

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
August 18, 2016
8:00 am CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much for confirming that. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG Elections Meet the Candidate call on Thursday, 18th of August 2016.

On the call – Amr Elsadr, (Aden Sutherland), Bill Drake, Ed Morris, James Gannon, Joan Kerr, (Pat Carmen), Klaus Stoll, (Mary Pitea), Marilia Maciel, Patrick Lenihan, Rafik Dammak, Robin Gross and Tapani Tarvainen.

And from Staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi, and (Michelle Dockson). I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Maryam. So for the record Tapani Tarvainen is speaking and as noted I am being a candidate in the election. I'd rather not chair this session so I'm – and ask Joan Kerr to do that – moderate this and without further ado Joan please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Great. Good morning. Thank you Tapani and welcome everyone. This is an exciting call. We have our NCSG elections to the GNSO and this is my first Meet the Candidates moderation for the – and so I'm rather excited.

Hopefully Stephanie will join us but I see the other candidates are on the call and welcome to everyone. I have been going through some of the emails that other people have written concerning the issues and what they would like to see the candidates address and their opinions.

So hopefully we will cover some of those but broadly speaking the issues covered things like transparency and accountability, communications and the representation.

How are people voting? Is it their issues such as coordination of votes or, you know, the whole personal freedom of individual votes? So hopefully – and they were all broken down but what – but broadly those are the categories that they seem to fit into.

So let's talk about the rules of procedures for each of the candidate. Now we don't have Stephanie yet but this is how we will follow it in the meantime and hopefully she'll join us.

The candidates will have their three questions and the candidates will have five minutes to answer each question. Then after each question the other candidates will have two minutes to respond, and then we'll have five minutes for open discussion for each question.

The Question Number 1 – we will start with Tapani, was Stephanie, Ed and then Rafik. Number 2 is just the – a question for the Councilors and Number 3 - I guess Tapani will go first because he's the Chair, Rafik, Stephanie and Ed.

I will repeat those as we go through. So if we're ready let's start with the questions unless anybody has anything else before we start the questions. No hands up so the first question – I don't know if we'll have it on the screen or not. Maryam will we have this question on the screen?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi Joan. Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes please. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: So the first answer will be from Tapani. You'll have five minutes and Stephanie if she comes on and Ed and then Rafik. And we're waiting – just waiting for the question.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan you may read the questions please while I...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Oh okay. I will read the question then. "Your candidate statements from all of you tells us about your past experience. What would you do differently in the future?"

Essentially what we want to know is what do you as a representative want to accomplish?" And we'll start with Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: So what would I do differently and what would I want to accomplish? Okay I guess what I would do differently is to make sure that I have enough time to do everything I want to do.

When I ran for Chair last - year ago I hoped I would have time to do more than the minimum needed and I would have time to also take part in the actual policy stuff more.

But everything takes more time and – than expected and well I think have more or less managed to do the administration stuff, which is the primary task of the Chair as I see it.

But I have not been able to do that as well as I could have, and many of the things I hoped to have done by now are still in motion and I haven't barely any time at all to touch the actual policy stuff.

And what do I hope to accomplish? Well I'll try to get the bureaucracy running as smoothly as possible to set up procedures that will make this easy and less manual labor consuming that it has – is.

Note – most notably I want to complete what Rafik started doing here about setting up the member database management, automating this election stuff. That actually now still takes fair amount of manual labor.

And also work better in coordinating and – with the Councilors and their work trying to make again these processes easy so that it would not be necessary to do ad hoc things all the time as we were.

How many minutes have I left? It's close enough. Those questions in screen are a little different than you said. Let me see. Should I – to answer those Joan?

Joan Kerr: No we're going to go question by question for each person to say.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Joan Kerr: You don't have to take your five minutes. It's a suggestion for five minutes but if you're happy that's fine.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay I'll note that I'm used – I don't like to make long speeches and I actually have something of a reputation of usually talking less than...

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: You've been placed on hold. Please wait.

Tapani Tarvainen: So I think that's enough for now.

Joan Kerr: Okay great. Thank you so much. Has Stephanie joined us? I don't see her name. Doesn't look like she has. So Ed you're next in line. You have five – up to five minutes – same question.

Edward Morris: Let's see. Thanks. Thank you Joan and thanks everybody for being here and for the – good for Joan for stepping up and doing this. It's got to be a bit daunting.

You have your first moderation in the NCSG Meet a Candidate forum so thank you very much for stepping up I know at the last minute. Boy performance in office – been a busy two years.

My candidate statement as folks have seen rivals War and Peace in length. So I've talked a little bit about what I've done but maybe I should talk here about what I didn't do and what I've done poorly.

I think my biggest regret was not understanding how disorganized we were here in the NCSG and how that affects your performance on Council. Some of the other Councilor groups are smaller and tighter.

They have better coordination with the folks that put them there. That's largely because the interest of those groups are pretty well defined. We're a very diverse group with lots of different interests.

As Councilors where I think we went wrong this year – and I keep coming back to our appointment for the Consumer Choice and Trust vision. The other groups were ready with list of candidates.

They threw them at us. We're still on a Skype conversation trying to figure out who we're going to nominate. Now I think we got our act together because the last episode - anything like this was attempting to staff the drafting team and it was principally - Marilia and myself worked together.

I worked some of the inside gains. She was posting amendment after amendment to an IPC attempt to pass the drafting team. The end result is we actually have one more representative than anyone else.

So I think we're starting to get organized a bit better but my biggest regret particularly at the end was not working better with my fellow Councilors, and not understanding how important that was going forward on Council.

In terms of what I want to accomplish I want to become the budget guru of the GNSO. During the past year I was the principal author of the GNSO budget response.

I should mention the previous two years I did the NCSG budget response. I liked it but I didn't really get into it too much. You sort of just look at the numbers.

This time I had Staff help. Chuck Gomes, sort of our previous guru, will get into this. I think this is real important for somebody in the GNSO to see where the money's going, for someone in the NCSG to make sure we're not being ripped off and that we're not being shortchanged, and particularly with the new community powers coming in we're going to have veto power over the budget.

Somebody in the greater GNSO needs to know how to read the budget, needs to know how to question the budget so if you could ask me what do I want to do policy wise for the next 12 months as a Councilor that's definitely it.

I've talked to James Bladel. I've talked to Staff members. They're willing to help me. They're willing to give me some support in doing this so if I'm returned to Council, and I do plan on voting for myself so I guess that's going to happen, I'm going to focus on the budget for the first year as my policy initiative on Council.

The other thing I want to do on Council is try to work with others and again I've talked to James. Susan from Facebook – I can never pronounce her last name – she wants to get involved with this and hopefully some of our other Councilors will be active.

We need to create a permanent way on Council for appointing people to things. The new community mechanism is going to require us to appoint lots of people to lots of places and we've been doing it.

And we're not structured for that on Council so I wanted to try at least in the first few months of the new term to work with others to create sort of a permanent appointment structure where the NCSG obviously is treated equally with the other four stakeholder groups.

One of the challenges we have as NCSG reps on Council is a continuous battle with the CSG who wants to do everything by constituency. The two key numbers here are seven and four.

In the minds of the CSG each one of their constituencies should have an appointed position. We should have two, NCUC and NPOC and the Contracted Party Houses should have one each.

That's not in our interest. The House system does protect us in that regard but frankly every time there's someone up for appointment they push and push and push to do it by constituency.

And we in order to maintain our relevance need to make sure they're not successful in doing that. And I know I see Amr's – you're on – in that and you're on the drafting team, which I'm actually going to be serving as an NCA appointment to get us that extra spot.

We're going to have to really push back against what I'm sure are going to be CSG efforts to try to do things by constituency. I guess one of the other key things I'd like to work on this year and again I mention this in my candidate statement – somewhere in accountability way back when, and I'm sure Robin can chip in on this, we got assurances early on in the process that when – for the – when the IRP was set up and the IRP is going to be used a lot more now than it was in the past - that there will be some sort of pro bono program for our members.

