Tatiana and Sam?

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry, it's a very brief, you know, kind of wrapping up from my perspective because I am dealing with all (unintelligible) at NCUC and I believe that we have to distinguish outreach where we go and inform people and not necessarily recruit them but just keeping them up to date from recruiting and from capacity building and actual engagement. This is trustable. I think that sometimes we are actually mixing the terms.

Secondly about different regions, I do believe that we need different types of outreach for different regions. I do believe that we need outreach in developing countries, in Africa and Latin America but you know outreach in Europe is a completely different challenge. People don't come. They are capable but they know they're market value. They know their price. It's really hard to get them even to come to your outreach let alone recruit them and let alone, you know, to get them actually involved. So I am for targeted outreach. I am for the EC members who and other volunteers who understand their region and can actually, you know, see what is needed and I believe unless we're doing this targeted outreach and then targeted recruiting and then targeted capacity building, we are just doomed because we cannot measure each region, you know, with the - like with the same measures. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: This is going to sound like a personal gripe. I've been engaged in three ICANN outreach activities in the last six months. Hyderabad, Dakar and here. Here after inviting the women's NGOs, the human rights NGOs and so forth to a meeting for tomorrow night, I had to email them all on the weekend and say, "sorry it's been called off." In Hyderabad, I had to pay out of my pocket

to cover the expenses that I can - couldn't mobilize and cover in advance. I'm yet to be re-paid and the same thing happened in Dakar. Outreach is driving me bankrupt.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Sam. At this point I observe this kind of - we should have this type of discussion -- so what we are going to do -- more often, because we are spending the time of what to talk about here. Okay, Poncelet.

Poncelet Ileleji: Thank you. Poncelet speaking for the record. I liked (unintelligible)'s comments on targeted outreach. But I would just like to say especially - which is something that I'm really concerned about when we are talking about targeted outreach.

I don't know. I want to look at it from we have similarities. Yes, we all belong to the same stakeholder working group. But I think we should have more synergy, especially based on regions, and that we want to do this outreach, so that we don't have a situation like what happened with NPOC for this intersessional, that we just have something consoled.

So I would like to suggest that within all we are doing, whether it's NPOC or NCUC at - on top of first the NCSG, we should have a more directed approach in terms of synergy, so that when we are doing this outreach, things will be able to fall into place, and each one will know what the other hand is doing. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Klaus and then Kathy?

Klaus Stoll: Very quickly. I think - I've forgotten who said it, but it's absolutely right. With the outreach, we have to split it up into two directions. One is quite simply

(sensible-itation), and making things relevant to people. And other outreach is actually engaging people in Internet governance.

And what we are experiencing at the moment is that the only interest from ICANN seems to be to outreach to come to Jesus, come to ICANN, just as a quick reminder. And, Tapani, this discussion is so interesting and (unintelligible), that I move that we actually forego our 45 minutes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. That was what - we seem to be needing all the time we have. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Actually, I guess I was going to make a slightly different motion, a point of information, which is, will we be using any of this session to talk about the upcoming sessions at this intersessional, and help plan our strategy and see if we have questions and ideas for the upcoming sessions? There are some big ones coming up. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. That's a good point, Kathy. But so far, the 12 minutes we have in the plenary, it seems we have a rather long list of things, a quick summary of which I've been collecting so far.

Talk about the Workstream 2, which may be taking longer than expected. But then again, we may want it to take long enough to avoid compromising quality of the work; what impact that will have in our work.

Then there will be this exercise of community power, which is happening apparently pretty soon. And that will be interesting to see how it works out.

Then we'll open the stuff that - policy works. We have auction proceeds; the RPM; RDS; the new gTLD subsequent proceedings; compliance; and some

overarching themes like content regulation, or rather how to avoid it, which has been our big concern along all the time; and privacy -- again a big, overarching issue; and in relation to that, Copenhagen; data protection authority meeting.

And outreach seems to be an issue that has lots of things within. And finally in general, organizational improvements within NCSG, including getting a map of who's doing what, and have we actually put things like - I guess, our new member database is part of that, and so forth, that's in our things coming.

Anna, you have a comment?

Anna Loup: Yeah, just a quick comment or a question. I think something that might be focused on would be methodological rigor within the working groups. I think that we are - that from my experience, that there are reports that are generated, but they're not methodologically sound. And I think that that would give us a lot of emphasis when we are reporting our outcomes.

