ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: NPOC Membership Meeting
Sunday, September 18, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the NPOC membership meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper format as I will note in the chat shortly. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session incudes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, clicked on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder mode, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name— for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Raoul Plummer. You may begin.

RAOUL PLOMMER:	Thanks, Andrea. Welcome to the NPOC meeting. We're a few here, some maybe online. Maybe we could go around a little bit just to see who's here. Maybe start from that end, from Jean Francois.
JEAN QUERALT:	Hi, Jean Francois Queralt from the IO Foundation based here in Malaysia.
JULF HELSINGIUS:	Julf Helsingius, incoming [NCSG] Chair.
INES HFAIEDH:	Hi, everyone. This is Ines Hfaiedh, NCUC Africa representative.
JUAN ROJAS:	Hello, everyone. This is Juan Rojas. I am outgoing councilor chair. I'm going to be a councilor and incoming policy chair in NPOC.
BIKRAM SHRESTHA:	Hi. This is Bikram Shrestha, NPOC Vice-Chair.
EMMANUEL AGBENONWOSSI:	Hello, this is Emmanuel Agbenonwossi. I'm the current general secretary for NPOC.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Hello, everyone. My name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje, NCUC Chair. Nice to be here.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Glad you could all join. My name is Raoul Plommer. I'm the Chair for the NPOC. We still have a couple of minutes. Would you like to introduce yourself? You can come and sit by the table. It's okay. We got plenty of space.

LEN MANRIQUEZ: Good afternoon. I'm Len Mariquez from the IO Foundation.

JESSICA RIVERS: Hello, everyone. My name is Jessica Rivers, and I'm here with ICANN Wiki.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nice to see you too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And I think we have a friend of ours over from the IO Foundation there.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay. So I guess I'm probably the last person to speak. My name is Caleb Ogundele , and I'm the membership chair. And I'm from Nigeria. Proud to be a Nigerian.

RAOUL PLOMMER: The first thing on the agenda is the membership matters. And I will give the mic on that to our membership chair, Caleb.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much, Raoul. So we want to welcome all our members that are also online [inaudible]. We see you and we fully recognize your presence in this meeting. We see some of our members. Bolu is on the EC team, who is also not here.

That being said, some of the membership matters that we'd like to talk about, first of all, is to ask ourselves some basic questions and some reflection on some of our active members, those who are not active at the moment, to see how we can improve on them being active. We understand fully well that COVID-19 has allowed quite a number of persons to have different priorities, which is basically affecting our volunteer time. And it's increasing most of the volunteer burnouts that the entire constituency has been talking about. And so one of the things we'd like to place on the table are, what are the numbers and what are we doing with the numbers?

So in the first note, I'd like to first of all just point out that, as of the last election we had, which truly reflects of our active numbers, basically I think we have about 45 members. That's for the total members that we currently have.

That being said, it's probably because of the fact that it's not open to individual members. So it's basically an organizational thing. So you can get everyone just dropping by, except probably you have to go through your organization, run some checks with your management

team, and then you get an approval to represent your organization with NPOC. So that's one of the things that we've noticed with that.

That being said, we noticed that 29 members have been very active, and that's probably during the elections and that.

So we need to start doing some reflection on how we can continue to see that our members continue with their engagement—not just engagement with what we do in NPOC (our vision and what we stand for) but to continue to engage at the NCSG level, as well as the policy level. Quite a number of times we generally make a call for public comments on certain policies within the constituency, but most times, we usually don't get to see volunteers come out. And we do understand some of the challenges. And so we'd like to see how we can improve on that.

On that note, we will still be turning the mic open for our members present and some of our friends that are here to make contributions and see how we can improve on that.

And basically, we'd like to just mention that we do have our target for membership recruitment for this current term, and we hope that, in this current term, that we should be able to at least get a quarter of the current existing active members being involved in some of the things that we do.

And some of the plans that we do have also is to continue to have quarterly membership meetings where we have and open engagement and accountability to our members, where we tell them some of the things we are currently working on and how they can participate with

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

us and we go along in some of those initiatives. Some of those initiatives also that we do have plans for our members also include capacity building. And these are some of the things that we have basically in stock for or members.

But more importantly, we want to encourage our members that, whenever we do have a call for comments—public comments when it comes to issues on policy that we have—we want to see that our members are participating actively, being penholders. Even if they won't be penholders, at least they should contribute to some of those policies, either at different comment levels and all of that.

