ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
August 28, 2015
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have been started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, (Jay). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG elections (unintelligible) conference call on Friday 28 of August, 2015.

On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Marilia Maciel, (unintelligible), (Antoine Nix), James Gannon, (Fizani Bodi), Amr Elsadr, (Antoine Weke), Stephanie Perrin, Peter Green, Tapani Tarvainen, Klaus Stoll, Bill Drake. And from staff, myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

And for all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much. Over to you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Maryam. And thanks for everyone for joining today. So this is kind of experiment for us, for election to have such comfortable we can really ask a question to the candidates to know more about them. We had before this may be for election for the board members that this is for standing for NCSG election and we hope we keep doing that in future.

So basically what we are trying to do first to give you a chance that candidate to make initial statements, two or three minutes. So we shared the statement in the list but this is more to highlight the more important points.

And then we will try to get more questions and ask them. So it's really to give a chance for you all to make a question and then asking for clarification to candidates.

So first we will start with the candidates for the chair position. And we are going to follow a particular order and then we start with James. So, James, please make your statement. You have two minutes, or three, if you want, for this. So please go ahead.

James Gannon: Thanks, Rafik. So for those of you who don't know me, James Gannon is my name. I'm from Ireland. So by way of background, I started off my career as a network engineer focused in the media production sector. And after working it out for a while I moved across to a number of security and privacy roles in the healthcare and biotech markets and primarily working on security policy issues.

And through that I gained extensive policy development experience and working with the FDA and working with industry groups in that area. During my time there we obviously had interactions with ICANN. And I started following the business of ICANN for a number of years through that. And about approximately 2 years ago I left to join a small security and privacy policy consultancy based out of Dublin.

And during my time there I started working on the IANA transition with focus on security and privacy issues throughout the process. And at the start of my

interactions with policy development and ICANN I was looking for a home and I decided that NCSG was by far the best place for me. And I'm very passionate about it and doing policy development and I believe that it's a place where normal people like you and me can have a genuine impact on how the Internet is run.

And I think that's an incredibly important thing that we all should be very proud of. And I think it's a huge amount of work for everybody. And the fact that we're all volunteers I think speaks to that level of commitment that people in NCSG have.

For what I would do if I was elected by the members to be chair I think I would try to be a facilitator. And I would love to allow the members to do their work in an effective manner. I wouldn't be a dictator. I would like to keep the bottom-up process at the heart of everything that we do at NCSG.

I would like to make sure that we have efficient processes and efficient ways to ensure that the policy that NCSG members want to get across it spoken loudly and strongly within the GNSO.

And for the administration side I spent the bulk of the last 12 years working as a project and a program manager and across both the noncommercial issues around -I work a lot with NGOs and charities. I also have a lot of commercial experience in managing diverse teams to common goals. So I think in the role of chair that I would be an effective facilitator and a cooperative leader for the NCSG.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks James. Thanks for this. So hopefully we get more question in the Adobe Connect and then we copy in the white board and Adobe there. Now we can move to Tapani. Tapani, are you here?

Tapani Tarvainen: Hello, all. Hello, can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Is this mic working?

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: So I'm Tapani Tarvainen from Finland. And I've been too busy to have prepared a statement so I'm just talking about of my head. A little background history, I've been working at various IT-related jobs mostly in universities since forever, mainly around 1998 I went to Saudi Arabia to work for Lucent Technologies and Saudi telecom. It was an interesting experience. I was (unintelligible) consultant but leading and trading system administrators and so forth.

And after returning in 2000 to Finland I went back (unintelligible) university where a new faculty had been founded, the IT faculty. And I was talked to set up a team building a IT support team basically because the university IT support was not exactly up to our need.

Then and I was fairly successful I think but at some point the university decided to just collect various IT teams in the university and put them together. And basically to cover my team and the practices we dealt and planned into the university wide. But my job was kind of left up to the faculty and I become sort of a board expert, special circumstance support and it's been increasingly on not only on technical but legal aspects.

That comes from my civil society interest, been always interested in human rights and also immediately after returning from Saudi in 2012 and soon after I found (unintelligible) Finland which had been just founded (unintelligible) in the board pretty quickly and I survived (unintelligible) president. And doing all kinds of possible things there.

But also (unintelligible) Finland is an independent organization having formally affiliated with a connection to your foundation but to (unintelligible) things in Finland since we don't have any money or very little. So just volunteer-based work I end up doing all kinds of things, building member databases and writing opinion pieces and legal aspects and so forth.

And I (unintelligible) work in ICANN mostly after WISIS in Tunis 2005. There's some background noise. Anyway after WISIS I guess (unintelligible) in IGF and been in IGF since and all kinds of roles there. And in 2009 I think I joined NCUC. And been not very active for the most part. But in 2012, '13 I was in NCUC. And then mostly from some (unintelligible) personal issues I had to drop out another time to be more active. Have not been very active in the working groups or anything like that.

But I don't see that as the chair's role, it's more of an administrative task and I have, I think, been a good bureaucrat so to speak administering all kinds of civil society organizations (unintelligible) some other small ones as well and also doing similar stuff at the university level.

So I think I would be reasonably useful for NCSG as the chair running the AC and bureaucracy and (unintelligible) administrative stuff effectively. To let people doing the policy work do most of it - do their work efficiently. I guess that's enough for a start.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Tapani. Thanks for the statement. I think we are starting to get questions. But in the meantime we will go to GNSO Council candidate first to give them the chance to make their own statement. And then we will after that we will start with the round of questions.

So let me start first with Amr Elsadr. Amr, are you ready?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Rafik. This is Amr. And can you guys hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yeah we can hear you.

Amr Elsadr: Can anyone? Yeah. All right great.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, we can hear you, yeah.

Amr Elsadr: Okay well apart from what I've submitted on my notes on the list, I'm not sure what more I could really add. I am a - from a bit of an odd sort of background in terms of normal participants in ICANN, I think, because I'm from the healthcare background.

But a s stated in my candidate statement, I have been working in tele-medicine and e-health solutions for, I mean, well for almost about 10 years now. And I've been doing some graduate studies in that field the past few years in Norway. I'm back in Egypt now.

My work has mostly been regarding information systems and electronic patient records and sort of connecting different hospitals with each other to sort of share specialist expertise without the need for travel of whether they're patients or actually just medical consultants.

And I sort of got into local Internet policies here when they affected my work. And through at I also started to become involved with a few civil society groups here in Egypt.

As mentioned in my statement, I helped establish an NGO that has actual representatives of different stakeholder groups. And this was something very new here. And about a year after doing this, which was in - around 2012 maybe, we - this NGO was set up as the Egyptian answer to the Internet Society.

I've been involved in ICANN for a few years now. I was originally a - I originally started attending meetings as a fellowship program participant. So I'm an alumni of the Fellowship program. And I went to the ICANN meeting in Seoul in 2009 with the Fellowship program and the one in Nairobi in 2010 and San Francisco in 2011. And I think my San Francisco meeting was the first meeting I attended as a member of the NCSG and NCUC. And that's the first time I got to meet a bunch of you folks out there.

I think since then I've been relatively well engaged in the work of the NCUC and NCSG. I've been a regular participant in GNSO working groups. I've drafted a bunch of statements on behalf of the NCSG and tried to - I guess managed to get quite a few of those endorsed by the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group.

I'm - I guess I'm kind of proud of the work I've done for NCSG. And I hope that members feel that way about me as well. I think I'll stop here and hopefully get more questions just to kind of get a feel for what I may have left out in my personal information what people would like to know about me so I'll pass it back to you, Rafik. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. Thanks for this. Now we go with Marilia. And then we will end

                  that with the statement. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much, Rafik. This is Marilia Maciel speaking. I am an

                  academic. My background is in law and international relations. I am a

                  coordinator and researcher at the (unintelligible) in Brazil. I am involved with

                  Internet governance for quite a few years. I started in Internet governance for

                  (unintelligible). Since then I have participated in (unintelligible) meetings, I

                  have been part of a working group on IGF improvements created in

                  (unintelligible). I've been following ITU (unintelligible).

                  So in spite of the fact that my involvement with ICANN is more recent I've

                  been working with Internet governance for a long time. And I started to be

                  involved in ICANN because of interest that I have been an intellectual

                  property professor for some time (unintelligible) of working with domain

                  name (unintelligible) so that's what attracted me at first.

                  And I entered for the Fellowship program. My - I think this is an amazing way

                  of getting involved as someone commented on the list. And I try to stay

                  involved with the Fellowship program talking about what (unintelligible) for

                  newcomers and become more involved in ICANN.

                  So after the Fellowship program I of course - I was already part of NCUC

                  through the (unintelligible) membership and I started to become more

                  involved with the policy committees (unintelligible) there. And then I started

                  to work at the GNSO and I've been in the GNSO for a year.

                  To me the three priorities that I have had while at the GNSO has been

                  (unintelligible) topics that are - one of them has kind of gained traction

                  (unintelligible) which is human rights (unintelligible) it was kind of a surprise

when I got involved in ICANN for the first time how many issues having to (unintelligible) with human rights. And I have been working with a cross community working party on human rights with other people here.

I have been helping to draft the charter or the document that kind of guides the working party. I have been trying to raise this issue and I'm waiting for the moment in which the GNSO will tackle how we're going to incorporate the ideas that have been raised by the working party on the need for a human rights impact assessment but we are in the process of developing policy. And I think at this moment it's coming soon because of the maturity that the topic has gained in recent times.

Another topic that has caught my attention while being the Council is a show of development and this is clear - this has a clear interface with the new gTLD process and the next round. I know that in a little time we start to discuss the next round. We are assessing the form around (unintelligible) as well. I had the chance to raise in the Council quite a few times the importance of taking into account issues such as the recommendations made in (unintelligible) report and to make sure that the next round are more consistent with the need from the developing regions to develop the DNS industry there too.

So for me this, in my first year in the Council, this has been two topics of key interest. I think I will continue to be involved in these topics if I am elected again. In the first year, as I mentioned in my statement, I took great advantage of the experience of other people that had been in the Council for more time or that had been involved in ICANN for more time.

And the issues that I did not have clarity I always consulted with them and tried to understand before I make my mind and before I vote at the Council. So for me it was a moment, and I hear of learning experience as well and

understanding what are the different issues. And I plan to broaden my scope of interest if I am elected to the Council again.

And one of the things that concerned me a lot is how ICANN and the policy discussed in ICANN are not very known and discussed in developing regions of the world. As I mentioned in my statement because one of my commitments to make sure that this debate is at least more (unintelligible) and the people have awareness about this so I have tried to, in different occasions, to raise awareness of topics being discussed in ICANN. And I'm doing this in an upcoming event, for instance, (unintelligible) together with the stakeholder engagement for Brazil.

So this would be one of my concerns too. And coming from a developing region I will try to reach out more specifically to Latin America too. So that's it for now. I think that (unintelligible) and debate more. Thank you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Marilia. And I see we have I think several question now. So we will start with I think so the first question are for the chairs candidate - chair candidate. So the first question is for Amr. And it's the role - about the role of the (unintelligible) chair to serve (unintelligible) policy committee. So okay maybe now we can change the order. We start with Tapani first.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, this is Tapani speaking. As I see it the role of the chair in the policy committee would be more of a coordinating role than leading the policy as itself. I would rather work with close collaboration with councilors and in that way actually I would like to ask a question to our councilors because one of the things that the chair would have to know is who knows what, who are our experts in this various issue so I'd like to have a question (unintelligible) councilor candidates what are your strengths and what kind of issues should

the chair call upon you. Otherwise I will not - I would not be strong policy making chair but coordinating organizing one.

And, yeah, I think that's it. Let James talk longer.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Tapani. Now James.

James Gannon: Thanks, Rafik. So as to the role of the chair I think that I would see myself as somebody who'd want to bring a greater level of structure to the policy committee. And I know that that's something that Rafik has already begun to work on himself recently over the last year or so. So I'd like to implement some tools and processes that would allow us to have a policy committee that functions at an even higher level than we already do.

I think we have a policy committee that puts in a herculean effort on the amount of public comment periods and issues that we respond to already. But I would like to try and push that to an even higher level. So I would like to put in a proposal to - for the PC to produce policy papers that reflect the NCSG's position on critical issues because I've noticed that - and this possibly goes slightly to one of the other questions is the when we have newcomers come in it can be very hard for them to get up to speed on the NCSG's position on issues within ICANN. So I'd like to see a set of policy papers produced that would allow our newcomers and also outside observers to see where NCSG stands on issues that may not even be out of the comment period yet.

So I suppose I would like to put in processes that allow the policy committee as the policy voice of the members to function in a more broad manner and in order for that to happen because of workload issues I think we would need to have a bit more tools and some more processes around that to allow the policy committee to take on that additional workload.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, guys. I'm tempted to intervene here but I should not. Okay so let's go to the next question. And this is doing more about that (unintelligible) part and it's what you propose as improvements. So (unintelligible) like here to do kind of way around. So let's start with James and then we go to Tapani.

James Gannon: So for administrative improvements I suppose it would be similar to what I've just said for the policy committee. Around the NCSG in general we have a huge amount of workload and we need to improve and build on the processes that we have to manage that workload so volunteer burnout is a serious issue for everybody in NCSG and I've seen that since I've joined myself as a relative newcomer. It's very easy to get burned out very quickly with the amount of workload that is going on around ICANN.

So I would like to put in a set of processes similar, I suppose, to a project manager, which is where I come from. I'd like to put in project management around the workload that NCSG has. I'd like to put in tools that allow us to track and to recognize where our issues are on that. And I think as a result of that we would also be able to then engage with ICANN staff to address the issue of civil society engagement in ICANN at a higher level.

And we can then go and say, look, we know there is volunteer burnout issues. Here is our, you know, data that shows that. And then we would be able to move forward with that and genuinely address the issue of burnout. Because at an administrative level we talk about burnout a lot and ICANN staff talk about burnout a lot but we haven't actually sat down and tried to do anything about it yet.

So I would put in a lot more stringent processes and I would allow our committees and our members to have a stronger voice by having a stronger way for them to express that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, James. And, please, for those who are not speaking (unintelligible). Okay let's go to Tapani now.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you Rafik. Tapani again. I very much agree with James about the burnout danger. After running (unintelligible) chair or president I felt that pretty keenly then. But we did build various systems to automate things to keep people aware of many things ultimately that should not take personal time when they're (unintelligible).

One thing I see a problem in the NCSG is that we have an overlap in work. For example, between the stakeholder group and the constituencies. Most obviously in the membership management which has been something of a - so far I think for some that we don't have actually maintaining three distinct member databases that we really should only have one. And it has led to situations where we're not quite sure who's member of where and may even be losing some members (unintelligible) because we are not quite sure who's going to be a member.

And so one thing I would definitely want to do is to build a good member database that provides a good service to both constituencies and stakeholder group level so with these kind of issues in the future.

I also would definitely want to set up some kind of project management system, again, some kind of automatic mechanism that is easy to follow and to see, deadlines, (unintelligible) things, automated alerts to people who

subscribe to them to let them know what's going on. Build up things that make it easy for members to find out what's going on.

When I joined NCUC and even in the EC trying to track what's going on has been really difficult at times. We don't have any easy centralized place to look for when you want to find what's going on, who's doing what. And especially for newcomers this can be a serious hurdle when they don't know where is that, what. Even trivial things, where is the mailing list archive?

Okay, you can find it but it's not something obvious. We have mailing lists that float all over the place, some of them hosted by (unintelligible) university and some by some other organizations. So whatever - which is fine, be nice to have that kind of service, but at least documenting in a central place everything (unintelligible) be one key thing.

And - am I running out of the subject. But I would definitely want to set (unintelligible) things that are - make it more common stuff for constituencies rather than having everything done separately. Okay, enough for now.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Tapani. Well so then the next question is about the outreach plan so the outreach is one of the chair tasks. So what do you think about what we have here maybe as a plan? And this time we start with Tapani. Tapani, can you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: You're starting with me again. Hello? I lost you for a moment. I'm sorry. Technical problem. But you're asking me about the outreach plan, yeah.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Something I would like to do an outreach in general would be to do it under stakeholder group level. We have seen something at least that appears to be as it were a competition between constituencies of getting members which is kind of silly.

And so some kind of cross-constituency setup where would be nice to actually attract members to the stakeholder group and see (unintelligible) which constituency suits you more and within rather than having it come from let's fight over who gets whom.

And having a new Website for NCSG because we don't have one of our own and beside the page we have in ICANN community page is not exactly, shall we say, a good advertisement for the stakeholder group. So I would like to set things - and somebody - Google's NCSG they wound up somewhere in the national chimneys group or (unintelligible) something like which is not exactly what we'd like.

And of course I'd also like to activate people within different regions to do that kind of outreach work again, hoping it would happen more in the collaborative fashion within the stakeholder group than just again doing it from the constituency level because that's kind of competition only makes things worse. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Tapani. Now James to respond to the question.

James Gannon: (Unintelligible). So on outreach I think my approach would be actually quite simple. I think the general agreement among NCSG members that we would like to see more geographic diversity in the work of the SG.

We - my interpretation of that is we want to see more people writing comments for NCSG. We want to see more people participating in working groups on behalf of NCSG. We want to have - basically NCSG is an incredibly diverse group if you actually look at our membership. I think there is a valid argument that we don't reflect that in the people that are participating in working groups or on mailing lists. And I think that's something that we should work on.

And I would approach that in a relatively simple manner. I would look to sit down with the geographic representatives from NCSG, from NCUC and from NPOC to formulate outreach activities within their own regions. So I'm not an expert in outreach in Africa, that's not my job. But we do have regional experts that we should be leveraging and we should be giving them the tools and the ability to do outreach in their own area to activate their own local members and bring those into the work of the NCSG.

And I think by enabling those representatives from the various regions around the world we can then show the diversity that NCSG has not just in our membership list but also in our work.

Rafik Dammak: Good. Thanks, James. Okay the next question is about travel funding. I think it's - I would think quite tricky one. But so what do you think about? And so let us start this time with James.

James Gannon: Yes, so travel funding, it's probably one of the biggest questions. We are a group of noncommercial volunteers so how do we actually get people out to meetings? At the moment we get a set of travel slots from ICANN for each meeting and each of the constituencies also have the option of self-funding through donations.

So the way I would approach this is in order for NCSG to be able to speak with the strongest voice that it requires and to be able to fit within the policy making body of the GNSO, at an equal level to those that are being paid for, for example in the Registrars, you know, their companies are paying them to go.

And I think it's important that it's recognized within ICANN itself that it is an unfair advantage for those who are being paid to participate. So the way I would go about it is I would like to sit down and have a discussion with ICANN staff. And I've already had discussions with (Jean Jaq) and (Saho) who is one of the outreach coordinators and we spoke in Paris about this issue.

And I think that if we can put together a strong argument for why we need to bring additional people to ICANN meetings or whether, you know, increased ways of doing remote participation is a viable way of doing it. I think if we can sit down and have a fact-based conversation with ICANN staff we may be able to bring some closure on the current issues that we have around ensuring our members are represented at ICANN meetings in person in the same way that we're representing ourselves in the remote sessions in the working groups.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, James. Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: I definitely I agree that travel funding is a major issue. The one key argument about this I think we should make is that diversity is highlighted in many points but not so much is actually being done about it. If we are going to have diversity and representation we really don't need to get representatives of all regions to all meetings. And that's the one line I would try to use with ICANN staff to get more funding for that purpose.

Another issue or the case that we might try to get funding on our own, I would like to get independent fund for NCSG by grants or maybe even try cross (unintelligible) so that we could afford to send people in the NCSG money.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Tapani. The next question, which is the strategy about newcomer and new members. And maybe this time we can have answer from councilor because they have also to work with members and the chairs. So let's just start with councilors this time. I have to give them some time to speak.

Let's start with Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rafik. This is Amr. Yeah, this is also, I mean, similar travel support, I guess this is also an issue that has been - was something we've been trying to work on for a number of years. We did have a so-called in-reach proposal on how to get people who are already members, whether (unintelligible) or old ones sort of get them more engaged and more involved with the work of the - I believe this was the NCUC at the time.

And a lot of thoughts were sort of put into that - into a document that we had worked on. But as in many other things very little work has actually been done in it - on this. And I think one of the challenges of bringing newcomers in and sort of helping them become more engaged with the work we do is that the folks who are actually doing the work and who know about it and who have the ability to instruct newcomers actually have very little time to do that because they're doing so much of the work.

And this is sort of like a problem we haven't really mastered getting - solving at all. But it is something that I would really like to help with, and speaking for myself, I think it's really important to do this. I think I mentioned this as

far back as the San Francisco meeting back 2011 when I said if people who know what is going on if they don't help other people catch up and get involved in the work then they will always just continue to drown in the massive volume of work they have to do - to commit to.

But, again, speaking for myself, I would love to help people become - or just sort of catch up with what the current work is. And this goes for anyone from any region. I really - it makes no difference to me who the person is as long as they want to become involved. I am more than willing to help.

But I have to be honest when I say this, I would not be willing to help with building the capacities of new members or newcomers or even old members that want to become more involved if I am not sure that they themselves are willing to commit to helping the NCSG with the time that I provide to build their capacity.

So for me I think a show of sincerity from new members who really want to get involved is to really just dive into the deep end and get involved in a working group. And if you're on a working group you will find me or someone else on the working group who is really willing to help and who is grateful that a new member is becoming involved and willing to put in some work and (unintelligible).

I say this because I think out of experience that worked well with me. When I joined my first working group I got a lot of support from members like Avri, like Kathy, like Wendy and really did help me catch up to things that I did not know anything about at the time when I joined my first working group.

And so although this is not a very structured model I think it is the only one we can actually work on right now until we do have a more coherent plan and dedicated personnel who are really willing to help with this.

But in terms of answering (Pascal)'s question right now, in terms of newcomers and new members, please just join a working group, get involved in any of the work that we're doing even internal work in the stakeholder group.

I remember my first actual job working doing something for NCSG was working on an application to create a new constituency within the NCSG. So this wasn't even really GNSO stuff, it was just stuff internal to the stakeholder group. But once you do start getting involved, I promise you will find myself and others who are willing to help. And, yeah, I guess that's it for me for that. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. Let's go now with Marilia and to answer the question. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Hi. Thank you, Rafik. This is Marilia Maciel. Well, speaking after Amr I can...

((Crosstalk))

Marilia Maciel: ...people that have helped with me in the GNSO and have been available to...

((Crosstalk))

Marilia Maciel: So - sorry I hear other people speaking on the line. Maybe if you can mute your mic.

Rafik Dammak: okay, yes, Marilia, someone is speaking. Please, if you are not speaking please mute yourself. Marilia, can you speak more - I mean, more louder?

Marilia Maciel: Yes, sorry about that, Rafik. Well coming back to your - to (Pascal)'s question, I think that I have touched upon that a little bit on my first time speaking. I think that one very important avenue for us to attract new people is the Fellowship program and the NextGen program. I think that people that people that get attracted to ICANN they usually have interest already in the organization. It's not very obvious to become involved in ICANN. So usually they have some background; they have some information.

And if they are properly approached and guided I think that we could direct them to be involved in the policy work, in the working groups, of course they are a little bit afraid to start because if they don't understand things enough to be involved. That is why I think that maybe one of the things we could do especially with people that come through the Fellowship program, is to start kind of a coaching effort with them, a one on one thing to identify if someone, for instance, has an interest on privacy why don't we make sure that (unintelligible) the reference to that, for instance and discussions can go to Stephanie and ask questions and be involved.

I don't know how much this would overload people but I think that (unintelligible) reference helps people who are coming to ICANN to understand who they can speak to when they have these sorts of questions. Of course if we have experienced people that can answer about virtually anything that's going on in ICANN that has been in the organization forever. So these people be kind of focal points or had that we can kind of make the fellows that are coming from the program reach out to. I think that this is one important thing.

So my first point is these programs that are already in place in ICANN to tackle them systematically and to direct potential newcomers that have already some knowledge to be involved in the working group.

The second thing is a regional approach and in that I agree with what has been mentioned by James before. I think that we come from different regions but we try to strike a general balance in our SG in the GNSO. And there is a reason for that. So I believe that each region has its challenges when it comes to the DNS industry, when it comes to (unintelligible) interest.

So for instance, when we organize this kind of outreach events as (unintelligible) I see that I can tailor the message in a way that will resonate more with the Latin America community, that's what would be, for instance, in (BA), we try to reach out to organizations that were from the region and for them to be (unintelligible).

But what are the issues that will be more interesting to them. And what are the issues - how we could prevent this information in a way that could be kind of attractive to them. So I think that part of what we do in the Council should be to try to translate the policies that are being discussed and since you're the ones that would resonate with within your own region and try to dissect that and to explain what is going on. I have been trying to do that and particularly with the Latin America region and list of discussions during the outreach events.

And I think that this is a good way forward because you can tailor the message to the people that we want to achieve. And I think that's basically the two points that I would (unintelligible) right now. But first I agree with Amr, I think that (unintelligible) of outreach but I think that this is something that each of us could do kind of starting. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marilia. Now let us move back to our candidates for chair position. And this time let's start with James.

James Gannon: Hi, thanks Rafik. So after hearing Amr's response I'm very tempted to say I'll delegate newcomer responsibility to Amr because he had a fantastic answer. So I would literally echo most of what Amr said. I think we need to make newcomers - I won't say more welcome because as a relative newcomer I think I would make very welcome.

But I think we need to enable our newcomers to get up to speed very quickly. And I think we need to encourage newcomers to get involved in working groups and get involved in writing comments even though they may feel that they're not up to speed on issues or they may feel that they don't know. So I think that we need to work on something similar to what Marilia said. And possibly a buddy system where we match up a veteran member with a newcomer and they can guide them through the complexity of the GNSO system.

Or another issue - or another possibility that we could do would be something along the lines of the beginner's manual to NCSG within the GNSO and within ICANN and have a simple series of steps or even possibly we could look at doing a video for newcomers to be able to say okay here's how you would get involved in your first working group.

Here's how NCSG submits comments to the various issues that are going on. Here is how our NCSG governance works internally and here's, you know, internal program teams and internal and project teams that you can work on before you go out and get involved, in, for example, a PDP or an implementation group.

So there's a number of different ways I think where we can go along and when we get our newcomers we can enable them to get involved in the work of NCSG and not just become members.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, James. Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Rafik. I'm in a difficult position. Most of the good ideas I had in mind have already been mentioned. Not that it's really perhaps the highest step is to get into your first working group or writing your first comment or something. So picking up newcomer personally ideally it might be even the chair to have a personal communication with each new member. We have had a few members.

But it might actually be better at least considering chair's workload to have regional members dedicated to welcoming new members from the region. Also in - once - the easy thing to do would be dedicated some kind of chat with a Skype channel or even mailing list or whatever for new members (unintelligible) volunteers would be answering questions.

They actually did this kind of thing for NCUC and Skype and I joined the AC. And it worked fairly well. And it also might be nice to have such things separate of reach regions so that (unintelligible) of language for example, have a Spanish language and Brazilian and Portuguese, whatever would be more useful, easier to ask questions in your own language.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Tapani. Okay the next question is really for the GNSO councilor. And (unintelligible) that GNSO moving to new territory after the IANA transition. So what you feel are the area you would focus within GNSO to further the cause of NCSG privacy (unintelligible) and so on.

Okay so let's start now with Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. This is a good question because one of the things that I had in this first year of the GNSO is that the discussion as a whole in the community and a lot of the bandwidth that we had has been invested and in a way divested (unintelligible) important discussions of the IANA transition and accountability.

Of course this is very important and it's just viable that we all became involved and that community was involved in the discussions. But in a way I feel that topics that were in the agenda of the GNSO have slowed down this year. And I believe that with the progress that has been made in both areas both on the transition and also on accountability, even though we will still have issues to discuss in the next cycle I believe that now we can expect that the agenda that is kind of for business of the GNSO (unintelligible) against.

And I think that, as I mentioned in my initial statement, I think that two areas that we need to do - dedicated (unintelligible) human rights both on procedural level in terms of trying to understand what are the specific points of pressure. In this we can introduce assessments about human rights in fact of the quality that we are discussing at the GNSO and this would take some work.

And of course (unintelligible) that issue that are related to human rights that are already in the agenda. And one of them that is very high is of course the issues related to privacy to next generation registration and the regulatory services and privacy and proxy. And I believe that we need to be still focused on that.

And another area that I think GNSO, at least the councilors that represent noncommercial interests, should become involved (unintelligible) I believe that now it's time that the next round of new gTLDs (unintelligible) again and move forward. So my screen has become blank. I don't know if you can hear me still but I (unintelligible).

But there is a tendency that when we finish the assessment of previous round (unintelligible) round but the next round is going to gain speed. And of course this is something that we need to be involved to make sure that noncommercial interests are taken into account into the discussion and in my case development of concerns are one kind of an angle that I do believe it's very fortunate that we explore but did not wish to leave that much due - a sanction on previous rounds.

And I think that we need to have a concerted effort to make sure that this message that developing concerns are important which (unintelligible) and that we can really have a next round that is more - that has a more kind of useful (unintelligible) for different players and different regions. I believe this to be issues that we would eventually add (unintelligible) on months to come. Thanks.

I hope you can hear me. My screen (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Marilia. We will go with Amr and we will try to figure out later about the rest of the question. Okay, yes, Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: All right thanks. This is Amr again. Well, yeah, I would like to maybe divide my answer to this question into two because on one hand the question sort of directs us to what our vision of what is - what will be important in GNSO now that the IANA stewardship transition and accountability work is coming to a

close. So on one hand, yes, there are some significant changes that will happen in the GNSO as a result of this.

On the other hand, the GNSO has continued to work. I mean, the GNSO Council hasn't stopped doing its work because of these two cross community efforts. But - and as Marilia has mentioned we do have a few policy development processes that are starting in the GNSO that will be extremely important and they will probably take at least a couple if not more years to resolve.

One she mentioned was the PDP regarding the upcoming - yet another new round of gTLD applications. So that's going to be huge. And the NCSG will have to focus on that. And the other is the post expert working group PDP which is the PDP on the next generation TLD registration directory services.

So again that's another one. But I would like to differentiate the role of the GNSO councilor in terms of this and the role of an NCSG member who is participating in a working group. Because the NCSG - a GNSO councilor from the NCSG doesn't necessarily need to know the details of what is happening with each one of those PDPs, they do need to be briefed by members who are participating.

And it is up to every GNSO councilor to make sure that they are fully briefed from the members who are working on these various PDP working groups. But the reason why the GNSO - the councilor needs to be aware of these things is because the councilor needs to know that the GNSO Council is managing the process appropriately.

And this is the real - this is, as far as I can see, this is the real function of the GNSO Council to make sure that these processes are managed appropriately

in order for NCSG members to be able to participate to the full in terms of what sort of participation we are afforded, whether this is our representation in the working group or whether it is the stakeholder group's input to any of the work the PDP working group is producing.

So that's one thing. And I feel that this is - although we are approaching the beginning of some very important work, I do believe over the past couple years the GNSO has continued to working and a lot of very important work has come out of the GNSO over the past two years. But then again there are some very significant issues regarding the IANA stewardship transition and the cross community working group on ICANN's accountability that will have an impact on the GNSO.

For one thing, I think as a chartering organization, the GNSO needs to be able to really keep an eye on how the accountability measures that are proposed by the cross community working group and will hopefully be adopted by the ICANN board, how these are going to be implemented.

So far we still have very little insights on how this is going to be done, how there is going to be community involvement in the implementation efforts - I don't want to say oversights - so I chose the word involvement. But I do believe that the community needs to be informed somehow and needs to have some measure or some measure of ability to address implementation efforts if they are not being done with the intent they were meant to when the cross community working group provided its recommendations.

So that's one thing that is very important to keep in mind for a GNSO councilor who is about to start another term now. Another issue regarding this as well is some of the roles that the GNSO will have within the context of the

broader community. And maybe some of the roles the GNSO will have to play because of some of these new accountability measures.

So we've been hearing a lot about this new single member model that is coming out of the accountability cross community working group, the GNSO will have a role in how this model works. And I do believe that councilors need to be very, very familiar with how this is done because, I mean, the nuances of how this would operationally have to work because - this is an important role.

And although there may be no need for a councilor to actually do anything in that regards over the next two years it may be a possibility and we do need to be on top of it. And I guess we need to be on top of the proposals in general because I believe the GNSO Council still needs to approve some of the work that is coming out of that cross community working group. So I hope that answered your question, James. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Still have some question to go through. And now it's more a question for the chairs. So this is from Bill. And it's about the relation between the stakeholder group and the constituency.

Okay so let's go with Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Excuse me. Can I actually ask my question?

Rafik Dammak: Bill, I think you asked so just they can respond or you need to elaborate?

Bill Drake: I have not asked my question.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Am I allowed to speak? That's not my question. That was the only way I could get in queue. Are you going to allow me to ask my question?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, please, be concise, Bill, yeah.

Bill Drake: Thank you. I was rather struck by something that Tapani said about supposed competition for members which I have never seen or experienced which led, I guess, to some - my thought about a broader question about the relationship between the stakeholder groups and the constituencies. And that is the massive confusion that consistently occurs because of the completely broken model that we operate under.

                In the CSG the stakeholder group is basically as a sort of artifice for aggregating votes and things like that. But we have this weird kind of situation where the (unintelligible) lines between stakeholder group and constituency get confused because of the way we have set it up, the whole model is like that.

                And so for example, when you talk about the outreach work, in-reach work, fund raising, policy work, building a new Website, all these things, these are things that it's kind of - it strikes me as rather strange to have effectively the same people doing the same work in two completely parallel spaces that seem to be competing with each other.

And it confuses everybody that we have to try to explain our configuration to. So every time we go to a Fellows meeting and have to explain what gets done in the stakeholder group, what gets done in the constituency group, the constituency level and so on, they get very confused. And so when I listen I'm just kind of wondering how do you two see the boundary line between what is appropriately done within the stakeholder group and what is appropriately done within the constituency. And should there be the same activities being performed in both by the same people with two different hats on implying that there's some sort of separation there? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Bill, (unintelligible) in Adobe Connect (unintelligible). Tapani, please go ahead.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, thank you, Bill, that was a very good introduction to the whole issue here that we have a rather difficult situation for historical reasons that stakeholder group constituency division doesn't really work for noncommercials here. We do not have any good cooperation, have some rather strong distrust between NPOC and NCUC. And that's something I would like to hear when we're trying to build trust (unintelligible).

But how things should actually be organized there are - I can see the possibility that the split gets so bad that the whole stakeholder groups (unintelligible) apart actually and we have just two constituencies that barely talk to each other. But I don't think that would be an ideal outcome.

Whether we should strive to make it like you said, the commercials do, that we have a very lightweight aggregator stakeholder group or whether we should actually work on the stakeholder group level is not entirely trivial. But I think I would tend to work more work together to avoid in-fighting when we

actually have agreement on any number - many issues we have common goals and doesn't make sense to fight over, well, if not members then for travel support or whatever else that we really clearly do not trust each other between NPOC and NCUC.

At least there is some historical distrust this doesn't work. So I would definitely try to build more cooperation. And one way to do that is just to do more work in the stakeholder group level. Whether that means any kind of formal changes in the system, well, nothing like that's going to happen within a year anyway.

When I was in the NCUC, well, they have trouble figuring out the demarcation line but they call it (unintelligible) and whatever but really stop with the bickering, start working together. And when people can do that - once we can do that I think we must be able to do that then we are better able to differentiate tasks on the stakeholder group and constituency level.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Tapani. James.

James Gannon: Sorry, I was muted. So, yeah, I think one of my first things on this it was at the higher level issue is that I'd like to sit down in probably Marrakesh and - with the ExComms of both the NCUC and NPOC and have everybody in an open and frank manner what they believe the issues are with NCSG and our - the way that we work and the way that the construct is kind of evolving at the moment.

And once we have all of those out in the open I think we can then try and somehow look to implement a plan where we can improve and work on where the relationship has broken down between NCUC and NPOC within the SG level.

Personally, I feel that we are probably stronger when we speak with a single voice. And I believe for this reason that I would prefer to keep working at NCSG level. I'm open to arguments for and against that.

But at a basic level I think the relationship needs to be built back up between the two constituencies. We're - at the end of the day it's an important thing that although we may differ in our approach manner to policy and, you know, we approach things in different manners. At the end of the day we're all here within NCSG for a common purpose. And I think it's very important that historically we may have had issues but we shouldn't allow that to drive a wedge between us on critical issues where we should be speaking together.

Because I believe that we can (unintelligible) of our constituencies. And I think that that relationship-building is an important process. I think it's a process that's going to take time. And I think that it's not going to be fixed overnight by one chair. But I think that hopefully I could start off a process of some reconciliation and between the SG and the two Cs.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So we are going - it's now 80 minutes in this call. You can have more 20 minutes? We still have questions so I guess maybe to be more concise here, guys. And the next question is for councilor. And it's a question, what's the area of your expertise? Let us start with Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. Well when I first began doing work in the GNSO I was more interested in the policies regarding Whois and I've continued to follow and participate on Whois projects. So I would say that is a bit of an expertise as far as I'm concerned. But that is not to say that there are others in NCSG who have far more expertise on these issues and have been working on them for a number of years prior to my even knowing what ICANN ever was.

My other area of expertise I think would really be on procedural issues. And I think this is important for all councilors. But I do have a bit of an area of expertise on this just only because of the nature of some of the work I've done in the GNSO on the Standing Committee of Improvements Implementations and the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

So I'm very familiar with how the GNSO is supposed to work. The GNSO - the PDP manual, the operating procedures, the Working Group Guidelines and how those fit together in the bylaws, the ICANN bylaws, where the GNSO is involved.

And I do believe this is extremely important because this is, in my opinion, the primary job of the GNSO is to make sure - the GNSO Council is to make sure that the GNSO can do its work and that it can, when necessary, fend off other parts of the community like the ICANN board or the GAC when they're trying to get policies passed, that should be going through the GNSO. So it's very important for GNSO councilors to know how these policies are supposed to be developed and how the work is supposed to be done to allow for the great amount of input and dialogue that the GNSO process offers.

So, yeah, those I think I would list as my two top areas. I'm sure I could come up with more if I had more time to discuss it. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. Well, my own academic background it's law and international relations. In law I had been working with Internet governance and human rights. Since I joined ICANN work (unintelligible) have been trying to follow Internet governance related discussions. It was a moment in which ICANN

was participating more actively in the Internet governance with - after NETmundial. And I had been part of the CWG on Internet Governance.

On the law side, as I mentioned before, one of the things that attracted me to participate in ICANN was exactly the point of domain name dispute resolution. And I tried to join the discussion on the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection. I did join the working group as an observer. But the discussion was kind of fading out and the final report so in spite I was there (unintelligible) was not much for us to intervene on that particular moment.

And my interest on human rights, as I mentioned before, has led me to be part of the CWG - the draft charter. And I think that (unintelligible) moment in which we will discuss at the GNSO there are particular issues for us to assess how we can make sure that human rights are part of the evaluation process when we are discussing and take part in activities (unintelligible) going to feedback into our policy development process.

So this particular area of (unintelligible) aspects is something at I am familiar because of discussions that are taking place in (unintelligible) about the different options. And I think that I can contribute to that at the GNSO.

I have been also following closely the discussion group on the new gTLD (unintelligible) procedures. And I think that this is one of the topics that I would be following closely as well in the future. That's it.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So we can try to extend the call but I'm not sure the availability of everyone here. So, I mean, I know it's hard but please try to be concise when you try to respond. I mean, it's not easy but let's try.

The next question (unintelligible) about if the GNSO councilor have any problem to meet with the new members. So let's start with Marilia and then Amr.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. To my knowledge there is not a specific moment in which councilors meet newcomers. What there is on the agenda for Fellowship program at the moment in which the leaders, the chairs of different constituencies and stakeholder groups to come to the fellows about that is the role of the SG, what is the role of the constituency, how they are organized, what are the priorities just for them.

This is focusing more on the chairs. And I think that this is a very good idea for newcomers to be more in concert with people who are at the GNSO that may stimulate them to become part of what (unintelligible) for instance or to make them more interested on the policy development process. So this is something that - a suggestion that we can definitely explore.

But for now I think that maybe an important thing to bring them to the NCSG open session. I think that this is a moment that they can not only meet the councilors but also have an overview of the policies that are under discussion in the GNSO at the moment so maybe that's a good way to get them (unintelligible) with what we do. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks. I believe Marilia answered this question accurately. The question is really asking for a yes or no answer and the answer is no, there is no GNSO councilor - there is no program for GNSO councilors to meet with new NCSG members.

It may be a good idea to have that. We could maybe set up a sort of quarterly call, for example, where GNSO councilors get to speak with new members who are interested in becoming involved in GNSO work.

But I would also - I think there is a bit of work that perhaps could be mixed with the GNSO councilors do and what the executive team does. Because there actually are a lot of webinars and resources that are out there and just really have to find them and either join the webinars or read whatever is already on the web to really learn more about this.

And I think with a little direction those who want the information will be able to find it. But like I said, that does not conflict with an idea of GNSO councilors having a meeting with new members or - new or old actually. And I think that this would be perfectly fine.

We have our NCSG monthly policy calls. Those are sort of geared towards something else. We could have another call set up for another reason such as any sort of interaction, NCSG members new or old, may want to wish to have with their elect councilors. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Amr. So okay so, Avri (unintelligible) a question here. I'm trying to see if we can maybe - there are some - common ground. But before that let's go with the question from Stephanie which is about the targeting webinar and do you think it's working? So maybe this is question for the chairs here. Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: I have not found webinars very useful so far but it may be due to my personal (unintelligible). But from what I hear some people do find them useful and it would be nice to have them for especially newcomers who find them effective introductions sort of work.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Tapani. James.

James Gannon: Thanks, Rafik. I'm broadly in agreement with Tapani on this one. I think that webinars are extremely useful for newcomers. And I think we should possibly step up our own version of the GNSO newcomers webinar for newcomers that are coming into NCSG and to bring them up to speed on things.

But with the complexity and the level of detail that much of the policy work that NCSG does I think that trying to compress that into a one hour or 90-minute webinar can be very difficult even for people, you know, we could have Stephanie talk about the EWG and privacy, you know, she's an international expert but trying to compress that into 90 minutes can be very difficult.

I think possibly, for example, working sessions at meetings would be a good was to do that or, again, going back to the idea of a mentorship for newcomers to bring them up to speed after they've had their initial introductions. A group mentorship could even work around specific topic areas which is human rights or privacy where we do have, you know, extreme experts in those areas within the NCSG. So maybe not webinars but targeted education outreach, yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. Okay the question - Avri's question, I will try to cover as much as possible. First about delegation and do you think that NCSG chair have the authority to delegate that? James.

James Gannon: So in the chat I put down something. So probably I think my wording of delegate was - of delegate was Avri's impetus for asking that. Possibly delegate was a slightly too strong a word. But I think that if I was elected chair the Executive Committee, when they are elected, have a responsibility -

and this goes for all three levels, so it goes for the SG and the two constituencies as well, there is a responsibility for the Executive Committees of all the groups to be willing to take on workload.

So I don't believe that I can do everything perfectly, not at chance. So where we do have experts either on Executive Committees or within our membership I would look to turn to them, those people, and ask them would they be interested in taking on a task that at that point had been a chair's task.

Now it's important to note there's no delegation of responsibility but sharing the workload I think is an important task for any leader. I don't believe that everybody - anybody can do everybody's work perfectly as one person. You know, we're not gods, we are but men. So I think that sharing the workload of the chair and possibly even activating things like a vice chair position or a cochair position would be something that should be looked into going forward.

And I believe that the charter has the capacity for a vice chair so maybe we should be looking into that for certain things where we have experts around and placing those people into vice chair positions so that they can share that workload effectively.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, James. Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah, there's actually very little. I am not at that delegation. There is no really power to delegate authority or anything. A position (unintelligible) by choosing a vice chair because then I think it would be (unintelligible) vice chairs. And then sharing chair's tasks with the vice chairs (unintelligible) should be but share EC's power to do - I think it would be basically put up to the chair to choose which task to delegate to vice chairs (unintelligible) selects

vice chairs. And I already proposed in my candidate statement that we should select vice chair (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Tapani. Okay I think the next question was about the NCSG charter. And so there was no - there was (unintelligible) to our member charter. So we think the process is too difficult. And we start with you, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Rafik. Yes, the process is difficult but not insurmountable. And there are lots of issues in the charter. But let's say I would like to get really into fixing the charter after the transition is complete. But at the moment when really don't know what's going to be in the ICANN bylaws soon a bit bad timing to start work on that now although I note that NCUC is working on its charter or bylaws at the very moment to bring it in line with the NCSG charter

And actually that very process is one reason I must agree that the process is difficult. But I think it should be doable. As I said, let's postpone it until we have - know what the new ICANN bylaws look like.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Tapani. James.

James Gannon: Thanks, Rafik. So I would approach this in possibly a slightly different way. So I - I suppose this ties into probably the next two questions from Avri as well. So if there's no objection I can probably answer those while I'm answering this.

So if you read the NCSG charter at the moment it's functional but not elegant. It has issues. I believe that we can take, for example, that we should have a finance committee, which we currently don't have one so we're - we have a

situation where we have a charter that's not necessarily reflective of our working procedures.

So if there was interest among the membership, because it'd be a huge effort, I would endeavor to perform a gap analysis against the current charter to see in our working methods what's not there and what needs to be modified. I don't believe that the time is now given that the IANA transition is going on and we have a huge amount of other policy work coming up with Whois and everything else. I don't believe the time is right personally at this very moment to overhaul the charter entirely given the amount of workload that would come along with that. I don't believe it will be a priority during my term.

But we possibly should look at doing a gap analysis for the required changes or the required fixes that are needed within the NCSG charter to ensure that it's a working charter and it's something that's reflective of the actual working methods of the NCSG.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, James. Next question, and it's still on the charter but this is for everyone, I mean, for all candidates and if they read the NCSG charter lately. And no particular for the Council candidates if they read also the operating procedures. I get this is about the GNSO one.

So (unintelligible) about more about the (unintelligible) and procedure and ask the GNSO councilor. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. Yes, the NCSG charter I have read when I started to become involved in ICANN and representing the NCSG and NCSG even to understand the charter. But I confess it was a (unintelligible) so it was in 2013,

may be time for me to get back to it. And the GNSO operating procedures, yes, I have read them too.

Actually I have browsed through them before I put my name forward to be at the GNSO to make sure that I understand what I was getting into exactly. And I have studied them and read carefully. And I even sat with Avri to ask questions about the number of votes to get issued approved. To me this is a complicated point until this day.

I need to wait for Glen or to ask questions (unintelligible) this is still is just something (unintelligible) but, yes, I have read both documents. But I didn't read after the last changes to the operational procedure that we approved the GNSO (unintelligible). And I guess that I need to understand better how the discussions in accountability will impact our working - our work at the GNSO and the how this will impact the procedures. That is something at I need to look into and (unintelligible). Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. Yeah, I have read the NCSG charter lately. I've read it many times. And if you see in the chat I've actually made a mistake on something that I mixed up between the NCSG charter and the NCUC bylaws. The reason I mixed those up is because I do actually read both of them quite frequently so I at least am - I am aware of what's in there, just on this occasion happen to mix something up between the two.

But, yes, I do read the NCSG charter every now and then. I keep referring back to it whenever I have a question. And as far as the GNSO operating procedures I read those all the time so I'm very, very familiar with them. Like

I said earlier, the operating procedures, the Working Group Guidelines and the PDP manual in its entirety really.

And one of the reasons, again, is just because I do so much work that involves those. But it is a good question, Avri, and it is something that should be expected of GNSO councilors. So, yes, that's my answer. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: So let's move now to the candidates for chair position. I think let us start with Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: To put it briefly, yes, I have read the NCSG charter lately. I read it in January first - when I was elected to the NCSG (unintelligible) and I have read it again several times, actually quite recently when I decided to run for the chair. And I have observed something (unintelligible) we are not been following like having the financial committee which it says we shall have and we don't.

But should I move on to the next question actually since Avri asked about the financial committee to save time? If NCSG is to do anything that requires funds of its own then it needs to have a financial committee basically. That's its task, to manage the funds and (unintelligible) grants and everything, that task of the NCSG financial committee as defined in the charter.

And I think we should have at least some funds of our own. If nothing else there are some structures that are - really should be common to the stakeholder group level instead of having the constituencies built by themselves, the most obvious case being their member database. As it stands the NCSG member database does not serve the constituencies but (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Tapani. So let's, yeah, James. So maybe if you can do like Tapani and respond to the two questions, yeah.

James Gannon: Yeah, happy to. So as I said my previous answer to Avri's first question, yeah, definitely read the charter the minute that I was nominated for the chair's position. It's obviously an important thing to be well versed in. I wouldn't consider myself an expert in it yet but I would certainly endeavor to understand the history and the background before it in much more detail. And of interest although I'm not a (unintelligible) I was actually reading the GNSO operating procedures recently as well. And I think that's an important part to be able to understand the ecosystem that you operate in.

On the financial committee, so I think we've shown that fund raising is effective at the constituency level. And I don't believe that we should put NCSG in a position to be competing for funding - outside funding that is - with its own constituency so I don't believe that's an effective way to operate.

So I would be in favor of reactivating the finance committee, not just because it's a charter requirement but as part of my chairmanship, if I was elected, one of the things I would push for is for some independent funding to come from ICANN for issues that happen at an NCSG level, for example, as Tapani was saying, things like membership management.

Now I know that ICANN is already looking into membership management solutions for all of the SOs, ACs and SGs so it's for things like that where ICANN may be paying for it but there is a financial interest from NCSG in what ICANN money is doing for NCSG. So I would see it as quite a lean committee. I wouldn't see it as a terribly operational committee. But I believe it's regardless of anything as it's a charter requirement definitely should be reactivated, yes.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, James. So I guess we can make it for the two last questions. The next one - so it's about (unintelligible) of the chair. I believe that (unintelligible) are helped by the CIO. Sorry, guys, it's too late here I'm sorry too. So what do you think about the (unintelligible) and leadership we think. Let's start with James here.

James Gannon: So I certainly wouldn't be a quiet person on the calls. There's a lot of very strong people on the leadership calls. And I've listened to some of the recordings of yourself and Bill and a number of the other SG and constituency leaders. I think that those calls are useful for informing us but I would be very wary of them becoming a replacement for the bottom up process. So I would definitely try and steer those calls. And I think they by and large have been in the direction of being an informative conversation with leadership as opposed to anything that could be construed to be trying to subvert the process.

And I think that's been effective to date and I'd like to continue that method of working with those calls. I would like to basically shout our own voice strong and loud to ICANN leadership, including the CEO, you know, we're going to have a person replacing Fadi. We don't know if that person is going to be an internal candidate who is well versed in who we are and what we stand for or if they're going to be a new candidate who may not know and may need to be educated in what we stand for as NCSG and what our positions on things are.

And to make sure that they're - the NCSG voice is heard as loudly as others in the fray and that we are taken seriously as a genuine contributor to the policy development process.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, James. Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Rafik. I think that the role of the chair in the leadership meeting would be primarily to channel what information, what's going on in the stakeholder group but also to do some kind of negotiation position basically to help to be able to make the voice of the stakeholder group heard.

I'm not quite sure what this question actually is about but still the point is that make voice of the stakeholder group heard and channel information both ways. Try to find out what's going on there in the minds of the other leaders present because it's sometimes very nice to do that in meeting group.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Tapani, thought you end. But, yes, go ahead. Okay, sorry. So next is I think the question for the GNSO councilor. And it's about what are your accomplishment activities in the Council that led you to run again and to run for more two year. So let's start with Amr here.

Amr Elsadr: Perfect thanks. Well in terms of my accomplishments or activities, I guess I would say that I've been fairly active on the Council. I've done - keeping track of all the different projects even if I am not personally involved with them on a working group level, for example, but I've always made it a point to stay up to date on all the different GNSO projects if there is something I don't understand or need more information on I'm never too shy to ask really.

But I have done quite a bit of work for the GNSO Council, some on behalf of the NCSG, some more on behalf of the Council itself. I've been a Council

liaison to several working groups. I was also a Council - I'm also a Council liaison to the - to one implementation review team for the thick Whois.

I've also been very active on the GAC GNSO consultative group, which is a group of six GAC members and six GNSO Council members trying to (unintelligible) process that will - I'm sorry, is that a beep for me to stop talking or - I'll just keep going.

So, yeah, it's a group working on a process to facilitate early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO policy development process, try to sort of mitigate the conflicting advice the GAC provides once all the policy work is actually done. So I think that's a good project. I've been very active on that from the GNSO side.

I've also - I think one of the things that I'm personally kind of pleased with myself about is ever since the expert working group finished its work there have been kind of attempts to fast track how the GNSO would adopt the Expert Working Group's final report and recommendations. I would like to think that I gave ICANN staff a really hard time on that. We spent months and months debating it at least over to ICANN meetings.

And I think it's because I know so much about the GNSO procedures I was able to sort of hold these arguments with policy staff. And I think in the end it worked out really well. I didn't do this alone of course, I mean, I had help from other councilors from NCSG. But I - it's one of the things I'm really happy about because when the whole Expert Working Group stuff started, and I think this was maybe around the time of the Beijing meeting, there was a lot of concern about how this - the work coming out of this ad hoc process would be reconciled with the GNSO's process.

So I think it worked out fairly well. We got a new preliminary issues report which is something that I had always believed we deserved as opposed to one that was published I think about two years ago now. So that is something I would chalk up as an accomplishment on the Council.

Apart from that, I don't know, I guess just put in a lot of day to day work with the GNSO Council. And I hope it reflects well. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. I think that to speak about accomplishments the accomplishments usually happen by the working group. In the GNSO the role of the GNSO is more related to review the discussion of the working group. And given the fact that noncommercial interests are a minority I think that it's important that of our presence there besides reviewing the work that has been done and making sure that all the procedures have been properly followed in the working group is also to make a point even if we are a dissenting voice from the majority I'm looking for noncommercial interests.

So I think that our role as councilors has been to speak, to advocate for noncommercial interests no matter what (unintelligible) no matter if we believe that we're going to (unintelligible) or lose a particular discussion or a particular vote or a particular (unintelligible).

When it comes to being involved in working groups I tried at first to look at those but I knew that I had some more background to participate. So the one that I joined as an observer was the IGO INGO one. I've been discussing this with (Dave), I have been to the meetings. But there was not really much to do in that one in terms of they were already finalizing the work that they (unintelligible) it was more a matter of following the discussions and making

sure that nothing would go wrong or be very (unintelligible). But there was not much in terms of work on doing that one.

And more it was simply I have joined the discussions on the - the discussion group on the new gTLD subsequent procedures trying to understand what is going on on that one. And I believe that in the Council when the report, the preliminary report was presented some of the discussions of the discussion group I think that I have been vocal because I have been going - I have gone through to the report and the table that has been used and tried to point out the gaps of the table and of the assessment that was conducted.

And more specifically the gaps related to the non-consideration of developmental concerns I raised in the Council of the importance - the importance of going back to previous documents that have been especially discussed. But that have kind of been forgotten such as the JAS report and try to make sure that these reflections that were important at the time they resonate in future discussions about subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

So that was the point that I had made strongly in the Council I think. And of course trying to bring to the Council as well as at least initially the discussions that are happening in other parts of the organization or other groups that I am involved with such as discussions on human rights.

I think what I feel about myself is that it took me some time to understand the point that I would like to (unintelligible) and be involved. I have a feeling that there are some working groups that have been going on for a long time. And in spite of the fact that I have tried to follow them they are in a point of converging - either they are finalized such as the IGO INGO in terms of producing a final report, or they are in the process of trying to close a discussion.

And I think that there are ones - there are some that are going to be clear from now on that I believe to be strategic. And these are the ones that I've wanted to be more vocally from the start in terms of (unintelligible) involvement and being there and participating.

In terms of sticking in the Council I think that I am pretty much outspoken and I can speak in public and I'm able to make a point. And I think that because of the consideration of the Council this is something that is really important for noncommercial interests whereas not to be completely (unintelligible) because we are such a minority there.

And I think that I'm able to do that. And I notice a progression in terms of my participation and being vocal in (unintelligible) in the last one. I've been much more vocal in the Council. I understand much more what is going on and I have been participating more. And I believe the next cycle I would keep for my priorities on the issues that I have mentioned and developing human rights and also become involved (unintelligible) issues that are starting right now such as the discussion on the assessment of the last round - the next round of new gTLDs. That's it. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Marilia. Thanks, everyone. We should - the end of this call. But before that I would like to give opportunity to each candidate to speak for 30 seconds, I want really that you speak only for 30 seconds, just to say to people why they should vote for you. So please convince them. And maybe we can start with the candidates for chair. And maybe with Tapani here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay 30 seconds. So my main idea is to reduce the time pressures for volunteers by building tools and automation and organizing things as well as I can and increasing members through outreach basically trying to do what I did

for (unintelligible) years ago. Two things, smoothly, smartly, effectively. Less than 30 seconds.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Tapani. James.

James Gannon: Thanks, Rafik. So I'm new blood to NCSG. And I'm possibly an unusual candidate to run for chair. But I think if you do elect me that I will work harder than anybody else in this position. And I hope that I can bring new perspective onto new issues and old issues alike. And that I can be a fair and neutral chair for all members of the NCSG be they NCUC, NPOC or individual members.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you. So let's move to GNSO councilor candidate and starting with Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Well thanks, Rafik. To me it would be a great, great honor and pleasure to represent and still to - for the next round of Council if you believe I'm fit for the position I think that we will have a good regional/gender balance in the Council with (unintelligible). And I believe that I could be a strong advocate for developing the concerns that are (unintelligible) very much (unintelligible) now. And I believe that we need to focus on the new gTLD discussion on the discussion of auctions and trying to bring this diverse views that are not only from the developed world and (unintelligible) discuss human rights issues as well.

                  And I am very much involved in the discussions that are taking place (unintelligible). And I think that I can (unintelligible) in the Council.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Marilia. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Right thanks. This is Amr again. Well, before I tell you very quickly why I
                think you should vote for me, I think it's only fair to mention that whether you
                vote for me or not it really ultimately won't matter because since we have
                only three candidates running for three - which is I find extremely
                unfortunate, regardless of the three candidates will make it to the GNSO
                Council spots allocated.

                But on the other hand, yes I do think you should vote for me. And I hope that
                you will. I think I've done a fairly good job on the GNSO Council this past
                term. I think I'm relatively one of the more experienced councilors now
                especially since Avri has elected to not run for a second term. But I do admit
                that I - I don't think, I mean, I say - I think I've been a good councilor. I don't
                think I've been a perfect one. I have had, I mean, there is definitely room for
                improvement on my part.

                I've mentioned this briefly in my candidate statement. And if you do vote for
                me I will work to be a better councilor than I have been in the past. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Amr. Okay so just maybe to say something before we end this
                call. First thanks for all your answer and trying to respond to question and also
                thanks for those who asked the questions. It was engaging. It was also kind of
                important to understand the concerns.

                What I can tell you to candidates, first we'd like for the election, this is still an
                election and you have the strong (unintelligible) none of (unintelligible) so
                that I heard a lot of good idea, nice proposal, how we can improve things. And
                I mean, it's quite important. However, the challenge is how we can do
                (unintelligible) regardless who will be elected. How we can implement that.

And this means the work of everyone. We elect people to position to do some work to facilitate, to represent us. But at the end we need all the membership everyone to volunteer for work. So I really wish we'd like (unintelligible) whoever would be elected you will need a lot of support. And that's important to remember.

We got a lot of ideas, a lot of nice proposal. I hope that we can implement even a small set of them. We tend to be optimistic but I hope that we can reach what we are talking about. Okay, guys, thanks again. And hopefully see you soon. And we will share all the recordings and transcripts and (unintelligible). Okay, bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, (Jay), you may now stop the recordings. Thank you very much. Bye.

END