And there are members, at least from the US that I've talked with, or interested folks who would like to be members, who have a background in method, but not within the community. And they feel like they wouldn't want to join, but they actually would be amazing participants within our working group, because of their methodological source background and abilities.

So I think that this might be something to talk about is, how do we shore up our - sort of the methods that we're using within the working groups, so that what we do produce at the end of the day is, you know, sort of quality and, you know, substantive?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, that's a very good point in general. That's improving our work, but that's a different tangled tech on that, so definitely improving our work within the working groups and methodologies. Poncelet?

Poncelet Ileleji: Thanks. Poncelet speaking again. I just want to go back to this Workstream 2 (unintelligible) animation, then compromising the quality of work. And Anna just mentioned something that is very important, because when you say compromise the quality of work, we have to be specific there.

And I think to be specific, is it based on the methodology used is something I don't have any clarity, because some is very generic. So I don't know if you can explain what she really means by compromising the quality of work.

Tapani Tarvainen: Tatiana, would you care to respond?

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry. Respond specifically to what?

Tapani Tarvainen: To what Poncelet just said -- what do you mean by compromising quality of the work?

Tatiana Tropina: Okay, okay. Just one of the examples, just to say they're not coming with this out of the blue. The Workstream 2 for human rights came up with a framework of interpretation, literal interpretation, of the text, of the bylaw, of the core value.

And we came - like drafting team who came up with this proposal, considered it just as a first step, as a part of the job we were supposed to do. But then because of the differences in the first report in the Workstream 1, we didn't - we asked the plenary to clarify the mission of the group. And it was clear that the group has to produce more.

But the group was divided because some people were insistent that this shall already go to the public comment. The job was not finished. It wasn't the quality of job that we were expected to do.

And so, you know, it could have produced further delays, or it could have, you know, produced the document which would not satisfy neither the mission or the group nor the idea behind accountability, and finally leave human rights - both human rights and ICANN vulnerable.

And that's what I already see. And this is why I'm so cautious, you know? Not to rush. Not to speed up. We have to ensure the quality. And as non-commercials, we have to contribute into this.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Tatiana. Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Two quick comments. There was an earlier comment about rushing meaning that staff would draft documents. That's not what my comments were addressed to.

They were about the working group taking better command of the process, and reflecting on doing a content analysis of its own process and saying, are we cycling around and around and around the same point? Or are we converging on something that's based on principles and evidence, that's going to give us the document that we can write with the help of the staff? Not that speed means the staff writes it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you.

Sam Lanfranco: That was one. Point 2, which I just lost on that one, was on - the last point was what? I just - remind me. The previous speaker...

Woman: Quality of work?

Sam Lanfranco: Oh, the...

Man: Quality.

Sam Lanfranco: Yeah, no, I'll save on that one.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Okay, Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: A very quick comment on quality. Every coin has two sides. Every time I'm complaining about staff overreaching and doing these sort of things, at the same time you have to observe that sometimes the quality of the work we're giving to staff forces them to do exactly that what we blame them for, because the quality of the work we are bringing over is just not good enough.

So there is a give and take on both sides. And I wish - and I hope that any staff or any ICANN member who listens to the discussion understands this is not a blaming game or a finger-pointing game. This is just simply something which we have to work on, and there are two sides to every coin.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. Sam, you remembered what you...

Sam Lanfranco: Oh, yes. I remembered the second point, and I have a question. And that is - and it's with respect to the human rights area, which I have been dealing with for decades in India. And that's that - that was not a working group. That was a working party. It did not have, as I recall, a sanctioned Internet charter and

all of that. It was - at what point was it procedural within Internet - ICANN's processes? That's my question.

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry. I'm not talking about cross-community working party, which is now dead in water. I'm sorry to be frank about it.

I'm talking about Workstream 2 accountability, human rights, core value, bylaw, which is a part of the accountability proposal, which is a part of transition proposal, and which now has to get framework of interpretation to be developed and adopted by ICANN, like in the same way as Workstream 1.

And it has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with cross-community working party, except some people who participated in both.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I think I'll have to call this - move on here. We are running out of time. What I'm going to do - I have this pretty good list of things for our agenda. And I will then, if time allows, (unintelligible) things, because I tend to speak fast, ask for people to open up a little more on these topics.