Not for us. We're covered. We're free as a stakeholder group and even down to I believe the constituency level. But for maybe one of our member organizations that has a problem with ICANN and wants to go to an IRP but don't – doesn't have any...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Ed you have about a minute to wrap up please.

Edward Morris: Okay will do so. In any event what I want to make sure is somewhere along the line we lost that pro bono guarantee, and whether it be through my report to our position in the CEP or somewhere else in this wonderful place we all live and work in, I want to make sure we get that back for our member organizations and individuals. Thanks so much.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you Ed. We'll go to Rafik please. You got five minutes – up to five minutes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. Can you hear me?

Joan Kerr: Yes we can.

Rafik Dammak: Right. Thanks for everyone for joining the call. Can be for a strange time for those in Asia-Pac. So I'm not sure in asking about my past performance in office because technically I'm running for GNSO Council and currently the NCSG Chair so it's not the same role, not the same mission.

But I used to be before a GNSO Council but that was few years ago. It was a different context, different challenges and things evolved. However I kept in touch as how things changed since then.

What I can accomplish or I do want to accomplish? I can just promise something. I'm not going to be a superhero. I don't think anybody can do that.

It's important to be humble here and so to think every time how we can improve ourselves and to set the target that we can reach. We have six Councilor and in fact having that number increase the way – the complexity of we – of how we should coordinate.

Other group has a smaller number and in fact that helps them a lot in how they do things. However it can be our strong point because it mean that we can have a diversity.

We should be able to share more of the workloads between the six Councilor, and I see myself as a member of a team here so I will help my colleagues to do our work and to see how we can do better.

I don't want to blame anybody or to do – to think – to put fingers because I don't think it's helpful in any matter. I am an engineer and so I am more in problem solving mindset.

It's more to be positive and to try to fix issues as we see, not to look for temporary solution because it doesn't solve the root cause but really to look more how we can solve for the long-term, to build something sustainable.

So I cannot be sure what kind of policy issue that we will discuss in future because things change a lot. Two or three years ago nobody was even talking

about the IANA stewardship transition and then it came and changed the road to follow dynamics and our priority.

However the things that remain important which is to follow the policy development process, and I do see that one of the things that we have to improve is how we engage our members in that regard.

And I think for a Councilor it's - one of their leadership work on that is to keep the membership informed, help newcomers to get more involved and so on.

So this is the kind of area I would - I will - I would like to help and accomplish and I think it's about also continuous improvement and so things will evolve probably, so I hope that clarify what I have in mind as the GNSO Councilor.

Two years is sometimes short but it's also long and - in many aspects so that's what I want to say here.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you Rafik. Welcome Stephanie. We also have some suggestions of other questions, which we'll get to later. Stephanie the preamble was that the community has two emails and dialog has been - indicated issues such as accountability and transparency, communications and coordinated votes versus personal - of votes.

And so in those contexts that's broadly what it - the community thinks we want to address and some of those Questions 4 and 5 address those so we - we'll get to those.

So the first question – the rules of procedure is you have five minutes to answer each question and then after everyone – all candidates respond then there's two minutes for the other team to respond or at least – and some – open it up – each – and so the question to you Stephanie is we know about your past performance in your statement that was submitted.

But what is your – tell us about what you will do differently in the future and wish – as our record under this. Thank you. You've got five minutes – up to five minutes.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much Joan and my apologies for being late. I think actually as - some of the discussion on this list indicates some of my priorities but let's just go over a few things.

I think that the fact that we're having acclamations instead of elections -- I'm not counting none of the above as a candidate here -- is a sad thing and so I think it points to one of the problems that we have as a group and that is recruiting new people and getting them engaged.

So I propose to spend a lot more time on that. It's – I've tried to model the mentoring. We've tried a number of things on opening up channels to get people involved but I think we need more work on that, because there just aren't enough new people getting engaged to swell the ranks.

I do think we have a lot of work ahead of us and load distribution is a problem. Some of us complain about burnout on a regular basis so the answer to that is getting more people engaged, so we need to work on methods of sharing the work and coordinating a bit better.

In order to get people engaged I think that speaks to better communication from Councilors on what we're doing. And we discussed on the list the possibility of sharing a load and reporting after meetings.

I think we should do that. I think people don't actually know what's going on in Council. I think just inviting them to the NCSG monthly meetings isn't clearly riveting enough to get people engaged.

So -- but I think it's important that we reach out and do something that might get them engaged and a short report might do it. We do have a lot of work coming ahead of us and I think there's a temptation for some of the Councilors -- I'll put my hand up here -- to try to engage in everything.

I think that's a mistake. Our job should be to just try to find people to help us do that work. So in particular I have tried to cover in the past all the privacy related and Wiz related processes, and I think we've got some great new talent on some of those groups and that's very impressive so I'm going to continue that work.

In terms of the IANA transition we've also got, you know, some people engaged on that but there's a lot of accountability work that needs help and I'm not sure that I have the time to engage on that.

Maybe we should be trying to find new people. There are some major committees that I think are chewing some of our time and the rights protection measures review is one of them.

And of course the other one is the RDS but building some of these accountability systems is also going to be important. So I think that's probably a start. I'm happy to answer questions later.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you so much everyone. We can now – each of the candidate can respond to the other candidate if they have a question. I see no hands up but please just put your hand up.

Otherwise we'll go to the community to ask a question. Anyone? No questions for Number 1? Okay then we'll go to Number 2 then. So the Number 2's question is to the Councilors only and sorry Tapani you'll be on Number 3 again.

The Number 2 is, "As a Councilor do you consider yourself a delegate or a trustee?" And the first person to go ahead would be Ed please.

Edward Morris: Hi Joan. Apologies. I should note as Stephanie talked about being over committed I'm actually doing two calls at once right now. There's a transparency call going on.

I may have to go over there for a few minutes in a bit and my apologies to everyone here. It's just something I've been working on for a year and a half that's about to come up.

This is a great question and it leads into something that's been discussed on list about directed voting. First of all I consider myself a mixture of a delegate and a trustee.

It really depends upon the activity you're speaking of and the salience of the issue in our group. For example when I'm working in small groups on Council be it as I said the budget, some of the administrative stuff, I feel that I'm more of a trustee, that I'm acting and working the best I can in the interest of our group.

When I'm voting there's some of that but I consider that to be more of a delegate function, and so I'd like to get a little bit involved in something that's come up on the list about the concept of directed voting.

In certain circumstances I think it's a pretty good idea so let me describe some situations that I've – that have come up or that will be coming up where I think directed voting is a good idea.

On the CCWG I wanted desperately for us to direct our Councilors on how to vote. First of all I think that it would be a good idea when we have a situation like the CCWG where we're appointing a representative, a member to represent us on that group to at the time we appoint the member to state, "It is our intention to direct our Councilors on votes coming from this particular working group or party."

And the reason I've come to that conclusion is during the CCWG Robin was our member. You know, a lot of us did a lot of work but Robin had the golden vote.

Robin was the one that was supposed to speak and did speak on behalf of the entire stakeholder group. It would've empowered her in negotiations with others.

For example when we were fighting back and kicking back against increased government power in the GAC, I think it would've been easier for Robin to press our view if she could've said, "Well if you don't give us that our Councilors are going – not going to vote for that."

We actually made some representations. I literally don't remember who was involved at that point that, "Look we might not be able to support this program."

That eventually got us the GAC cowbell by the way but I remember in one instance where one of the CSG members came back to me and said, "You say you guys won't support it but I talked to one of your Councilors who loves the transition."

So I think it's a strategic move when we're appointing people to represent us on committees like the CCWG. The default actually should be for a directed vote at the end.

Now if we come back and we don't agree on the direction of the vote or what our member wants us to do then maybe we can then undirect, but I think as a default in those instances votes should be directed.

Second one is something we get coming up and rather than consider it whoever direct – are Councilors or not I would propose that we take a position that we are going to direct us.

That's in appointments and particularly the Board appointment we have coming up. I know factually there are members of the CSG that do not want to reappoint Markus Kummer.

I don't know what we want to do. I haven't given it a lot of thought but what I do know is I don't want a situation where you have a united CSG saying, "Get – dump Markus."

Most of us like Markus yet they pick off one of our members so I think on appointments and even a – greater than just a Board appointment, perhaps all appointments we should try to do as a group and submit as a group to Council.

The CCG thing was a complete - talked up. Maybe if we had agreed that we were going to direct our Councilors on all appointments we would've had a list ready.

Those are the two areas that I feel more – most strongly about that we should direct our Councilors and it's basically for strategic reasons, not so much for accountability reasons.

I think we're stronger acting as a group. We are diverse. As Avri wrote on the list she doesn't like directed voting because we're a diverse group. I think largely for most votes I agree with it.

We're going to have some differences but for the – for strategic reasons, for appointments and for places we appoint people to I think it's imperative that we're united, unified and we do have directed votes in those cases. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Ed. Same question for Stephanie, please. Would you like me to repeat the question Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: The question is the one on whether we considered ourselves as delegates or trustees.

Joan Kerr: Correct.

Stephanie Perrin: To be honest, I'm not really sure what the difference between a delegate and a trustee is in this context. I think I'm elected by the group to go to council and I

have certain responsibilities. One of my responsibilities is to be accountable to them, to communicate with them, to represent their views, to try to understand what their views are. And that requires communication.

I don't think - I think that's a distinction... And pardon me for having a kind of a bureaucrat's approach to this. It comes from being a bureaucrat for so many years. But I'm not in there to represent really my own views. I'm in there because I'm supposed to be able to gather everybody else's views and reflect a consensus opinion.

In some respects I act as an expert. Obviously I think I have some expertise to contribute in which case I try to make it clear what I think - when I'm contributing my expertise, what I know. But for the rest of the time as a counselor, I'm representing the views of the group.

So that's why the structures have to work really, really well so that we as councilors can reflect the group. And I think that it's one of the things we need to improve on. And I'm not pointing a finger.

I think as mentioned in my first five minutes, part of our problem is that we have very few people covering an awful lot of work and they can't really cover it well if they're rushing around doing everything. It's much better to have a broader group and a good communication mechanism. So that's important.

I think we are going to have - I'm not sure that directed voting is going to solve the problem of councilors going off on their own and doing what they want to do. I think the issue is more one of how do we set up the structures so that councilors really are clear on what they're doing.

We've had a number of votes where it's been problematic, the coordination in the group. One of them was the election of the council chairs that took place in Dublin. And I think those kinds of experiences are unfortunate and reflect badly on us.

So I think it's really, really important as NCSG that we reflect a united front, that we coordinate better and that we know what each other's doing, what we're saying to one another. But that requires a bit of work.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Stephanie. Now we'll have Rafik respond to the same question, please. You've got up to five minutes.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So I don't think it's - the idea is to being a delegates or trustee as much as qualification. But maybe also it's important to remind some elements here.

First, we are elected and it means we are on for such position and there is expectation from our members that we to do several tasks. And this is within the GNSO council which do basically the oversight and the management of the policy development for generic names.

But more and more, there are more task added to the basket of the GNSO council and we have to deal with that. So it's important to understand about the structure, where we are.

And also within NCSG we have an existing structure that would be more functional which is the policy committee in terms of a - find a consensus in policy position. And so that's the role of the GNSO is to express what we reach as a consensus within NCSG. With the help of the policy committee in that matter, we are to give guidance.

It means in some occasion that we as elected we have to act to be proactive and to deal with many things that come up. And it happens in practice. For example like - even like when we vote for a motion, there can be some amendments like if they can say that on the fly during the call. And we have to find out how to respond to that. So there is some autonomy in that matter.

But what we have to recall is that whatever we do we have to explain why and how we did that and to give people the rationale we do that because we have to be careful that acting alone can -- even for good intention -- can backfire in many aspects.

As social engineer, I am really more toward working on teams. There is no -- as was said -- superhero. There is no someone who fix all the issues. And it's important to work with everyone on issues.

So I really insist that it's about working more, about policing making, reaching consensus within policy committee and then we can liaise with that as a counselor.

Another matter, I don't think any councilor has really have the grasp of all the issues, of all the policy that are going of everything within ICANN. And we have kind of sharing the workload between different volunteers who are not even necessarily elected.

And so one of our roles is to liaise with them and ask their opinion and ask for their feedback. It's - as a councilor we have really to do more listening more than talking, to listen to everyone but also sharing information. So we have to think in that matter, in that way.

So I could say that I am a delegate trying to be the messenger of what my group reach as a position.

Maybe in some occasion I can be a trustee but I would be careful on that because it will - I will have to change - I will have to put some on my own judgment and there is always limitation on that because maybe I don't have all the information and so on.

So I would think how we can work better. And this is more by coordination between councilors, with the policy committee, with other volunteers who are involved with on specific process and so on so back again with our elected members. And we have to think on that.

So we are not - we have to be realistic. We cannot as individuals fix all of the problems. We can focus on some areas and help others and ask others for help on for that so.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Rafik. So we now come to question number three and there are four, five and six. And four, five and six is also what was on - among the e-mails where people were concerned with any rule specifically.

So question number three is: What are the issues that you have identified as pertinent to NCSG? Now the community -- just to point out -- has identified accountability and transparency, coordination of bullets or personal freedom or opinions and communication and/or reporting -- as I said in my preamble.

That's what the community has identified as issues for us to deal with. So we would like to know what you have identified as pertinent for NCSG. And we'll start with Tapani first, please. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Joan. Now of course I rather like to follow what the community identifies as important but - and I look at this from a little broader perspective.

We are representing the non-commercial interest in ICANN. They say money runs the world and we are kind of a concept balancing that attempt.

And the high level things we are focusing on would of course be freedom of speech, privacy, accountability, transparency and openness in just about everything ICANN does.

Even though I just said that we account in money, we should keep tracking for money, follow the money so to speak so we can actually see and highlight whose interests are actually being served. And of course accountability comes as key element there.

If I try to think of a bit lower level, one of details, concrete things of course, you know, the processes that are going on the CCWT and accountability is a key item. Who to - or part of Whois replaced this with is important, especially in privacy perspective, the rights of individuals, registering domains. And when look at RPM processes, of course important as well.

But other than that, I think I will leave it up to the councilors to comment on the policies, their domain here. Okay thank you. I'll leave it at that.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Tapani. You make it really easy for timing, just want you to know.

You know, when I was reading some of these e-mails, I was thinking the dialogue that was going on which is fantastic, you know, people agreeing with

one pull-in and another. And I think this is great that we're listening to what our representatives represent.

So Rafik, if you could answer the same question as well, number three? Thank you. You've got up to five minutes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Joan. I was not expected to be the first but okay.

Well, I mean, I think it can be quite easy and also difficult to identify what's pertinent for NCSG folks and GNSO because first, if we talk - so it's about policy development. I may be redundant here, repeating that many times but that's the reality. It's about policy development.

And for this year we have a big challenge. I don't think we face it before. We have three heavy policy development process and by the way that's - they will take - they need a lot of volunteers and they will last for a few years. So we have that to face and to find solution.

So I think I can mix from my side my experience as a chair and now more like a GNSO councilor has to work on that, to find more volunteers and so on.

Other issues is still we are going to talk about the work stream two for the accountability for the next month. There are several areas that we start to work on. And I think we have people involved with there.

We still need more expertise and so on and also to - we need to be careful for some of them because they are going to impact us as a stakeholder group.

Other area, it's more like - it's not necessarily the most exciting but it's always a recurrent issue for the last year. It's about GNSO future on itself.

GNSO had several restructuring and with IANA Stewardship Transition and ICANN accountability, the context is changing. And though we have to think maybe about that impacting the GNSO and in particular the NCSG.

So this is the kind of thing we have talked, always about policy development. We have to find out how we can get more volunteers. It's more easy to say than to fix but I keep faith that we will have some solution on that matter, the work stream two for the accountability and I said about the GNSO future itself. So we have to focus on that.

On the same time we still have many things that can pop up any - at any instant. And so that's why we have to kind of proactive and ready to handle them. It's not easy in term of managing the workload but I think we will get some experience in that and we can find out how we can handle whatever it comes.

It also need more planning and strategizing because there are some area that we are kind of unsure how we - that it will come in the future. For example we have the schedule of the review teams and we know that it will come like in six months or one year and just we need to do more planning ahead. Again it's more easy to say than to do but we have to start at some level to do that more.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you Rafik. We'll now have Ed. Ed are you there?

Ed Morris: I'm here Joan. Hi.

Joan Kerr: Ed.

Ed Morris: Shall I go?

Joan Kerr: Great. You're next. Continue.

Ed Morris: Okay thanks. I get a little echo here. If others do, please let me know.

Two issues, two things to focus on. There is no more important issue for the future of the NCSG than how we incorporate the transition changes into the GNSO.

Let me give you a stark fact. We only...

I have a doorbell ringing. That's wonderful. I'll keep going.

We have only 5% of the power in the empowered community. We're one-quarter of the GNSO. The GNSO is 20%. ALAC is 20% by themselves. We don't have a lot of formal power in the community itself.

So it's imperative to us that as we port the transition changes into the GNSO we make sure we actually have that 5%. And fortunately -- thanks to the efforts of (Aurelia) principally -- we have a majority of folks on the drafting team that's going to lead the changes...

Excuse me one moment, please. Just leave it there. Leave it there.

...from ICANN because our academics can use...

Joan Kerr: Did we lose Ed?

Ed Morris: Hello? Am I there? Joan? Hello?

Joan Kerr: Yes go ahead. We can hear you.

Ed Morris: Yes sorry. So basically the number one issue porting the changes into the GNSO to retain our influence. It's a (unintelligible). I'm determined to be able to get us -- at the stakeholder group level -- the ability to use the inspection right so principally our academics folks -- like Milton folks like (Bill), even (Robin) because she does some great stuff in CircleID -- can get the documents they need to further our influence.

Because we may be small, we may not have a lot of formal power but we have the best folks in terms of making arguments and getting things into the public eye. So we need to maximize that through the ability to get the documents through how we port stuff into the GNSO.

The second policy area is an area that I'm really concerned about. Let's talk about intellectual property. That's the bread and butter of policy at ICANN historically and in the future, going back to the Green and White papers.

Now, what's happened since I've joined the NSCG only, what, four years ago is we brought in a lot of new people, experts in human rights. Privacy's already been there but we get a lot more people involved in that.

And it's almost as if some of our newcomers are looking and saying hey, this group is about diversity, human rights. And it is. And we push these issues. And we put them on the table.

What we cannot forget that the principal business of ICANN in terms of policy development is IP. And this is what scares me.

In the RPM yesterday at the general meeting I walk in there and we got 30 IP lawyers and they make lots of money and they have staffs. And the only folks

battling them are (Kathy) and me. We have a few other people on the group. (Robin)'s been active, thank God. We have a problem. We're completely outstaffed and overwhelmed in IP issues which should be our bread and butter.

I'll do the best I can. (Kathy)'s brilliant as chair. I know (Robin)'s going to be there. She's great. But I think one of the things that we need to think about is how to get more IP people involved in our group because this is going to be a four-year process and particularly when we get to the UDRP review, that's something a lot of us - that's why I joined the NCSG.

We need to be ready to go at it with everything we have. Otherwise we're going to get overrun by the nice folks from the IP business in the world.
Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Ed. Stephanie, if you could answer the same question, please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Can you hear me? I'm using a different microphone. Having microphone problems today.

Joan Kerr: Yes we can hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: Wonderful. That's great. I think we have quite a few priorities actually. I think that we should be concerned about the GNSO review that went on. Some of us participated. We managed to get the report beaten back from what was really quite a bad report.

But that report also indicated the fractures in our own group. And united stand, divided we fall when it comes to NCSG. As Ed has pointed out, we're in a minority.

So following up on the implementation of that independent examiner's report -- and I'm referring to the Westlake report -- there's a committee where - which is starting up. We need to get a volunteer for that and it should be soon. And it should be someone who's aware of the issues. So that could have an impact on our future in terms of the structure of the GNSO. There is also an ad hoc group looking at the structure of the GNSO.

So I realize that the IANA transition and the accountability measures that flow from that have more or less taken over our lives in the last two years. But there are many things that we have to participate in to keep an eye on it because it is whack-a-mole here at ICANN. Things pop up in various venues.

But again I think we have to figure out how better to staff these things. And I think we are making some progress thematically. The - you know, there could be a cluster of people around the Whois. There could be a cluster of people around free speech. There already is a cluster of people around human rights but they're not necessarily on the PDPs where the policy actually gets developed.

So I think we need sort of a little more strategy actually. I think our strategy - we can talk well on a call like this every two years but then when it gets down to the day to day, it's who shows up at the policy call, what's going on on the list and who has put up their hand as being willing to do some new work.

So we need to work on that. We don't have enough people to cover these issues. I know - I realize I'm asking or rather answering the same question at every one of these questions. But I think it's an important one: How do we get more people engaged? How do we keep them engaged? How do we transfer knowledge and experience? Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Stephanie. Thank you all. That's - those were the three formal questions that we had.

I just wanted to say something from an observer from afar and being involved for the last year and a half, almost two years.

The issue of our people being involved, I thought about that quite a bit when I started getting involved at ICANN. And I found that there was so much to know first of all but there was a lot of, you know, the issues, the acronyms and, you know, the inside - I call it the insider language. So there is always that.

But there's also a lot of displacement of language, for example sarcasm or, you know, put-down language and things like that. And I think that makes other people feel abused or to become involved - become like oh I don't want to be part of that.

So I think for myself, I think that we should have more inviting languages that we use for new people to become engaged. So that's one thing.

So we have some questions from the community. The first one - and so we're now in the informal part of the call. It's - we could just have the councilors and representatives maybe take one to two minutes to answer each question so we can try to get through them.

So the first question is: How would you include transparency, accountability and openness in the EC between the EC and the community? That's the first question. And anyone can jump in to answer that question, any of the representatives.

Ed Morris: Hi Joan. It's Ed. I wonder if (Matt) could let us know if he means EC as in some executive committee or the empowered community. I'm trying to figure out what he wants us to...

Joan Kerr: You know what? That's a good point. You know what I'm going to do Ed -- if it's okay with everyone -- the people who write the questions, I'm going to invite them to ask the questions so that they can clarify it. Is that okay with everyone?

So (Matthew), would you like to go ahead? Thanks.

(Matthew): Sure. Can you hear me?

Joan Kerr: Yes we can.

(Matthew): Okay thanks. I guess in many ways my question was more broadly about -- and it's kind of echoed in (Robin)'s below it -- which is how do we improve transparency, accountability and openness amongst our councilors and in terms of how they interact.

And we talked a little bit about - in a bit of a discussion about voting so far but how they remain in communication, how they interact, how they make decisions and then how those - how that accountability is dealt with with the rest of the community. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Maybe if I could give some directions here. If somebody's going to answer, just raise their hands so that we know somebody is going to answer and that we have some sort of (unintelligible), if that's okay. Ed, you were going to answer or you were just clarifying?

Ed Morris: Hi.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Everyone. So Rafik, you're first.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So I think that can be improved and then through some steps. First is to really - to - for now we have the NCSG policy call. I think we can improve that in terms that we share more information beforehand, trying to give at least a short briefing about the issue and explain sometimes it's not enough in the call because we can't start really discussing the more technicalities and so on and not everyone can grasp and digest in that time

I think also that we have to - we have like the formal vote and we - each councilor even if we agree on the same vote (unintelligible) the NCSG policy all and also if the policy committee helped to manage that, it will be easy if we are voting on the same way. If not, I think at least the councilor have - has to explain the rationale for his or her vote and to share that with the membership.

I think what is still missing is that we discussed like on the policy call but we don't do really the follow up after the GNSO Council call happens just a few day after. So we have after the call, afterwards we have to share the votes, why we did that, how we did that, and so on, just to clarify to people to give them more the context and why things are done like that.

Also it's more about coordination. We have to be coordinated and during the vote and also during the discussion and asking the question for example on the call or in a public meeting and so on. There are (unintelligible) or having ad hoc meetings or ad hoc calls or whatever. It's really more to improve the ways how we share information and to agree on action.

I think that the policy committee has been called here to do that. It's really about explanation. It's to be open. For example, my first experience really kind of a long time ago, it was 2009 when I joined my first ICANN meeting, we had a public vote...

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) .

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay, sorry that's the train of thought. Okay I'm not going to bring the example. Anyway, so I think we can do better. It's more about communication, and everyone has to be responsible for what he's doing and explain why he's doing that to the member. And it's more like being open of why we are doing this. So sorry, I was kind of distributing my train of thought at the end.

Joan Kerr: Sorry, it's just that we're trying to get through and for everyone to answer - there are other questions to answer as well. So as I said before, if we can take two minutes to answer the question, we can have dialogue later. So the next speaker is Ed if you want to go ahead.

Ed Morris: Thanks, Joan. Let me quickly touch upon accountability and then an idea I have to try to make the PC work a little bit better, and in that way try to help our coordination. Who are we accountable to? Let me give you an example. There are 19 members on this call. We have 500 members in the group. I want to give you a quick example from last year about why the who is important, and I want to quote Wendy Seltzer, my favorite all time GNSO anything, on a video the NCUC put out was it three years ago, where Wendy said the equivalent, "In ICANN, those who yell loudest get what they want." I don't like that system.

So am I responsible to the 19 people and accountable to the 19 people on this call? Yes, you guys are the most active members. But a warning, last year at this time we had an election. I was supporting Tapani. And the day before results were going to come out, I'm talking to Tapani and saying, "Man you're going to lose. Just get prepared. You've run a good fight." Why is that? Because I'm talking to mostly the active members, most of whom were supporting James. Tapani won, what, 290 to 40 or something like that.

So we have to be careful when we're talking about who we're accountable to make sure we're accountable not only to our entire membership but to their membership in terms of institutional organizations. And I'm not quite sure how to do that. However, Tapani did have an idea on the list the other day and Rafik came up with some sort of modification that. Maybe we should start doing some polls of our entire membership on issues so you can give us some guidance a little bit about where our folks stand on the issues, not just those of us who are more active but those who follow things, you know, a little bit quieter.

In terms of evaluating councilors and accountability of councilors to the community, I just want to caution on one thing. It's very easy to be a councilor and show up and vote and hold us responsible there. Make sure you look at things like who's reading the issue reports and the charters, because folks that's our principal job in my view, it's not voting at the back end, it's making sure that the process is fair at the front end. That to me is the most important thing a councilor does. See which ones of us are working in the small groups and what we do there.

What I'm saying is you should take a look at councilor performance in a whole bunch of areas. Because if your councilor's not (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: I'm sorry, Ed.

Ed Morris: Yes (unintelligible). If I have more second about the policy (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Thirty seconds.

Ed Morris: We don't value the PC the way we do. I think it's ridiculous to have a councilor with all of our responsibilities also have to take on the chairmanship of the PC. My recommendation very quickly, the constituency should appoint four members to the PC, one of those of appointees should become chair, and we should value and reward that position by giving that position one of our (unintelligible). Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Ed. Stephanie, would you like to - Stephanie, are you still on? Stephanie? I think we've lost...

Stephanie Perrin: I think we're running out of - no I'm on. I think we're running out of time and I'm not sure that listening to me talk is important. I think we should ask the audience if they have more questions and get them engaged in this discussion. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Yes there's questions on the whiteboard that to your point, there is a question - if you don't want to answer that question, the next - (Robin) has merged her question with (Matthew)'s. (Unintelligible) which is reporting after meetings on issues and votes. What are your...

Stephanie Perrin: Let me give you an answer.

Man: Joan (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) you can go ahead.

Man: Stephanie, did you want to say something quickly and then I would like to actually - I think it'd be good to get people in the group speaking.

Stephanie Perrin: That was my thought. But I do have - it's not that I don't want to answer the question. I have one practical suggestion. I think if we engage the folks on those policy calls and appointed someone who is not on council to cover our council meeting, the next one, and then have a dialogue asking about the reports that we're going to be filing, because I think we should divide up the work and each do a one-pager after each council meeting, then we would have a more active debate.

Because putting more work just on councilors to report back is not as good as engaging people from the outside to pay more attention to the council meetings. And so if we had someone acting as the reporter for a given council meeting, getting engaged, asking the questions, I think that would help. And it would also help train people up for council. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm hearing myself when I speak. Whoever's got their speakers on, please mute. Okay, good afternoon. Thank you. You just said a question - a comment and a question. The comment is I served on the GNSO Council for four years with Rafik from 2009 and so experienced a lot of the same things he did. And I would have to say based on that and having been on the policy committee mailing list ever since, I think one thing is clear to me is that we should use the tools that we already have.

And one of the tools is the policy committee mailing list and the calls. It is the case that actually we go into these meetings and often people don't know how each other are going to vote. And I've seen circumstances, including at the public meetings, where coordination between our councilors quite visibly broke down and people were having to revise and extend each other's comments and so on. That's not good. That doesn't make us look good.

So just as a general matter, we don't have to get into my views, we don't have to get into directing votes and things like that, but we certainly need everybody to share more information about what their thinking is at the front end and at the back end. So at the front end in the policy committee and all these calls that it would be good if more councilors attended every month and then at the back end, I do think that having a report out would be useful and we did try it way back when for a little while. It does take time.

Stephanie, I don't know whether you're going to be able to get a member able to do that as well as a councilor could do it and I don't really see why you couldn't rotate among six people the responsibility to send a couple of paragraphs just outlining, you know, the issues and the votes. But in any event, I would like to hear from the members, can they commit to sharing in advance what their thinking is and what their positions are going to be going into these meetings within the other stakeholder groups and then reporting out afterwards. That's what I would really like to hear from people. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Any takers from the representatives, candidates?

(Renata): Hi (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Sorry, I couldn't hear who it was (unintelligible). Hello?

(Renata): (Unintelligible)

Joan Kerr: I can't hear who is speaking. Perhaps you're able to write.

(Renata): No I'm on the phone. I would like to...

Joan Kerr: Go ahead. We can hear you now.

(Renata): Okay great. (Unintelligible) thank you. Okay. Hello. (Renata) here. I would like to address these comments that Stephanie made and also drop a quick question. The new members - for the new members or for the less experienced members, communication is key. So the periodical meetings do not necessarily come through to the general group, so I was wondering if some kind of - I agree with Stephanie that some kind of reporting mechanism, like the use of (rapators) for meetings just to give a quick summary of what is going on could help.

But also I would like to address the low participation of developing countries and Latin America specifically. All candidates talked about engaging new people but most of the times it does seem like the developed countries policy makers are talking to each other, and it seems because of the low participation of developing countries and specifically in Latin America's case it's been kind of wiped out of ICANN history. If any of the candidates would like to address this to give ideas of how can we participate or engage better, I would be very thankful. This would be comment. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Thank you very much for your question. Rafik, you had your hand up. You'd like to respond?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Yes, so first maybe just to say I think what you're suggesting is doable. We just need to start somewhere and to do and to try and experiment. We don't need to think again over again. Let's do and try and we can adjust. To respond to (Renata), (Renata), I think I am from a developing country and my passport reminds me that every time. And I understand your concern about engaging.

And this is a real difficulty because even when we talk about Africa, Asia, and Latin America, there are a lot of diversity within those countries. Myself coming from North Africa, I cannot pretend that I can really - I can represent fairly all the diversity within the region. And that's why we have to find out how we can get more input on the specific topics and engage.

First is really to make things more accessible and digestible, ICANN tend to produce sometimes too much information that can be overwhelming and not necessarily to access. So one thing I guess for, as a former councilor here, is really to work on how making a briefing, using existing material but how we can make them more accessible and how also it's more about mentorship. I would be very happy to work with newcomers and so on. And it's - for me it's a kind of continuation of what I am doing as the chair is really to work directly with you as a member, a kind of mentorship sharing experience and so on. And we can do that.

I hope that we can more - get more representative in the future. I don't plan to last for a long time. I would be happy that someone will replace me soon. It's really good. No one is irreplaceable and that will have to work to bring people to be in the leadership for the next year, for the two next year and so on. And that's my engagement for you with other from developing countries. I am from that region. I understand the concerns. I understand the difficulties. I understand the challenge. So that I can promise to continue working on that.

It's not an easy task, I know the difficulties, but I can only commit to continue to work on that.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Rafik. The next person is Ed, if you could try to do it in two to three minutes if you can.

Ed Morris: No problem. Very quickly, to react to what (Bill) has brought up, I think it's a no brainer. And the example I would use is what (Fasi) has done on the EC level. Every now and then as a European, I get something in my email box from (Fasi) saying as your EU representative on the NCUC council, this is what's going on. I think we as councilors should be doing that for the greater whole.

Number two, I'm going to make a commitment right now and I just hope my fellow councilors will join with me so I'm not accused of going off rogue. I made some proposals last year that we start using Periscope at the constituency level, all right? The high savings time for our members is during the ICANN meetings, and it's also when we're all together.

So what I propose is that at the last day of an ICANN meeting as councilors, let's just get together and do a Periscope chat, see if some folks show up, so we can engage directly to our membership while we're all together on a video forum and try to use a little bit of a new technology. Because frankly guys when I joined the NCUC four years ago, I made a proposal of getting rid of the mailing list. I didn't think anyone used them anymore. So let's try to communicate using the new tools we have and let's do it ourselves. The six councilors can just say we're going to get together on what traditionally would be the Thursday of the meeting and we're going to go out and say, "We're here, anybody out there have some questions. Let's use Periscope to do that."

And number three, very quickly in terms of outreach to the developing world, I want to bring it down to the SG level. We do everything in English. ALAC has translators. I would ask Tapani, as our chair, who's here on the call, can we get some translation going on for our meetings so we can bring more people in. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Ed. Stephanie you're next. Rafik, is that an old hand?

Rafik Dammak: Oh it's an old hand, but maybe I can - I just want to say something to the last comment from Ed. We are at the NCUC level we are going to have a translation and interpretation for our meetings in Hyderabad. So I wanted to say that at least we are working on that. And I think it will also be available for NCSG. So this is something going on. I was going to announce it on the list, but yes I'm going to announce it here in the call.

Joan Kerr: That's wonderful. Thank you very much. Stephanie, if you would like to go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. I think the translation idea is interesting. The problem is that it's taken ALAC a long time to get that. They do have subtitles -- I think I talked on the list about that a while ago -- that don't cost as much that we might be able to start immediately using. I'd just like to point out, I think we're being a little too happy face here. We have problems folks and we have deep cracks in our organization. The councilors are not all getting along just in case anybody didn't notice, and we have to start figuring out how to solve that problem.

We have made some progress on getting engagement and I think that we should focus on that. I think we should do more tutorials and side meetings on different topics. We've had plenty on privacy, and I think it's worked. We've got people coming to some of the meetings. We need it on the RPMs because

we cannot have that staffed by two people. We need a lot more help on the RPMs. So we need to use our policy calls to talk about how do we get more engagement on the work issues.

In terms of what are the barriers to newcomers, I think there are number and I'm really pleased that Rafik has committed himself to getting better engagement on this. We've got people who are reluctant to come forward. We had two people drop out of this leadership race. Why did we drop - why did they drop out? I'd like to ask that question. Why are people dropping out? Is it because we're too intimidating? Is because the politics once you get engaged are too ugly?

I'm sorry I'm going to have to speak on it. I'm about ready to step down because I don't want to engage in the kind of politics that go on, and I'm not encouraged to think that we are going to achieve the openness that we want. So these are problems and we have to address the real problems instead of just blowing white air across it. We have a problem between NPOC and NCUC. I didn't go to newcomers meetings because there was a huge issue of competing recruitment. Join NCUC, join NPOC. We have to solve these internal battles. They're destroying our credibility as NCSG. So I think that's a problem.

In terms of engaging new people and young people, we need to have almost the acronym police on our calls so that we don't use acronyms so that the language is accessible. We need to have a kind of engagement monitor that will tell people when they're being too aggressive, because very frequently we have aggressive discussions and aggressive language even coming out on council calls. I think that's - we need to be reminded that we're not behaving in a way that would encourage people to join this group. So that's what I've got to say. I'm sorry to be the downer here, but I'm a little discouraged at how things are going. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Stephanie. I'm now on the phone. I guess - I tried not to talk too much because I knew my - there was some interference so I apologize for that, but I'm now on the phone so hopefully there's no - or little interference. Now I've got Kathy with her hand raised. I just wanted to ask Rafik and Ed if those are old hands as well. But we'll go to Kathy. Kathy, you have a question? You have the floor.

Kathy Kleiman: Actually I wanted to share an idea. Thank you so much, Joan, for moderating and for our councilors and Tapani for being here. So this is something we've been exploring on the - in the mentorship program and I wanted to run it by you and see what you think. I think traditionally councilors and leaders and the constituencies in the stakeholder group have taken on an awful lot of responsibility and we keep trying to pile on more.

I was wondering if there - we've been trying to explore ways to create tiers, way to break things up so that there are different forums for doing different things. So the policy calls, where we're actively debating our policies frankly, and pardon me Stephanie, should be aggressive, not professionally aggressive, but we're going to have different views, as Amr said. We have minority views, we have majority views. We need to be able to debate them as we're going into asking our councilors to go to a vote. And the best thing I think we can do for the councilors is have an active debate.

And yes, there are going to be acronyms. That's not the moment to teach. That's the moment to debate where we want to go, what our strategy is, who are allies might be on council so that we can get not minority positions, but majority positions. At the end of the day, it's our job to try to get as much policy that represents our views and concerns as possible: free speech, fair

use, free expression, due process. That's - we're the only voice for that in many places of ICANN.

So one of the things we're thinking is that we create the teaching opportunity someplace else, maybe - and that we use some of our more junior people - (Aiden) for example has become a privacy expert, working closely with Stephanie on the RDS Working Group, so he would be a great person -- he's already started doing it -- to answer a whole set of questions from newcomers, you know, who have questions about privacy and about Whois. We don't have to employ our (unintelligible) to do that, we can employ some of our wonderful rising junior people to do that.

And so we wanted to let you know that I think we're going to be coming up with ideas for how to do this and how to create different teaching education involvement opportunities at different levels because people come in at different levels. But I don't think we have to do it all and I don't think we have to put it all on the shoulders of the councilors or all in the same meetings. We may have to create new people, new leadership and new meetings. So I wanted to run that by you. I hope that's clear. We'll be coming out with more detail soon. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Well that's wonderful, Kathy. I think that's probably welcome news for everyone because there does seem to be an issue of involvement, as Stephanie points out. It's frustrating. And I think it's, you know, having a teaching moment or a mentorship is brilliant. How we do that, we'll all have to work at it. Now Stephanie, I see your hand up. Is that an old hand or you would like to say something as well? And Kathy, you still have your hand up as well. Thank you. Okay, so Kathy you still - there it goes. Any other questions for anyone?

Now we did have a question that was not answered and we did address was from (Matthew).

And he wanted to know about the overall accountability and good governance. I know we talked a little bit about that but perhaps if any of the Councilors would like to answer that directly.

The whole issue of transparency and open communication and - it just keeps coming up and up and up. And I just - first of all I wanted to ask is if that question is coming up for me as a newcomer, why does that question keep coming up?

Has the past - was there no communication from the past Councilors? Like why do those issues keep coming up? Maybe that's the actual root question. But anyway, if we could look at the overall accountability and good governance question; I'm going to choose (list) - ask Stephanie to answer that question first if he's still on the line.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi Joan. And I'm still on the line. So you're asking the question of why these transparency and openness questions keep coming up. Now that is a simple question but I think that's something there is no good answer. It's not limited to our group. It comes up in just about everyone.