So that's just for some of the updates for now that I'd like to speak to.

And I'd like to open the conversation with Raoul's permission to ask if anyone would like to comment on some of the updates that we just gave on membership. And we see that we have one of our friends—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ines.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yeah. Ines. So please feel free to take over the microphone.

INES HFAIEDH: Thank you very much, Caleb. Sorry, I really wanted to raise my hand through Zoom, but I'm unable to do that. I'm really sorry.

So I had a question actually about NPOC, about the leadership. How is the organogram, the hierarchy? How is it organized? Because I think it's super different from NCUC for us. It's regional. How is the leadership in NPOC done? So this is my first question.

My second question is, if this is written in your bylaws, if you have strict bylaws that the leadership has to be this way … Actually, with the way the leadership is done, would it help to have more engagement from the membership if, for example, you had some regional representatives? So this is my question.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay, Raoul, you want me to go on that?

RAOUL PLOMMER: Sure.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Okay. So your first question is how our leadership is organized more like the organogram. So basically, we have the Chair, who apparently seated next to me, who is Raoul. And we have the Vice-Chair, who is Bikram, who is also seated next to him. And we have the secretary, who happens to be Emmanuel over there. And we have the policy chair. The new incoming policy chair that we have is Juan, who is also seated next to Bikram over there. And we have the membership chair, who happens to be myself. And we have the comms chair (communications chair).

Within all this, when you hear someone say that you a communications chair, it is your task basically to get members to be part of your small subcommittee where you get to do stuff related to communications: update websites, [inaudible], all the things of communication with members and all of that. That is also intertwined with some of the things that the membership chair also does: organize capacity building, stakeholder engagement, and quite a number of things that we do at that level. The policy chair basically is to see that we have current and active engagement at the policy level from within NPOC. It's basically encouraged to be the penholder in most cases, but in the case of the fact that are with NCSG, we can just at some point just say we have our own public comment. We just have to do everything on the NCSG because we believe that we all are under NCSG as a constituency.

So that's a quick highlight of some of the things and some of the roles that have in NPOC.

More importantly, you mentioned how some of these things can improve with a charter on all of that. More recently, we shared some of the good news with members that we just completed our new and improved charter, which we sent for public comment also to members to make the comments and for them to make their impute into the comment which we prepared. And I think the document currently has gone through OEC at the moment. That's the Organizational Effectiveness Committee at the level of the Board. And I think it has also passed through Legal. And I think there will be some next steps and improvement on that.

And part of the things that we also thought on our own part for improvement through the initiative of the chair was to make sure that we want to see members engaged, so for some of the travel slots that we do have, we thought it would be nice to delegate some of those travel slots to members. That was recently announced by Raoul on the mailing list. And that means someone has to put in the work. But we need people who can actually put in the number of hours that we do the real work and not just at an administrative level but also at the policy level to make sure that NPOC voices are heard.

It seems like you have more questions?

INES HFAIEDH: No, actually it was my second question about the regional … If it was … It would have more engagement from membership if there was some regional initiative.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Right. So basically, I think the difference between the organization of NCUC and NPOC is because we are only representing organizations of which many are international organizations. So the regional divide would not maybe be as functional as it is for NCUC.

And, yeah, like Caleb was listing these, all the positions are really listed by function, not area. And in fact, our new charter should be opened for public comment before the end of the month. We'll actually reduce our EC by two, so we'll become an EC of four people.

CALEB OGUNDELE: So just to add to that, one of the things that we also try as much as possible to do within ourselves is to make sure that we have diversity on the EC so it's not just a particular region that we have on the EC. As you can see, Raoul is from Europe, and Bikram is from APNIC. And Juan is from LACNIC, and myself and Emmanuel are from Africa. So, yeah, we try as much as possible to have regional balancing in everything that we do. But this is also based on the interests of our members who really want to be a member of the EC. So it's not a function of … I don't know. Maybe for lack of a better word, but I fully subscribe to the fact that we have diversity at our EC currently.

INES HFAIEDH: Thank you very much.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I'd also like to add on the first item on the agenda that, yeah, we don't actually have a great history of making policy, and that's partly due to many of our policy chairs dropping the ball so far. And I think one of the reasons has been that they've basically been left alone to start that process. So that's obviously hard. And I think, this time around, we've already made a decision in the EC to be more supportive of that. And we've now picked, like, two policy topics that are later there on the agenda: the TPR, which is the Transfer Process Review, and the IDN, which are the Internationalized Domain Names. So we are actually concentrating on these two, including myself, to make comments on these policies and to actually be a productive part of the community.