At this point before moving forward, I note that since we have a couple of board members (unintelligible) here, if you want to comment on these points, you're welcome to. Rinalia, please.'

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you, Tapani. Just three things. The first one is, I just want to say that the board is quite concerned about the speed of Workstream 2 work, and whether or not it can be completed. And it looks forward to discussing it with community in Copenhagen. So I think that will be one of the topics for constituency day.

The second one, regarding the exercise of community powers, I can confirm that it will be coming for the community, because there are a number of topics that have come on the board's agenda that tell us that we do need to initiate some changes in fundamental bylaws.

And what we're trying to do is actually to aggregate it so that it doesn't trigger so often during the year. And I think it would be useful and helpful if the community could just prepare for it, and know how you are going to engage with it through mental exercises and discussion on the process, so that it can be more efficient and effective moving forward.

The final one is, it's interesting for me to hear about your challenges regarding outreach. And I wanted to know more about how much cooperation or support do you get from stakeholder engagement department at ICANN. Now with the new CEO, the emphasis is on stabilization.

And with stabilization, it becomes more process-oriented, and more advanced planning is required. And so staff is required to be prepared early. And if you have a plan that is annual, and if it's discussed with staff at the beginning, then there may be resources to support and to synergize.

So I just wanted to get an idea of how that is going, and whether it's useful.
Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I see Tatiana, then Klaus, then Poncelet, then Ed.

Tatiana Tropina: Thanks, Rinalia. Actually I have an idea. And I have to admit we have problems with outreach and recruitment, but only in terms of, you know, field work. The amount of support NCUC gets from stakeholder engagement team is immense. The only thing is just failure to inform early.

I know that activities of the NCUC in terms of outreach, for example, at IGF was, you know, highly praised like everywhere, because we did well. We had an NCUC booth and everything. We got support from Adam Peake and from many others.

The same with the outreach in Europe. For example, we are now aiming to do joint outreach, NCUC and EURALO at ICANN in Copenhagen. So we started planning early, and we had the full support from Adam, from Jean-Jacques, and from all these guys.

And I do think that the point is really to plan early, to coordinate all these. And then you will have funding for drinks, for snacks. You will have the full support, and you don't have to pay out of your own pocket. But you really have to have this strategy for outreach -- what you're going to do and when.

And I believe that this corporation is going very well for NCUC, and I don't have enough words to praise like really the help from global stakeholder engagement team.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Tatiana. Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: I have to follow up Tatiana, and I have to say that our experience as NPOC in this thing is exactly the opposite, 100% the opposite. I put in requests for outreach events and things like that nine months ago - before, one year before. And I'm getting replies the week before a meeting.

And maybe it has something to do that our understanding of outreach is different from the understanding of the outreach from the outreach team. First of all, we don't believe in drinks and snacks. We believe in using the funds

available to give real knowledge and education and awareness and capacity building to people, to the grass roots, and leave something behind.

And the other one is that we have a two-step approach which I mentioned before. We are not going out and promoting ICANN. We are going out first and explaining why the DNS is the best thing since the invention of sliced bread, and why it is important and relevant and vital for every user. Once this relevance has been established, we talk about why it is important for everybody to get involved in Internet governance and ICANN.

So far, every time we did that, and we tried to do the first step, we've been told this is not inside our agreement.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Klaus. I point again that we don't have really enough time to discuss the substance at this point. We're just planning ahead. Trying to anyway. But still, Poncelet and Ed and then Tatiana. Poncelet, please. Be quick.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to respond to what Rinalia said. And I think for us in NPOC, it is very quite obvious. I will be very brief on this. We don't really get any big support from the global stakeholder group because if we had, in the processes, I don't think our event for Reykjavik would have been cancelled.

And the few problems we had in Dakar with some having to pay from his own pocket couldn't have occurred. So I would like to know what processes - what have we done wrong, when we seem to do everything on time? Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Poncelet. At this point again, I will take this as one key topic in our agenda in the plenary session. But we don't have time to sort it out here. But still, Ed, quick comment, then Tatiana.

Ed Morris: Very quick, and this is directed toward Rinalia. I have a different take in outreach than pretty much everyone in this room. Since I've been here in the NCSG for a little over four years, we've over doubled the number of our members. We're doing fairly well in terms of outreach for numbers.