That's something we should keep fighting for at all levels. There is a natural tendency I think for people to (hide what they are doing and) play in the background and all kinds of things and trying to do things openly and transparently, which has been kind of our leading (star) so to speak, it's very difficult.

I don't have any good answer to how we should fix that but at least try to practice what we preach so to speak even though I know that's difficult thing to do. And we should but we fail in that but at least we should keep it in mind and all of us have a cleansing of conscious when we realize that we are now doing things the easy way or the (safety) way or whatever instead of the transparent open manner, which is ideal but difficult.

And of course it also works in the (higher context) that we may feel the need to hide what we are doing from the opposition so to speak. And then if we - everything we do is open, then that means that our other side will know what we are up to. And trying to draw the line there.

How can we communicate with each other in such a way that our members know what we are up to with each other or know what we are up to and we don't reveal it to the - for the (unintelligible) too early at least is difficult. I don't have any easy answers but sorry at least.

If I look at it from the perspective of a Chair, what I could do there to help communication, not all that much. Of course I can try to (probe) Councilors and others into talking more.

I could try to work on the technical front, look for some easier interactive tools for communication that yet would encourage openness and transparency and accountability and (chat tool at least that) trace recording that can be see what members afterwards but that's not open at the same time for the (world) to see them during some tactical discussions.

So something like that come to mind but as I said, it's a difficult question. I don't have any good answer. It's an internal problem actually. Does that help any?

Joan Kerr: Well it's just your input. And so I'll go to the - if there's anyone that wants to try to...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: ...not for profit. And we have, you know, three different programs. And we have a lot of involvement in our programs. And people always ask me how do you get your volunteers to participate. And I always say that we don't get them to participate. We don't tell them what to do. What we do is create the atmosphere for them to feel like they're, you know, that we appreciate them.

And I think that's one thing that they respond to all the time is that we make a big deal about if somebody comes to us with a project, we don't say oh we can't do that. We explore it and then we say to them, you know, what are the resources that you have. Here are some of our resources. And we work it out and they take ownership of it.

But it's very encouraging and - to them and we find that we have a lot of people who get involved. We have five projects going on at one of our food projects at the moment and there are five different people who volunteered to do them. And it's from different levels from, you know, senior engineers from companies to people who are digging up soil.

And so it's not like it's a level in terms of skill. But the whole thing is that people feel like they're part of it. And I think that's a key thing in any - and especially for non-commercial is that people need to feel that they're appreciated, there's - you're not talking behind their back. There's not all these little groups that are going on and people are - somebody's more important than someone else.

And, you know, those kinds of things. But that's what we do in terms of getting our volunteers. And it's just like even last night we were there and people were there. We're all just like laughing and joking and working. This is our garden.

And I said to everyone, I said, "Oh, it's just so wonderful to come here even though we're doing physical work." And people say yes, we love coming here because it's - the atmosphere is that people are appreciated.

And I think that's the key for us anyway. And I don't know how do you get that into a situation like this where people feel recognized and appreciated and informed. The whole issue of communication and reporting is one of the key things that - I went through the emails to see what people were saying.

So I guess again how do we do that? And we're putting a lot on the Councilors to do but what we should be - also doing is engaging the community. You know, how would you like to be involved? Like put the - some responsibility on them as well. Anyway, there's my thoughts. Is there anyone else who would like to answer that question? No. We're good. Okay. So let's then go to - oh, a hand is up. Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Joan. I think I can have more time compared to you to speak.

Joan Kerr: (Okay).

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So I think that I want to be more practical. I think we should discuss with some steps - some actions and experiment. So maybe starting with writing short briefs we will figure out what the best (form or play) (unintelligible) by iteration. Let's start doing things.

I don't really believe that a technology will fix those kinds of issues. It may help but also they can bring other challenges by themselves. So let's start with some stuff.

I mean I would be happy to volunteer with things. I mean if and when I was not in the policy committee, I made the proposal about how we manage public comments. I would be happy to continue to do that.

Let's be more practical. Let's be more proactive. And let's take actions. I understand that we can spend so much time about to figure out what the best solution and so on. But it will be already (main theory) without doing. So let's be doer and we can start from the next GNSO Council call. It's not even related to the election. Regardless of the election we can start doing that.

So not wait for the - know in the future to make things. Let's from the next days and we see how it can work and we can get feedback from the members if they are not happy or not or they want some changes, so.

Joan Kerr: Great. I like that. So if I can help you, please let me know. So we have - Milton, you've joined us. Did you have a question? Anyone else have a question for the Councilors because we're at the - we're at 10:30 right now. So any other questions? Kathy, go ahead please.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. Are we at time there Joan? I mean should I say not ask another question?

Joan Kerr: No. Please ask it. We have until 11:00 am...

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Joan Kerr: ...from my understanding, so.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. And maybe we can go early and give people back time. But thank you. Question for the Councilors. We've talked a lot about coordinating with each other. Can you guys talk a little bit about coordinating with other Councilors? Ultimately in a multi-stakeholder model it's only how successful we are in working with others that helps us advance our ideas and concerns.

And often, at least in my experience, we're fighting against staff that writes issue reports and charters that are very one-sided. And we have to get changes put in.

So I guess first any ideas on how we can help staff to be more neutral when they write issues and charters so that it's not all in favor of trademark owners and not in favor of balance in registrar rights? And also any thoughts on coordination with other Councilors to come up with majority positions across the Council? Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Any takers? Councilors? Okay. Ed, go ahead. We'll get to you in a second (Renato).

Ed Morris: Yes. And Kathy, thanks for the question. I think that's an area where it's good we're going to have Rafik back. It's good that we're going to have some experience in Council.

I know the first year I didn't know anybody. And it takes a while to develop the personal relationships. And I think our group as a whole does a good job of getting along with some of the other Councilors.

You do little things. Amr in Morocco hosted the Council dinner. In Helsinki I hosted the Council dinner. We went out to a little island on a boat. It was a wonderful time. So you start to get to know some of the other Councilors personally.

I work with Phil Corwin up in the Business Constituency fairly closely in Council. He's a good guy. He has some views, which are very similar to ours. But we did the reconsideration motion that I mentioned (unintelligible) statement together.

And so you start working with others and start understanding who they are as people and you start developing good relationships. So if something's coming up on Council that maybe it's not one of their core issues but is important to us, they're going to back you on that. And you do the same for them.

Working on Council in small groups. I didn't do it my first year. The person I looked at and said man, he's doing something good was Amr. Amr was doing this all the time.

And so this year I took that step. And yes. You start working in the small groups, that also means you start working with staff. So Marika is sort of our principle - one of our principle staff members along with Mary who I've known for a long time. And I get to work with Marika. Now I know her.

So I think the key as a Councilor is first of all (longevity). Secondly is working in the small groups. And thirdly is just being there and getting to know folks, stepping up and say I'll host the dinner and just trying to get to know them and see things from their point of view.

Quick example. One way to approach things is to come with our position and say I want this and pound the table. What I prefer to do when I see oppositions as (Marilia) and I did with the drafting team. Things - we went up to Paul McGrady and said, "Paul, what do you need here? What are you trying to accomplish?"

So I think the other thing you do is just try to put yourself in their shoes and that's a way you can try to work together to accomplish mutual goals. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you Ed. (Renata), you had a question. No. Okay. We've either lost her or...

(Renata): Yes.

Joan Kerr: Oh.

((Crosstalk))

(Renata): Can you listen to me now?

Joan Kerr: We can hear you yes.

(Renata): Sorry. Yes.

Joan Kerr: You seem to (be) in and out.

(Renata): My microphone was acting up. Yes. (Unintelligible). Just a quick follow up on the Latin American strategies. I believe the candidate spoke about the need for translation. But I would like again to specifically come back to this topic because we have two years without Latin American meetings. And other

constituencies have organized strategies to (unintelligible) this need for engaging this region.

I haven't heard - not even a mention of Latin America from the candidates. So I would just like to know if there are any thoughts (or nothing). Okay. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you (Renata). Any of the Councilors would like to answer that question? Stephanie, you haven't spoken for a while so I thought I'd call on you. Hello.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi. Thanks. Maybe the answer is that we need to - can you hear me folks?

Joan Kerr: Yes we can.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Okay. Good. Sorry. Maybe - Stephanie Perrin for the record. Maybe the answer is that we need a little working group to try to engage and maybe (Renata) you'd like to join that.

I'm disappointed that both you and (Carlos) stepped down from Council because that would have helped. And unfortunately - well not - it's fortunate for (Marilia). She's got a great job and doing a great job. But she's not actually in Brazil at the moment.

So we do need to put a focus on how to get more attention on Latin America. So maybe that's a working group. We do have Latin American members that we could maybe get engaged on this.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Milton, you're up. You have your hand raised. Go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Okay. Hello. Can people hear me?

Joan Kerr: Yes we can. Go ahead.

Milton Mueller: All right. I'm probably going to ask an uncomfortable question. But I have watched the Council not as closely - basically at ICANN meetings I - over the last say year or last three or four meetings.

On the one hand I hear you all talking about working together better and acting in a more strategic and coordinated fashion. On the other hand I hear multiple complaints from various Councilors about other Councilors. Won't name names but, you know, you all know what your frustrations are.

And then during the election I see the same people who might be complaining about each other endorsing each other for reelection. And so frankly I'm a bit confused. Do you all think things are hunky-dory? Do you think every other Councilor is actually doing the right thing?

You know, are you afraid to speak up against another Councilor during the election process? How are we as sort of ordinary members who are simply following the Council supposed to know who is doing a good job when we get all these contradictory and conflicting messages? And I would encourage any and every Councilor and candidate to speak up on that issue.

Joan Kerr: You want the other Councilors to comment on the - okay. Stephanie is going to answer that question. Go ahead Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: I think I already said - can you hear me?

Joan Kerr: Yes we can.

Stephanie Perrin: I think I already said in a previous intervention that you may have missed Milton that I was thinking of stepping down because I don't really feel like putting up with the (hostian) politics that have been present over the last year on Council. I've got other things to do with my life. I might join - go and join Joan's garden group. It sounds like more fun.

So I think it's incumbent upon me to explain what the problem is. I think we've had several outbursts at meetings that were emotional and at - in demonstrating bad form. And I don't think I can go on without apologies for some of that behavior.

So the fact that I have been unable to get the individual who made the remarks to apologize or the Chair or any other Councilors to form a little sort of Mennonite committee of three and go and talk and say, you know what, what you just did was unacceptable. You can't attack people like that. And by the way, you're wrong.

That interferes with my willingness to carry on working like this. And that's a fact. So unfortunately if you raise your hand and you're the one saying oh, things aren't all hunky-dory, we're not all (Kumbaya), we need to fix this - you're the whiner and complainer.

Well I'm the whiner and complainer. And you're about to claim me again unless all of you vote for none of the above. But I really do not want to tolerate this kind of (histrionics). We've got so much work to do. We have to get together.

But there are some things that require an apology. And I'm referring to one of our Councilors leaping up and shrieking at one of our former Councilors at the

meeting in Marrakech accusing her of slander. You don't do that at a GNSO meeting. You need to apologize afterwards. You need to apologize to the GNSO and you need to apologize to your Council and to that individual.

Now the individual that was Avri has said she doesn't need an apology. That's not the point. It's bad behavior. And we don't call each other on it. And there's been a lot of fighting between the two groups that, you know, that we've aired and ventilated in front of Board members. It gets to the point where all the Board members expect from us is fights between the two constituencies. That's nonsense.

We are being - we are being - our voice is being cancelled out by the strikes and the - and ad hominin attacks. And it makes (unintelligible) sense.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Thank you Stephanie. So it looks like some apologies and - but I think it's a good point that people want to work together. Klaus, you have your hand raised. Go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: No. I think the other Councilors should answer Milton's question first...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: ...and then I come back to - about what...

Joan Kerr: Let them think about it. You go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Yes. I just want a very short remark. Stephanie, you mentioned quite rightly the situation between NPOC and NCUC. And I just wanted to say that I see it as one of my role as new Chair of NPOC to really work hard on solving this problem.

And my solution to the problem -- it might be a naïve one -- is complete transparency and openness and to just forgetting what happened in the past and demonstrating that we can work together. And I'm trying to do my best. It might work. It might not. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Klaus. Stephanie, is that an old hand?

Man: I want to say something please?

Joan Kerr: Yes. I have you on the list. Go ahead Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: (So thanks) Joan.

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: To - yes - to respond. Sorry.

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: To respond to Milton - to Milton question. I'm not an incumbent candidate so I cannot speak what happened before. I think it's a lot about being transparent here. It's - if there is anything worthy, I will share it with the whole group.

And it's not to make a judgment from my side about some action or not but it's really about being responsible myself about what I am doing. I will do if I am

elected to - in the Council and asking for input and so on. And this is back to the previous discussion we had about disregard, (delegate) or (trust) and so on.

It's really that when we put more trust around (seeing) openness about our action, it will make us more uncomfortable in the long run. And the more we put let's say the light of the discussion, it's happen - we need to make the Council work and functioning more clear for our members.

And I share some - I concur with what for - Amr is saying in the chat. I think many of our members are not really aware what's happening in the GNSO and they trust us. So we have to be cautious with that and to be more transparent.

So if there is something happen, I will share. I will tell that maybe we need to fix that. And it's a lot about being respectful and respect all opinions and respect the colleagues because we are - we have to work as a team at the end.

And personally I'm doing this in my free time. I'm joining this call and just late at night so I don't really want to get in something that will be stressful or whatever. So the respect it's really something important here and so I will be respectful to all my colleagues, treat everyone fairly and so on, so.

Joan Kerr: Great Rafik. Thank you so much for that. Any other comments on that? I think it's very important that there is respect and maybe there is a dialog that needs to happen as well. Stephanie, Rafik, is that an old hand or did you want to continue? Okay. (Stepani), go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Joan. It is true that we should always try to be polite and avoid that kind of outburst. But one thing that's kind of being hidden here when I (note) (Bill) saying that when he was in Council we did not know what each other was doing.

There are some genuine disagreements among our Councilors sometimes. And when people are in that situation people will be - tend to do whatever they think will advance their point of view. And sometimes it will inevitably lead to conflicts.

I may - I must admit to a fault. I think Stephanie did speak about it and I tried to (unintelligible) but I'm not perhaps the best person to do that. At least I sometimes fail to persuade people to whatever (I should). Yes. (Bill) was just saying if you did know what each other is doing but sometimes (unintelligible) maybe you don't.

When there are genuine disagreements then it may lead to situation where people want to sort of hide their actions from others. Like I said, we need to sometimes hide it from their (commercials) but if a disagreement happens within our own group, then we (unintelligible) happen as well.

It should be - would be good to try to bring this out in the open as much as possible. But I'm not sure how it could be forced. Anyway our time is running short so I won't be long.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Great. No, I agree. And maybe that's something that we can do as an (EC) to resolve that particular issue. So we're at four minutes to the hour. If there are no hands raised and no questions, maybe we continue with email.

I do have some suggestions of actions. Kathy mentioned the teaching opportunities at different levels and we'll be hearing a lot about that. There's some suggestions for having a group or a working group for translations and for Latin America. So that's another good activity. And some writing from Rafik for public comments and (he's about) to continue with that.

So not only do we get to ask our Councilors some questions but we have some actions that have actually come out of this and - which is wonderful. So we are at the end of the allotted time. So I wanted to thank all of our Councilors and our attendees and for all the questions. I hope fully that we did address any - all of the questions that in some way or another.

And from my side I'd like to thank you all and congratulate you on your appointments. So that's all I have to say.

Joan Kerr: Thank you very much everyone for attending the call. (Kevin), you may now stop the recording. Thank you for your time today.

END