To accomplish this, we'd really want to engage our current members who are active who voted in the elections and hopefully the new ones as well. But it'd be great if we could actually from maybe two internal groups around these two policy issues. So if you can pick either/or and maybe would be interested in either of them, that'd be great. And we could have our own little group, making our contribution to the NCSG comments.

So, yeah, I think that'd be great. And I invite you all to join that effort.

Does anyone have any question about the membership matters?

No? All right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah.

So the next item is about the NomCom rebalancing. Just to give a little background, that's basically … NPOC was formed after there was the ICANN bylaws were including NCUC as a chair in the NomCom. I lost my thought there. So ICANN bylaws have NCUC listed there, but there is no mention of NPOC, which actually gave an excuse to ignore us or the recommendation that actually came from external auditors. As I understood it, it was a strong recommendation to rebalance the NomCom. The issue is basically that the GNSO is represented in the NomCom with seven seats, and one of them is the Registry Stakeholder

Group. One of them is the Registrar Stakeholder Group. One of them is the NCSG, our own beloved Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. And the fourth one, the Commercial Stakeholder Group, has four seats.

So you can see that that's not really fair. It's basically that the seats at the NomCom by the GNSO are so that the CSG has one vote over all of our votes. They can basically nullify all the rest of the stakeholder groups and put one vote on top of that. That's just a crazy situation. And they've been making the case that they should have a seat for every constituency they have, but in fact they have the fourth one, which is small businesses. That's not an actual constituency.

So at least that one should the CSG should really give up. And since we have two constituencies, that should really go to us. In any case, the thing should be rebalanced. At the moment, it's just wacky.

So we've been working on that since the Marrakech meeting in ICANN55 in 2016. We've raised this issue again in Hyderabad later that year in the AGM. And then the Board told us, "We will have this NomCom review coming up, so you have to present your case there and hopefully get it rebalanced to reason your position," and so on. But I have a nasty feeling that basically the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups have been given something by the CSG for them to be happy with the status quo. Otherwise, I don't think they could be happy with it. So I do think they are getting some advantage there that we are certainly not getting.

So the situation right now is that the NomCom review has actually already stopped. And basically, the result was I think they first tried to

pass it on the Board, and the Board said, "No, it's not theirs to decide. It should go to the GNSO." And there was a vote in the GNSO that included all the stakeholder groups. And basically the rebalancing recommendation didn't pass there.

And also the review group, in my understanding, did make an option that this could be passed on to the ICANN holistic review when all the bylaws are going to be reviewed. For example, NPOC could be listed there as one of the constituencies that deserves a spot in the NomCom. But, yeah, the NomCom is quite important. Although they don't do policy, they affect the whole of ICANN by selecting its leaders. And I think that's quite a lot of power because the leaders actually set the tone for the whole community.

I think that's pretty much it. At the moment, we're trying to find out exactly what can still be done maybe within the GNSO—if not there, then at the holistic review. But we will certainly be pursuing this until the very end and try to make a change there. And I think that really honestly would be best for the whole GNSO.

Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. So just to correct you on the NomCom—I'm actually on the NomCom—although the constituencies are appointed, they don't represent their constituency. So you're just looking for the best leaders. You're not necessarily representing your constituency on the NomCom, which is one of the main reasons the GAC is not included in the NomCom: because they don't believe that they can … They want to

represent only their constituency. And that's not the rules of the NomCom. So if that is your understanding, then that's not necessarily a correct one.

But the question is that there is room. There's also some constituencies that have a non-voting slot in the NomCom. And that also could be something you could look towards in the interim and before you can get the full slot. You could try to see if that would help get you onto the NomCom. Instead of asking for the voting if there's a lot of pushback on that, try the non-voting because there is voting, yes, but there's also a lot of … You're very active in the whole process, even if at the end you don't vote. There is a section before the voting that is preferences— what is your preferences? And everyone votes. It's only the act of selection where you don't vote. So that's something that you might want to consider.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Julf?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Just to follow up on that, yes, I think we all know what the theory is. In practice, it might not always work that way. Even the ones who aren't representing their constituencies still kind of come with their values and interests they represent.