Yet I'm on one of the major RPM - the working groups, RPM, which Kathy is the tri-chair. And we go in the meetings where there are 40 IP lawyers and two or three of us. We need to recruit people that know what we do here at ICANN. We do a great job of bringing in students who love the IGF. That's not who we are.

But back to outreach, one of the problems that I see -- and particularly now that I've taken on the mantle of the finance committee chair -- is the budget cycle really hurts us in the ability to grasp onto opportunities that may be there to do targeted outreach.

A quick example. We're trying to get Kathy and myself possibly to the INTA meeting in Barcelona. Every eight years the INTA comes to Europe. In addition to not having non-commercial members doing the RPM work, we don't have very many non-North Americans -- a few commercial clients.

So this is a great opportunity for us to go and bring five trademark lawyers in from Europe in non-commercial use. And guess what? Their meeting is at the end of fiscal year '17. And because 14 months ago we didn't know we needed this or had this opportunity, we're out of luck. But we can go to Seattle in 2018, which isn't going to help us right now.

So part of the problem, in my view, in terms of at least targeted outreach, is the planning process at ICANN requires us to know what we want to do 14, 15 months in advance. That's too long. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thanks, Ed. At this point, George, did you want to have a comment before...

George Sadowsky: Yeah, thank you. I'm still processing what is a rich mixture of opinions all over the map. And I think it's very useful, and I'm going to continue processing after this session is over. But it seems to me there's a lot of agreement. There's a lot of dissonance. And one of the things I try to do is make order out of chaos to the extent possible.

And what I'm picking up here is there are five areas that you're hopping around in with different topics, and two of them are governance. What do you do externally with respect to WS2 and the other constituencies? And the second one is, what about your own internal governance and process issues?

Then there's the administrative issues with respect to the staff -- issues, screw-ups, whatever. There have been a number of those. Then there's the rest of the world outreach issues that have nothing to do with ICANN, but have to do with your membership.

And finally, finally, there are the policy issues. And there hasn't been a lot of discussion of those in a sense. By the way, I'm not speaking for the board. I'm speaking - these are only my own observations.

There hasn't been a lot of discussion of those, and I really wanted to hear more. I'm sort of thirsty for, what are the issues that you're bringing to the

table that really have meaning in terms of the way ICANN moves forward on issues that are of real concern to your constituencies?

And they're important, and I know you discuss them. So I'm wondering, you know, if I were running this, which I'm not, I would say I'd love to see a combined paper on all of the concerns with regard to each of these five points, as opposed to hopping around and seeing them in this mixture.

And I know that's not the job of this session, but I think there is some order that can be brought. And in particular, some of the administrative issues that were brought, if the constituency were to say to ICANN, look, here are some of the things that concern us, and here they are on two pages, and here is what we think is wrong, can we work together to fix them, that would be useful. And that's true for the other four areas also. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, George. I must admit that that's some quotes in my experience as the NSCG chair, that trying to bring order to chaos, very much so. And also that I find I have had basically not time at all for any policy work of my own. I'm just trying to organize people doing that, which of course makes (unintelligible) sense. But, Tatiana, you had next?

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry. Just a brief comment about doing outreach for snacks and drinks. I was just answering Rinalia's question how stakeholder engagement team helps.

What's important about our outreach, at least in my region, is that we are self-motivated. I travel a lot. And I always have NCUC brochures with me, because I'm always ready to talk to people even outside of our general, you know, outreach strategy. And this is how it goes at the NCUC, and the help of like global stakeholder engagement is just one part of it. Yeah, basically that's all.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I have Matthew and Kathy, I think, anybody else...

Matthew Shears: Thanks, Tapani. I think we spent a - I think you've got a pretty good list for the upcoming session, right? So perhaps we can switch now to some of the policy issues that are on the agenda. It might be useful to hear from those who are leading those policy segments, if they have any questions for the group or things like that. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Sounds like a good idea. And I note that we have - I was hoping to get a list for things to talk with Goran, but I guess the same list pretty much applies if we can't get anything better done.

Man: We have compliance coming up, too.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, compliance was already on the list, but we can try to find lunch break or something to sort these out.

Man: So we're doing compliance during lunch? So we need to deal with that now.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Anna, please go ahead.