And, yes, I think it would be much easier to get an observer post or a non-voting post, but on the other hand, that would then make the

Board and everybody say, "Okay, you got what you wanted." So that might be a dangerous road to go down.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, I do think there is a problem if basically the Commercial Stakeholder Group can overrule the rest of the GNSO there. You're saying that they basically have to give up their interest for their own stakeholder group, but do they really? These—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, they do.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah, on paper, but—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, no. They do. I've worked with people in other constituencies, and you do. What you're looking for is you're looking for the best qualified person. There's a lot of training being held on that. So make sure that you're not bringing an unconscious bias into the evaluation. There's a huge amount of effort put on there. And that's also one of the confusions about the NomCom: how we select and why, in some cases, do you get less diversity than you want. And that always turns out to be not on that you're looking at diversity but that, of the people who applied, who are the best candidates that do not have any problems with bylaw issues?

Sometimes what gets people trapped into different areas is that the bylaws are not as clear as they could be, and so some people get caught. And so I think one of the efforts of this year's NomCom is to try to work better on communications and really explain how the NomCom works—not just a black box—so people can understand more what really it is and why results happen that may not be what we want but is the hand that is dealt to us.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah.

Go for it.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: My point here is that, yes, I know there are no voting rights—"Oh, you don't represent the constituency"—but I think, if we need to be able to get enough or more NCUC people here, some of these opportunities act as incentives to our participants. And even after doing NomCom business, they can come to NCUC or NPOC business. And that is part of gathering momentum for our cause and being ears to our concerns at various tables and speaking our values to either the Board or to other constituencies.

So for that reason, I think, if there's a small possibility for us in that space, we deserve it, and at the maximum value that it carries. So that's why I would require that. If there's anything, they should give it to us. Knowing our background, we don't have the big pockets to support bringing our participants to all these places where these conversations

happen. So that's why I would say it's worth pursuing. And if there's anyone has any form of clout to push that for us, we can use that. Thank you.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you so much, Benjamin. So I think one of the few things we've been able to establish clearly here is that we need to make a case for an additional seat—that has been clearly stated—because if we look at the bylaw, what the bylaw said is that we should—that's Section 8—have one delegate from consumer and Civil Society groups selected from the Non-Commercial User Constituency. It didn't say the NCSG.

So if you look at the background, like Raoul was saying earlier, the background of this bylaw is a result of the fact that NCUC came before NPOC. And so obviously that's the only of crafting the bylaw as the current situation was then. Now there has been some evolution in ICANN over a period of time. And so should the bylaws also evolve?

And as a result of that, the summary of what I am looking at from this conversation is, one, we should have a small internal working group to come up with both scoping and a good strategy. And it should be cross-constituency because, from what I'm seeing here, we have our friends from NCUC also giving us that shoulder and support, which for me at this point I see as very encouraging and it's something we need to applaud them for, giving us all the necessary support that we need. And I see Jeff (Julf) also giving us all that support—right?—given his last e-mail and his commitment to us [inaudible].

Perhaps one of the few things we need to agree on at this meeting is to have a cross-constituency approach and strategy where we can work around these issues, come up with an action plan. Then we see that the NCSG Chair is someone that needs to also push that agenda from some of the strategies that we will come up with. So we want to thank you in advance for agreeing to that commitment.

And I see that Judith's hand is coming up again.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Another thought that you might do in the interim before getting your bylaws changed, which is going to take you a very long time, is you may want to work in the NCSG to switch off so that one term was NCUC, and the next term would be NPOC. And so alternate until you can get the bylaws changed because it's going to take a long time because it took us so long for the NomCom review, and now they still have to go through a bylaw change. And it's going to be very tough again to change the bylaws to get changed again.

So I'm thinking the best approach my be, if they're amenable, to work with the NCSG to switch off. They're only going for two years each. And they can only be two years. So one year could be NCSG. The next two-year term would be NPOC. And then that would give you some momentum to build up because it's going to take a very long time to get another bylaws change.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Yeah. So let me wrap this item up after Bruna has had her say.

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

BRUNA SANTOS: We need to pay attention to the hands up in the chat as well if we're doing hybrid just because I had my hand up for a while.

First of all, I think it's—again, Judith pointed out something really in a more correct way … If we're discussing rebalancing of the NomCom, we're discussing having more people able to represent Civil Society in a much broader way for the leadership position selection and so on. It's not just about having NCSG or NCUC or the three of us, but it's about having a more concise and stronger voice for selecting Civil-Society-related leadership for ICANN and so on. So that's one thing.

The second thing is about the exchange or the suggestion you just gave. It's something that was also suggested in our list: for us to try to see whether there would be space for transferring the NCUC's slot to NCSG and then have a cross-community conversation to see whether one can occupy this slot for a time, and then the other can occupy the slot for a different one.

But I also think it's not just something in between the constituencies. And to me, it's a little upsetting to see this conversation being put at the level of the constituencies because, after all, we are a stakeholder group, and this all should be coordinated at the stakeholder-group-level because it's the stronger voice and it's the group that has a seat at the NCPH.

So it's the group that talks to other parts of leadership. So it's just a reminder for us to keep in mind that you need to work together with the SG leadership in order to have any improvement to this because if you

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

go through the NomCom review process in which we all had a seat and a chance to discuss, the review was also deferred. It was deferred in June this year. So in light of this deferral, and also considering we're bringing this topic as one of our discussion topics with the Board this week, it's key that you guys find out a strategy together with the SG, together with the NCUC, and maybe avoid also pointing fingers at the other groups because, at the end of the day, it's not who has the seat. It's what we want, what's the end goal. It's not just being balanced with the CSG. It's bringing Civil Society to the Board. It's bringing Civil Society to leadership positions.

So just a few reminders about this. And sorry for taking too long.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Thank you so much, Bruna. So it's my quick assumption, just to wrap up this session, that we need to come up with a cross-constituency conversation, like a subgroup that we'll have to come up with a strategy for.

And I see Jeff nodding his head somehow. It looks like we have your commitment towards that, in leading that initiative?

Oh, okay. When I saw you shaking my head, I was thinking maybe you had something to say about it.

JULF HELSINGUIS: So sorry. I was confused because I'm Julf, not Jeff.

RAOUL PLOMMER: My apologies. I'm an African, so—

JULF HELSINGIUS: No problem. It's a difficult name. No problem.

BRUNA SANTOS: And if I'm allowed to come in, the leadership transition is yet to happen after this meeting ends So I obviously don't understand the dynamics here.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Oh, I thought since it's the incoming … So my apologies on that. But we can move on.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Okay then. So I don't know. I do want to wrap this item up now. And just as the last words about this, I think it's crystal-clear that the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is supposed to be a counterpart to the Commercial Stakeholder Group, and they are representing four to one. And I think that's it. That's the bottom line, right?

So I'm moving on to the next item, which is the current possibly developments that NPOC is participating in. So like I said in the beginning of this session, we've sort of possibly left our policy chairs a bit too alone on starting to draft policies for us. And this time around, we've tried to really take our lesson there, and we're now trying to … Well, basically, we're concentrating on these two policies: the transfer process review and the IDN (Internationalized Domain Names). And like

I said in the beginning, if any NPOC member wants to join in working on these, feel free to contact myself or Caleb. Me and Juan are working on the TPR, and Caleb and Emmanuel are participating in the IDN group.

Would you tell us a little about the IDN developments- and what's going on there?

EMMANUEL AGBENONWOSSI: Yes. So I currently represent the NCSG at the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on internationalized domain names. So I joined the process after ICANN74. That was very recent. So it has been a couple of weeks of literature because there's a lot going on currently. And I think we were so absent that I have to get myself up to date. So there's meetings going on almost every week, but at the same time, a lot of literature from the archives I have to read to get myself up to date.

So, yes, I think, from time to time, I'll update the community on what is going on, being the ears and eyes there, so that they can also be present and have their voice heard when it comes to IDNs. So I think the work just started, so I think I'm the weeks and months will be tough. And I think I'll update you guys from time to time to get your comments and views and opinions on all the policy work that is going on. Thank you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Do you want to add to that, Caleb?

CALEB OGUNDELE: No, I'll pass.

RAOUL PLOMMER: All right. I guess we'll move on to the TPR then. So, Juan, do you want to introduce that to us, that transfer process review?

JUAN ROJAS: Okay. This is the team that was formed according to one council initiative because … This comes from the public RDDS information with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) about gaining registrars, about the transfer contact via RDDS. And this information comes from the temp spec. This group has one recommendation that … This started in April 2020, so this has a lot of discussion.