Anna Loup: That would be me. I guess for me I'm just generally trying to lead a positive and generative discussion about compliance. What I would urge everyone to do is go - if you don't know, go onto the ICANN Web site and look at the ICANN compliance reports. I think that those would provide a wealth of information, and especially would lead to, I think, a very productive discussion.

I know that they are not easy to find, so I will, at the beginning of the session, discuss them. But you can go. There are two. I'll just say the - it's features.ICANN.org/compliance. That is the dashboard. And then you can find yearly reports if you just search in Google, not on the ICANN Web site, the ICANN compliance yearly reports.

It's easier to find them through Google, not on the Web site, which is actually a topic of conversation that I'm very interested in having, about access to what I think is very critical data about compliance. And I think that's sort of where I would like to see our discussion go, is access as well as understanding of these reports -- who's writing them? What's the process? So go from there.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, thank you. And one item we - you know, mainly leads to a discussion we want to bring up with Goran is this accessibility of - availability of data -- how to find something on ICANN Web site basically. But I understand some work is being done on that. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: In the compliance as well - and this is - and Anna's going to be introducing it and introducing us to the reports, which many of us haven't read, and should. This should be an area, as we discussed under our priorities for the year and our work plan, that we should be doing more compliance work.

But I just wanted to raise that some of us will be asking questions about the fairness and the balance of the compliance process. Our complaints - there's been a lot of emphasis on the complaints and on the complainers.

But what about the registrant? If the registrant feels that the complaint is for the purpose of harassment, or to drive their speech off the Internet, their expression, what is their recourse? What is their ability to find who's

questioning them? So just wanted to let you know kind of the big picture on fairness and balance, hopefully, in compliance.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Kathy. Stefania?

Stefania Milan: Thank you to both of you, Kathy and Anna, for introducing this. Another important issue is how we, as a constituency, can intervene and interject in the process when need be. For example, what we should probably start to (unintelligible) - and maybe you have done part of the work already, so sorry if I ask stupid question.

But where can we intervene? I mean, we've heard what Kathy said about, you know, (unintelligible) problems. There's also the audit program. Is it something for us? And can we have a strategy up and running for when we need to intervene?

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Stefania. Anna?

Anna Loup: I think that would be a great question to ask Jamie. I think that looking at these reports - from my work just looking at the reports and going through them, and trying to understand what's going on at the very intro level, I think that's a good question. Where do we fit? Because I don't think that's clearly answered anywhere, and that's something we need to know.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I'm missing someone. You?

Ed Morris: Yeah.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Ed. Go.

Ed Morris: You're missing me? That's sweet. We need to understand, particularly for the newer members here, the importance of the sessions for compliance. I would state, without speaking to them directly, that if the CSG could have the compliance session, they would gladly come here for compliance and go home. This is the one that matters to them.

They have Jamie Hedlund here. He just got appointed head of Compliance. He can be molded in any way they want or we want. We need to push back.

I plan on asking Jamie - Allen Grogan who, in my view -- I know there's some disagreement here -- was really good. I mean, got a little bit off at the end, but he was really good at making sure ICANN did not so much get into becoming the content police.

Allen had a - when he was first appointed, had a wonderful blog post stating that we're not going to become the content police through the RAA or in any other way.

So what I intend to do is to quote from Allen's blog post, and ask Jamie if he agrees with it. Let's get him on the record as saying either ICANN doesn't do content through contract; or if he has a different view, let's try to see if he should still be employed.

Because in the bylaws, we're not supposed to get involved in content. We worked real hard in that over the past two years. So let's get his views in that, but let's start out with what Allen wrote, because I think it was a guiding principle that served ICANN and us well over his reign here for about two years. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Ed. Just looking at what other stuff we have, I guess compliance is very well under control. Thank you. We have these NCPH procedural in-house issues.

Man: Oh, no.

Tapani Tarvainen: Do we have any major problems in that? Klaus, you're leading the session. But, Dave, you were on that team trying to come up with a board selection procedure at least. Just a quick comment from Dave, if you can tell what's up there.

David Cake: No. The discussion - I don't think the discussions about board member election procedure's sort of at the point where we're converging on a solution yet.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. We were supposed to come up with that procedure during this intersessional, so...

David Cake: Yeah. And, I mean, I just - I think the views are fairly disparate still. There's...

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: I don't think we're yet advanced enough, and we're not yet really even heading in the same direction.

Tapani Tarvainen: That sounds kind of bad.

David Cake: I do expect we will like formally nail down the vice-chair selection procedure, and that will be great because...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

David Cake: But that's about where I expect us to get.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Some of the (unintelligible). And I talked to (Ricky) yesterday, and basically what we are trying to do is to keep it as easy as possibly, basically starting off with NCPH self-evaluation, asking values and expectations from the different groups; then going into the finalization of the vice-chair issue, but we understand that that's basically something which can be done in five or ten minutes.

And then as a third point, we had basic election of NCPH board chair procedures, and what's on - and I think we really should be - have a little bit more clarity about that one. And we wanted to ask Julie Hedlund or Glen basically to tell us where we are, where we have to go, and what we can do.

And then basically the other big point where (Ricky) really would like to go and spend some time - I know it is - we will end up in a discussion which might not have an outcome. But basically, how can we improve the communications inside the house? And where are we going there? And adding up at the end with any other business.

That's all I've got on our agenda. If there's anybody else who has something, who wants to add to that agenda, please - absolutely open to that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you, Klaus. It actually sounds like it will be a - well if some of those topics may end up spreading out - but we'll see. But anyway, it sounds like (unintelligible). Marilia, you had your hand up a while ago.

Marilia Maciel: Yes, actually my point was about contractual compliance. Can I go back?

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...but try to be brief.

Marilia Maciel: Just a quick comment on - because I think that governance by contract is so entrenched in Internet governance everywhere, it's just - it's not a phenomenon that we have here.

You know, infrastructure is governed by contract. ISPs are governed by contracts that they have with us. Platforms that we use -- Facebook, Google -- they are governed by contracts. So it's just a way that the business of Internet governance is done. So we need to have an understanding of how much we are trying to swim against the tide.

But in order to do that effectively -- and I do agree that it's important that we keep the policy role of the bodies of ICANN intact. It is important that we reach out to other communities.

My example comes from the Internet and Jurisdiction Conference that happened last year. And sometimes it is important for us to participate in these other conferences like Internet and Jurisdiction, IGF, that sometimes we see as something unimportant, but a lot of things that relate back to ICANN are being discussed there, and we need to be informed.

So Internet and Jurisdiction had a tract only on takedown of domain names, domain name seizure, and how this will affect providers of domain names, registries, registrars. The room was packed with registries and registrars and GAC members.

And the conversation was, you need to do something because my constituencies back home -- and this was a government speaking -- they knock on the door and they want to see child porn and copyright-protected issues being taken online. And I don't want to be the ones that go after you guys.

So either you self-regulate - and the proposal that seemed to resonate more in the room was to self-regulate by terms of service, so each provider would agree with (unintelligible) who was hiring the domain name, what are the limits that they would have. And, of course, at some point I believe that they would be required to coordinate among themselves.

But what I'm saying is that we're just sort of scratching the surface here. If we keep bashing staff about contractual compliance and not doing policy by contracts, we also need to reach out to other stakeholder groups. Because if they start to regulate by terms of service, then it becomes out of our control again.

So the problem is a little bit more than an issue with staff. Maybe we need to have a discussion with registries and registrars with regards to what are the policies that they're actually putting in place with individuals with regard to that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Marilia. At this point I realize there's one item we should put on our work plan of things we should bring up -- simply trying to improve our cooperation and work together with other stakeholder groups; not the CSG,

but the (RARSG) and (RYSG) and so forth, because we do rather tend to live in our small bubble sometimes.

Man: You're doing meetings with them in Copenhagen?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. That's where we are going to have separate meetings with registries and registrars in Copenhagen.

I can also note that we have today, after we talk to Goran, we have another hour to discuss our internal things, whatever we want. And it seems we have things to discuss there.

The final plenary today is new gTLDs. Because Avri's chairing that, I presume that's well under control. But maybe you can (unintelligible) going to be a - have major fight over. So please, Avri, quick comment.

Avri Doria: Okay, quick comment. I'm basically - I mean I talked to (Tony), who's also co-chairing it. I'm basically - since I am the co-chair of the new gTLD group itself, basically going to give a quick view of all the stuff we're doing in that.

And then the question I have is - for this group is, why are none of us interested? Basically - and so hopefully I'm going to basically put out a set of issues there, and except maybe for community TLDs which I've heard some interest in, by and large my impression is that NCSG is really not all that interested in new gTLDs.

We do have interest on the CSG side of various sorts, and they participate. But we don't. We don't answer community comments. We don't participate in the working groups. We don't participate in the work tracks. We're basically not into new gTLDs.

I'm not going to say it quite that way. I'm just going to basically - I mean after our, you know, hors d'oeuvres last night, I went and chaired, you know, the meeting we had last night. And I was, you know, plea-ing for more people to do work on that.

And I would plea for us to do more work on that, but I just don't see it. I mean I just haven't seen an interest in NCSG on new gTLD topics. So I'm going to present a list of the topics we're working on. Maybe people don't know what it is that's being discussed. But that's what I'm going to do.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I see Anna. Marilia, is that still - okay. Anna, Ed and Kathy, but Anna first.

Anna Loup: Cool. Thank you, Avri. I think that this is something I'm going to talk about when - in the introduction to my session as well, that there is actually a ccT metrics page that is also on the ICANN Web site, that might be a way to get more people sort of interested, because then using - through those metrics, people can find a reason why they should be interested.

There are some pretty good stories that are on there that link, you know, sort of the new g's to people's interests, not only within this group. So I think I'll introduce that and have people take a look, because that might be a way to get more people involved in the working group, just because there's a lack of knowledge that this data and these metrics even exist. So...

Tapani Tarvainen: Thanks. Kathy, I think you are next.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. I see what Avri's saying. And I think we're all stretched so thin, and working on so many issues, that getting to the new round of new gTLDs is

hard. But there's so many important issues, and we talk about them all the time. Like how the PICs, the public interest commitments, suddenly arose. And what those mean. And think PRPs.

They're issues we talk about all the time that are really part of the subsequent procedures new gTLDs working group. And so somehow we've got to take some of the energy and concern that we have about what's going on now with new gTLDs, and funnel it there. I just don't know how to do it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Kathy. Ed?

Ed Morris: Yeah. First I want to thank Avri for taking the lead in that group, because without her there, I don't think we have much of anyone. But I want to point out this is not a problem just for new gTLDs, and maybe we can talk about this at the second session today.

We don't have anybody interested in RPMs either. We have nobody interested, in my view, in the work of ICANN. And what I'd like to talk about later is why we spend so much time on the IGF, on RightsCon, on everything except the work of ICANN.

Because those of us who are - and Avri's involved more than anybody. But we don't see many of our fellow NCSGers in the working groups, outside of accountability to some degree, doing the work that ICANN is here to do.

George asked about why we don't talk about policy here. Well largely, if you look at our mailing list, we don't talk about it there either. It's a real problem, folks. We're here to serve and to work in the multi-stakeholder process here within the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. We're not

here to be an IGF advocacy group. I think that's an issue I'd like to bring up later today, Tapani, if we can.

Tapani Tarvainen: We can bring it up in the...

Man: Second session.

Tapani Tarvainen: After we make (unintelligible), I guess. Now we've got two minutes to go. Nice timing. So note that we don't have a nice list for things to talk about with Goran, but we have a long list of things. I'll try to put them in some kind of order. But if somebody has specific points that we emphasize, drop me an email or something in between, because we have to try to find some - a few moments in some break to put this in order.

And otherwise, we'll get back to our internal discussions in the - after we speak with Goran, which seems we definitely need. And when there's been talk about whether intersessional is useful at all, it's one of the rare occasions we actually get this kind of in-group discussions.

We don't find time for this in (unintelligible) for whatever reason. And it seems we do need it, and we have certainly lots of things to talk about, just to get our own house in order, so to speak. So at this point, Kathy, you have something to say?

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. Do we have a minute to know what Poncelet is doing with the RPM session, and introducing that? Or...

Tapani Tarvainen: Sure.

Kathy Kleiman: ...take us over time?

Tapani Tarvainen: Tomorrow. So I was hoping to leave that until later, because covering that today - (unintelligible) agenda today, but...

Kathy Kleiman: Oh, so we have a preparation time tomorrow? I apologize.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, great.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, so thank you, everybody. It's 10:30 now. We have a 15-minute break before the first (unintelligible) session.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

END