But now the working group is discussing mainly about this: gaining or losing registrar form of authorization. It's known as FOA. And this important because the council has flagged to the Board these ICANN interpretations of this language. This gaining FOA should be discussed according to the policy development. This group has proposed these reliances on auth info code and some changes in the lines of responsibility. And as some of the discussions from the last meeting yesterday, these initial discussions are centered in that part of that question: gaining registrars and FOA.

The first is we are talking about these scenarios to transfer a domain name from one registrar to another one, from one registry to another one. Initially, the discussion is centered on that we have a 30-day post-transfer lock that helps to ensure that for domains, if stolen, the losing and gaining registrars could work together. But this part of the discussion.

Also, the group is discussing the five-day window that the registrars can roll back because this is the minimal standard for the registrars. And we are talking about having the gaining [inaudible] ID and the necessity for retaining the losing FOA (Form of Authorization again) because the registrants are on their own.

And this is a little bit from the discussion that we had in the group yesterday in the last session. So I think that's it for now.

RAOUL PLOMMER: One more thing to add. I think we had a good comment—an NCSG comment—that we made after Phase 1, and it about the high transfer fees for some registrars. And we found that especially very restrictive for non-commercial users. So that's something that should be addressed in the next phases. And I think we should really try to make it so that there aren't any unreasonable fees extracted. In fact, they should be discouraged. And I think that's what we know of it at the moment.

Caleb, you want to tell us a little about the holistic review?

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yes. There is an ATRT3 recommendation specifically speaking to the pilot holistic review terms of reference that was earlier established. But key to some of the things that we want to encourage is that the public comment is currently on the ICANN website and that we need to start putting in our public comments in regard to that specifically.

But key things that we'd like to call your attention to for some of the terms of reference is the structures. Some of the things that were mentioned were the structures on accountability of members and their constituencies.

The next one was [continuing a proposal of] structure and potential changes in structures and operation to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as ensure optimal representation of community views. I believe some of the conversations we are also having here, which also revolve around a NomCom rebalancing, are also some of the conversations that we should be having also on that public comment. And I feel that this is also an opportunity for us to use that opportunity to make some traction and some imputes when it comes to that specifically.

So we want to encourage everyone to please check out the current public comments that are open on ICANN's website and see how we can make imputes on that.

So I think it's a wrap for me today.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Thanks for that, Caleb.

JUAN ROJAS: Sorry. I think it's important to check that. We have another public comment opened. I think another one that's important is the proposed updates on the GNSO operating procedures. So we can do that maybe.

We can check. And remember that the comment that is happening that Caleb was saying. It's about the holistic review. It's about ATRT3, right?

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yes.

JUAN ROJAS: Okay. That's it. And we'll have soon our charter in a public comment, so maybe we invite all of the community to be alert when our charter is opened for public comment to do their comments, too. That's it. Thank you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Thanks, Juan.

So the last item on our agenda today is really quite a new one. It's about making ICANN sustainable. It's something that, as I understand, has been tried already through ALAC in some form. It was supposed to be given to the Board to consider, but they didn't take that, of course. And what needs to happen is that that initiative needs to come from the community.

Well, a little background. Basically, ICANN is critical Internet infrastructure. And I think it really needs to be sustainable in the future as well. I don't think currently there's really any effort in ICANN to make us more sustainable—environmentally at least. And you've seen the framework we're here with with the sheep coming, with the ICANN equipment going from one harbor to another throughout the year. And

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

I don't know if we're flying to the tune of 500 people or something to each meeting just by the ICANN. And of course, all the other attendees also come here. And I think there's also quite a bit of footprint as well for running the hubs, the root servers, and all that technical infrastructure that goes with ICANN. So that's something that I think should really be addressed, and it's not being addressed.

And I think ICANN wants to show itself as a modern organization that actually is a responsible organization. And I think this kind of environmental responsibility is a crucial part nowadays, and ICANN really needs to start considering it. And I think there is a fair bit of funding coming from the new gTLD auctions. And it's not that ICANN really is that poor that we just warming up the planet without a care for it. So this is something that we've already been looking at. I think we'll present this fairly soon to the wider community. So far, we just have a working document that's seven pages or so.

But I feel that it won't be really that much contested (whether ICANN should compensate its carbon footprint) but how to do it. And I think we do make the first [at first] and find out that the ICANN community does want to do it. And I'll be making one hell of a guilt trip if they don't.

So I think it's something that really can be done wrong. For example, there has been a lot of fake ways of addressing this. Like for example, a big company is buying a forest somewhere. It's something that doesn't actually reduce carbon footprint. The forest was already there. It's just that, okay, it might not be under protection of some big company, but the carbon footprint didn't really change at all. So we do need to make it in an effective way.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

And I think NPOC definitely wants to be one of the groups/constituencies that start to make this initiative and take it to the wider ICANN community. I think it's not going to be Commercial Stakeholder Group that is coming up with this particular initiative. And I really think that that's NCSG's responsibility to bring that forward.

Does anyone have any opinions on this?

Okay. Silence is agreement, right?

I think that's pretty much our agenda today. We can still have an AOB (Any Other Business) if somebody wants to raise an issue that would be relevant to NPOC.

Yeah, Jean Francois?

JEAN QUERALT: I actually would like to go the previous point for one second. It just occurred to me. Do you have any access to some type of mapping of the infrastructure that you'd [be able to do] those evaluations [in terms] of cost and consumption but also for print?

RAOUL PLOMMER: I'm quite sure this some form of it. It probably isn't anywhere collected as a whole. But I think that's definitely part of the work that should be started on to even know how big is that footprint. But, yeah, I think they do have information. Like, for example, all the travel slots that the community traveled here with and they book through Concur. Concur already calculates how much exactly is that footprint, how much CO_2

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

emissions it is. And, I don't know, I tried to calculate just some kind of a rough idea of how much it actually is, and I was thinking, "Okay, maybe for this meeting, I'm sort of an average-distance traveler coming from Europe," so not quite as far as the US or some other places. And just one way was, like, 3.6 tons. And if you calculate that … I don't know the exact figure. I think the ballpark is around 500, maybe, paid attendees—something like that, including staff as well. And one trip, one meeting, for just the travels, would be to the tune of 3.6 million tons of CO2. That's quite a lot—no, not tons. 3.6 million. Yeah, that's it. Not tons. Yeah. Sorry. But that's still a lot.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Just to add to what he was saying, one of the few things for me that I'd like to see is, with most of core DNS infrastructure, how exactly do they affect the environment. And we need to look at some of these thing they're using renewable energy in powering some of this core infrastructure so that we know that, yes, we are keeping the Internet. We want the Internet to work, but then we don't have to destroy the environment to use the Internet. So that's the balance of one of the few things I'd like to see in this initiative that we are trying to work on.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Glenn?

GLENN SMITH: My opinion is that a green ICANN or a sustainable ICANN is too limited. I think you have to look at a corporate social responsibility perspective,

much broader than just carbon offsets and green energy, and how ICANN sources its materials from ethical sources. When they select a location, are they dealing with locations where they have a host of things in terms of the country having rule of law as well as how they treat the gay community or what's their views on geopolitics. There's much more than getting … Big Tech is doing this from a CSR point of view. ICANN is not progressive. At-Large did not look at sustainable ICANN. It was an ICANN initiative from a few years ago from a few people, and it died on the vine. So I think there's Big Tech examples that have taken this model.

And a question is just laying out a plan on what a CSR is, what things could be implemented, like a green manifesto. We've talked about this. And it's a simple ten steps. And you lay it out with, "These are the things you can set up," because if you go back to their strategic plan, they very well said that they're caretakers of the environment in general language. But clearly there's a lot of things they can do, not just the footprint.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Thanks, Glenn. Yeah, I got the note there. We are—oh, one more comment?

[INES HFAIEDH]:   Yes. Actually, just one question with regards to sustainability. Is there some kind of measure or KPI … Does sustainable ICANN only mean the environment, or does it mean something else or something more?

Start, like, a reference document we can look at it to contribute to a sustainable ICANN. Thank you.

RAOUL PLOMMER: I don't think we have those yet.

[INES HFAIEDH]:   Do you think we can make one as NPOC?

RAOUL PLOMMER: That'd be great, but first, like Jean Francois said there, we do need to get some figures for the infrastructure and this travel and the supply chains and so on. That's going to be a lot of work, but I think that's where we have to start. We have to make this acceptable or accepted at the ICANN community: that we actually want to go environmental. That's the first step. And I don't think we need to build too big a case for that. Like, there's a ton of information.

Okay, I think that's us. Thanks very much for attending, and I hope to see you next time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR