

ICANN

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 14, 2016
6:35 am CT**

Rob Hoggarth: Welcome back, everybody. We are now, for those following by phone or on your agendas, we're at Slot C. This is your first plenary session, Plenary Session Number 1. We've got 75 minutes where you all are going to be sharing your work plans, your priorities for the next calendar year. A lot of active conversations going on in the various breakout sessions so I'm sure you'll have a productive exchange of ideas.

Chatting with a number of the chairs, this is the order that we are going to go in. We are going to go alphabetically but alternating between CSG and the NCSG so we will start with the BC, followed by the NCSG, the IPC, the NCUC, the ISPs and then NPOC.

If you do the math, six different presentations, 75 minutes works out to just about 12 minutes. A couple of you have told me it may not take 12 but do you expect that there may be questions and answers and some dialogue. So I'm looking forward to seeing that. We are going to be going right up to noontime comment that will be our timing for this session. And then I will do a quick little presentation to let you know about running out to get your lunches and bring them back in here for the lunch session with Jamie Hedlund.

So let's get right started. We have the BC first on the list. And please, I don't have to jump up between every one of you. I'm happy to do a queue, but I think it works better if whoever is making the presentation just also have a member of your team do the queue as well. So we will turn to the BC first and perhaps, Chris, that's you, and then we will just continue on. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Rob. And thanks everybody. So as Rob noted, I don't intend to take 12 minutes to go over the BC's priorities for 2017 in part because frankly our priorities for this year are not really any different than our priorities have been in years past. I think as many know, you know, we are very much engaged in all the different policy working groups that are going on, all the different public comment processes and periods that are occurring throughout the year that ICANN comment that always occur throughout the year that ICANN and will continue to do that.

I did just want to highlight I guess three core areas that will sort of guide a lot of our time and attention. First and foremost contract compliance, contract compliance issues. These are issues that we've raised frankly publicly at ICANN meetings with the board and others in the past. In part - and we will learn more I think in the next plenary session we'll do a deeper dive with Jamie on these issues, but obviously focusing primarily on improvements of transparency into the compliance office and the processes that are used to adjudicate complaints and issues with contracted parties.

And that continues to sort of be a focal point I think for the constituency going forward and especially because we have a new compliance officer and look forward to working with him in 2017.

Second issue, which I think is probably true for everyone in the room, we will continue to be - due diligence and oversight on post IANA transition, sort of

accountability work that's going on, obviously that's going on within Work Stream 2, and as many in this room are all - some of us are very much engaged in the Work Stream 2 activities that are happening now, but even outside of those formalized discussions to sort of continue to sort of be an engaged member of this new and powered community that we are all now part of.

And that's including working closely and learning more about the complaints office or position, the person - the complaints office, the consumer safeguards person that will be hired and working with them more going forward and learning more about how those roles will develop and mature this year and frankly and beyond so we will sort it continue to sort of be focused on that.

And then thirdly, will be our reach, we continue to sort of strive to sort of grow the membership particularly geographically. And we will continue to do that and bring as many new faces and new perspectives into the Business Constituency that can then branch out and work with the broader community on policy issues and get some – hopefully get some new blood if you will into that.

So those were our three core focal points for 2017. Again, it's sort of exactly what we've done in the past but hopefully gives you a sense of where we are and what we intend to do. If others in the BC want to – Steve, did you want to go ahead and chime in a little bit?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, just one quick addition. A number of you may be aware that the BC undertook to revise our charter, our document that guides the way we do things. And we published it for public comment. That public comment period ends tomorrow. There've been three or four comments posted. But you're all

welcome to review and give us your advice or commentary on the charter that we are putting together.

The BC is endeavoring to make sure that we adhere to the charter of transparency, open to participation, to recruit for diverse representation in the business community. But that charter itself, putting yourself out in the public like that often brings back scrutiny that you weren't aware of. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: So hopefully that provides a little bit of perspective on where we're going to be. And obviously happy to take questions from folks if anyone has any more advice as the case may be. Well that's great. Easy. And perhaps why don't we go ahead and move along then if less people want to work on this. But I forget who's next in the noncommercial side, I think it's the NCUC. But go ahead and turn it over to the noncommercial side for their presentation.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Chris. I think, Tapani, you're next with the NCSG. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I'm looking at a few things we are concerning this year. First the policy issues, I know that compliance is very high in our agenda as well. We are fairly interested in perhaps some other aspects are not say like fairness from different points. And of course we are working in RPM and RDS working groups as you may know, auction proceeds are of interest and the new gTLDs as well. So that's - nothing surprises there.

But some overarching themes in our interest of course our first, content regulation is something we want to make sure that ICANN keeps out of. Since the (unintelligible) tried to creep in here and there and that's something we have our eyes on that should not happen.

And another aspect that's now pretty much on our agenda is privacy issues. As you may know, there will be Data Protection Commissioners' meeting in Copenhagen, we've been organizing meeting with them so we want to try to keep the privacy issues and in particular European data protection regime in mind in a number of ICANN aspects, RDS notably where that's important.

Then a few upcoming issues that we are concerned with, the Work Stream 2 seems to be may be continuing longer than planned. And we should think about how that will affect us. On the other hand, we don't want to rush it either because it would compromise the quality of the work so how to do that is something of concern.

And we are also looking, we are interested in the forthcoming first ever exercise of that community powers by the new bylaws because there will be some proposed changes to the fundamental bylaws and we are concerned with that.

And of course there are some - quite a lot of organizational improvements internal within NCSG. We want to improve our administrative staff, also our work in the working groups, methodology (unintelligible) and so forth.

And one that's perhaps more interest to you as also we definitely want to improve our cooperation with other stakeholder groups with CSG but also within Registries and Registrars. We are having meetings with them in Copenhagen so trying to do more - better cooperation with different groups within ICANN rather than just trying to sit in our own little bubble and meeting three times a year for a few hours or whatever.

And one perennial problem issue is our reach, seems to be cropping up both in terms of recruitment because we are always shorthanded and also in terms of

be a reach in terms of trying to spread out the word for people what's going on, what they should know. So that's pretty much my list. Would any NCSG member want to add here? Any questions from any others?

That was much less than 12 minutes, you may have noticed. But I note that NCSG of course is organized a bit strange, that the more significant part of the work goes within the constituencies and they will be speaking for – use a bit more time in turn. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Tapani. Very interesting, yes, you're all doing this in an average of four minutes. I don't know if someone is angling for another break before lunch. Next up is the IPC. Greg, I think that will be you. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I'll see what I can do to use all the time that's been ceded so far. And we have a list of 12 priorities so that may actually happen. But I don't think actually I'll take all the time.

You know, first, you know, echoing Tapani, what I call the big three working groups are, you know, a major priority for us, the Next Generation Registry Directory Services, the Review of the Rights Protection Mechanisms and the Subsequent rounds are all priorities. And we have a number of members participating actively, some even trying to participate actively in all three, which is a special form of masochism.

And, you know, in each case, you know, balancing, you know, concerned as we must for our stakeholders in, you know, maintaining and refining protections for intellectual property owners. At the same time, you know, looking at the entire multistakeholder process, making sure the processes work well for the entire community and that we solve some of the issues that are intended to be solved.

You know, the first round had its share of issues that some don't even necessarily affect our stakeholders have such but nonetheless we still need to participate in helping to mature all of these processes. And that's the defense also a priority is to make sure that we balance both, you know, kind of stakeholder-based concerns and multistakeholder-based concerns as a thought.

And the reviews of the ICANN new gTLD program, the Competition, Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice review, both - that's one that kind of hits home as an intellectual property representative organization. And we have Jonathan Zuck who is cochairing that group so clearly it's a priority for Jonathan. And so that's - those are all important to us.

And then this little thing called accountability that has, you know, changed everything and changed our lives and rapidly aged some people. And including everything in Accountability Work Stream 2 there are, you know, nine subgroups and I don't know if we - we're certainly not equally looking at all of those but SO/AC accountability obviously as a part of an SO, that's important. The human rights subgroup, the good faith challenges to directors subgroup which Lori is chairing or co-rapporteur-ing.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Oh rapporteur-ing - no co. And I am allegedly the co-rapporteur of the jurisdiction group. My other rapporteur seems to have been swallowed up by the Ganges. And sometimes I'm not sure if that group can actually have a rapporteur as much as maybe a ringleader or a circus, you know, I need to just kind of keep it all moving. I am rapporteur-ing that with much joy.

And we need to, again, you know, both from our stakeholder perspective and our perspective as a member of a multistakeholder community, I won't say that every time but that's kind of always in my mind – our minds.

Issues related to geographical indications, which is a very specific term which refers to (Appalachian controversy), words that have been denoted as resource identifiers for things that come from regions whether it's Vermont or Champagne or California champagne, which is a carveout from the Champagne, (Appalachian controversy), but I digress.

And next, as you might be surprised to find this all the way down at number six but I didn't say this was in order, infringement and other abuses and concerns particularly relating to the new gTLD program and particularly, you know, both overall and of course specific registries, specific new gTLD specific registrars where problems seem to be concentrated. And that doesn't seem to be coincidence. So those are, you know, particular concerns as well. And 'twas ever thus that we are concerned with infringement issues.

Compliance of course. Jamie will find that we are his new best friend or, you know, we will be competing for the title amongst the many, we are doing that. You know, continuing to improve our relationship and working relationship with the Compliance department encouraging compliance by registries and registrars and the dark side of compliance of course is enforcement, and that there should be strong and consistent and transparent enforcement of the – ICANN's contracts, and predictable enforcement too one hopes especially the abuse provisions and the protection of IP rights, provisions that are, you know, in the new base agreements or newish base agreements, which are already changing even as we speak.

Going beyond kind of policy type of issues, educating the IP community about ICANN domain names, gTLDs, there is kind of a universal knowledge issue getting beyond those that, you know, are friendly faces you see here, you know, a few hundred others perhaps. Of course we have, you know, groups that, you know, devote themselves a lot like INTA and others to that, but that's all part of what we do.

Educating the ICANN community about intellectual property, find that sometimes people don't understand, you know, just there's a lot more information about why, you know, intellectual property is a good thing and why it needs to be protected and how it fits in, you know, economically and in terms of protecting a lot of rights and not just IP rights.

Also of course as Tapani said, outreach is always an issue. Reaching out particularly want more members from underrepresented regions. We've done well in Eastern Europe which had traditionally been somewhat underrepresented; we're better there. But Latin America, Africa, Asia - I think Africa we still only have a single member and that is a -- that's an unfortunate -- that's something we need to, you know, continue to work on across the board.

Last, not last sorry, this is maybe not an IPC issue but it's one we, you know, take a look at which is improving how dotBrand applications are handled in the next procedure or round for new gTLDs. It was sort of an afterthought or retrofit in the first round and should not be in the next round.

And to echo Steve and Chris, we are at the beginning of a process that which you are at the end of. Maybe the "of" shouldn't be at the end of that sentence. But we are beginning to review and revise what we in our infinite wisdom call our bylaws, which is our charter. And that's why I'm a president and not a

chair because we have bylaws and not a charter because back in the dawn of time I think we were - it was modeled on a nonprofit corporation. Indeed, they look a lot like somebody took some nonprofit corporation bylaws and, you know, made kind of the minimum necessary changes, and maybe not even quite that. And so we are in the review process.

We have reached out now and will be getting support from, you know, Rob's team to help us through this. So, you know, we are - we want to talk to you grizzled veterans of the charter review process, and you as well - I think NCUC is also in a charter review...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, NCUC is, but NCSG is not.

Greg Shatan: Yes, you have both on your thing so...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...so I'll look somewhere else, sorry, just...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I read from right to left. You know, ancient Semitic thing. So but we do want to get advice as we have gotten into the thick of it of Vicky Scheckler, our Vice President is also chairing the bylaws review team to ensure that she has, you know, no free time whatsoever. And I think Vicky for taking on that, which was kind of sitting on our to-do list for about six months and never moving forward. And now Vicky has kind of grabbed it and we are moving forward.

So those are our priorities, that and having fun. I forgot to mention that but I'm sure that kind of goes without saying for all of us. So those are I think the IPC's priorities. So if there are any questions. I see Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Just to come back to the charter. We have in NPOC a very positive experience with working with Rob and Benedetta and some secret weapons they have. So my only advice is that talk to them, use them. There are a lot of very good processes which doesn't mean you have to spend a year or two or three to get your charter done. There are really good ways. And we're really having a very good experience. And what I'm talking about NPOC, we will talk about that too.

Greg Shatan: Anything else - anybody else from IPC - did I somehow miss a priority or list state a priority or say something was a priority when it's only really my priority? Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Greg – Jonathan Zuck – is there a record? Do we even need to be doing that? All right, Jonathan Zuck. I guess - I may have missed the priority part of the priorities. And so I'm interested - and maybe it's a question going back to everybody on this. In a sense, I'd really be interested – this group to express, like looking out on the horizon, what's the thing you regard as the biggest opportunity for the community and the biggest sort of danger that we better make sure we get right or something like that.

I guess what I think of as a priority and not a list of everything that we'll be working on, right? I mean, we're going – we're all going to be working on lots of stuff. Everyone's going to end up listing the Work Stream 2, etcetera. I mean, to me a priority is what really scares you or excites you for the coming year?

Greg Shatan: Big water bugs scare me. And what excites me, I don't know, coffee ice cream maybe. Just to mention in terms of priorities and the multiplicity - I know most of you can't see this but I've created a mind map of the IPC priorities and the various things that we have to be thinking about. And so, you know, each of these is a specific priority or sub priority or a sub sub priority. So this is our mind map.

And I put it out for comment from the IPC. I don't think I got any comments but I think that's because people looked at it and just, you know, quickly moved on.

Jonathan Zuck: They'd rather be lost to then use that map, is that what you're saying?

Greg Shatan: Maybe they realize if they made a comment about something that they be assigned to take care of that priority and so. So, Rob, have I helped us get back on track in terms of time?

Rob Hoggarth: You were actually precisely 12 minutes, even with the intercession. So thank you, Greg. Next in line, NCUC, I believe Tatiana was going to be providing this report. Thank you.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much. Actually what really struck me and what Jonathan just said, you know, I believe that many of us are going to list the same priorities. It's just we as constituencies might have different views and different goals on these priorities.

Anyway I will start for NCUC and I will start with our internal issues for us which gets us excited for the next year. So last year we developed and voted for the new bylaws. So the process of adoption is not quick so we are working on this. But what gets us excited here is that we are trying to improve and

document existing processes which ensure transparency, efficient decision-making. We have a special task force for this.

So, it's not like we didn't have these mechanisms before, but we are going to improve them to make NCUC more transparent and more accountable. So this is on our constituency level.

Secondly, I think we have been very successful with in-reach and outreach last year and we are going to build up on this. But we are going to distinguish between our reach as informing the general public about what we are doing both recruiting new members and capacity building for members because many people just come that they do not stay in because you know a civil society is not that homogeneous so we have to get people hooked and get them participating in the policy processes.

And the question is how we are getting them involved except from kind of educating them and training them on policy. We believe in the power of public comments. What we noticed as NCUC that people are getting involved when they're commenting on something that is related to their area of interest. So we are going to be – and now I'm coming to the substance – we are going to be very active in mobilizing our members to issue public comments on the NCUC level.

We are going to be very active on this. And issuing public comments about a fax both noncommercial users and collectively GNSO. So this is one of our priorities. And coming to policy, well, I will not say anything new here probably because one of the uppermost priorities is Accountability Work Stream 2 and we are very active there. We have like our members, as rapporteurs in many groups like starting with (unintelligible) for human rights

and outreach for staff accountability and, you know, Farzaneh, Rafik and many others actively participating like co-rapporteurs or group members.

Other priorities, they are well known, avoiding content regulation, privacy and data protection, new gTLDs. Also I believe that our priorities, because we do have a new leadership now, we do want to cooperate with other stakeholders and constituencies. And maybe you have already noticed this from our work in the Work Stream 2 in Accountability.

And I believe that one of our priorities, higher priorities is to start collaborating with other constituencies in trying to speak the same language and understand each other's concerns. So if anyone from NCUC think that I've missed any priority, please jump in. But that's all for me for now.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. Let me just - maybe this is a good time to echo - I sort of wear different hat, I also serve as co-rapporteur for the Work Stream 2 Transparency subgroup. So I'm detecting a theme that transparency is going to be a key priority for perhaps every constituency and stakeholder group. And I just want - for those that aren't following that Work Stream 2 work product, you know, that our recommendations will be put out for public comment probably tomorrow.

So I know you're speaking also for transparency internally but I think even broadly for those that aren't following it, just be aware that that report and recommendations are going to be put out for public comment if not tomorrow hopefully by the end of the week. And welcome everyone's input on that so we can hopefully get that finalized and provide some further guidance for the broader community on transparency. So I just wanted to put that hat on for the moment. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Tatiana. Anyone else have any comments or questions for the NCUC? In that case, Mr. Holmes, alternate over to you for the ISPCPC, thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Rob. I found the whole debate around priorities almost a little bit sounding cheap because I think most of us are in a situation where the demands that stem from ICANN at the moment in terms of involvement are so great, the ability to actually prioritize in any real meaningful way is not there potentially. You can focus on a few key things and I think that's what we're looking at in terms of things you absolutely have to do no matter what.

And it's almost like a wish list rather than priorities because I don't see the demand from the other parts of ICANN dropping away. Similar to some of the points made already, certainly for us as ISPs, the accountability stuff post-IANA environment, Work Stream 2 in something that you have to be involved in.

And I would say that the level of involvement we have in that area at the moment is still far too light, and I will come back to that in a minute. Another big issue for our constituency that's probably isn't shared by other people to the same degree here, although the impact could be, is the universal acceptance stuff. Certainly Christian is very hooked into that driving forward.

It seems to have gone a little bit quiet in terms of how some people view that. And I think some of that comes down to the constraints and the demands from other parts of ICANN because at every ICANN meeting there is a presentation as to where that work stands and what's happening. It always clashes with other things on the ICANN program. It's always difficult to get a slot where he gets the visibility that we think it really demands. But it is ongoing.

Like many things they must be doing a pretty good job because no one has been screaming so far. While that doesn't mean it's not going to happen in the future.

Future gTLDs open terms of review of the existing issues that came from that and also looking ahead is something that's very much on our radar, that we see as a focus for us. In fact anything that in any way impacts security and stability in any way will always be a priority for the ISPs and infrastructure providers.

We also feel that we need to concentrate on increasing the effectiveness and efficiency not just as us as a constituency but as the place that we come to ICANN within the stakeholder group and also ICANN overall. Part of the big picture problem with ICANN is that we're all running so fast, we don't believe that's getting the attention that it needs. And there needs to be a way of recognizing that there's a problem and tackling it as well.

And also we have a lot of – a lot of assimilation with the views expressed by Tatiana in terms of outreach and engagement. I would certainly say that as a constituency, the effort we've put into outreach has been pretty substantial. It certainly proved that we have the ability to perform it quite well. And we are growing as a constituency.

The problem we have, that we haven't fixed, is that whilst we're bringing those people on board and we're getting broader engagement, we're getting engagement from other parts of the world that we've struggled with in the past to find – to find we can actually get representation from ISPs, hasn't resulted so far in a lot of those people engaging at the working group level and any actual day-to-day issues around ICANN.

So they're involved with us, maybe there are the learning curve at the moment, but we need to find a better way of going the engagement of the constituency where we reap the benefits from those outreach efforts. And that's something that we do need to concentrate on.

So overall I only see looking ahead that it's going to get more and more busy. The effort that's required to keep up and run at the pace that ICANN is going at is pretty demanding. And I think what we're doing here is highlighting things that we were saying no matter what happens we have to tackle those issues across the next period. So any questions happy to take them or any comments from other ISPs.

Then I think we've gained some time again.

Chris Wilson: Tony, yes, how many members do you have, just out of curiosity?

Tony Holmes: Off the top of my head - I can't answer that off the top of my head, I'd be guessing. Come back to you on that better. I would be guessing now. But certainly we've been successful in terms of the effort we've put in with the help of, well, three or four particular ISPs, Tony, Christian and others, we've really been quite successful in that. Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes, thanks for that question. I think maybe we should repeat something we said quite often in public, the particular nature of the ISP business is that we have thousands of small ISPs in the world; they don't have the people or the resources to follow what's going on in ICANN so they rely on associations.

The leading Internet associations in most parts of the world are members of the ISPCP and you come to the meetings. And they take back what they - what's happening in ICANN to their membership. Even in spite of that, we do

have a significant amount of members, individual companies particularly in the last year we've been very successful in recruiting new members from developing areas.

Tony Holmes: I think that's a very important point as well and I should have made the same comment, so thank you for that Tony. Certainly the large ISPAs are members of our constituency. And I know that Tony, in his part of the world, myself, Malcolm Hutton, we all go along to ISPA meetings where we actually do have an engagement with the ISPA community on ICANN issues in particular.

And certainly that bridges a huge gap because as Tony said, some of those small guys, they are just battling for day-to-day existence. Getting them to come along to ICANN meetings three or four times a year and engage at that level is a challenge for them. What they do rely on for us is to basically keep them up to date of where things are and at times when ICANN touches on issues that they really think they're at risk from then they engage quite heavily in the constituency so that's the way that dynamic works.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I think coming to that point, to the outreach point and the engagement point, this is one thing which I think it's common to all of us, to all our constituencies, well, and we are open as a constituency, well, to learn from your side as well, you know, how you deal with that, you know, in order at first, well, to do the outreach, which we did and which we are really successful from the last year; we had in Hyderabad a big outreach event. And the resonance was very good, resonance from other continents like Africa as well.

But to keep these people really engaged, this is a huge effort to be done. And I'm really surprised, well, to see if I look here around so if I look here around so from – on the NCSG side there are many new faces I didn't see before, so

I'm quite happy to see that. Whereas from our – from the CSG there are more of the old faces, you know, here. And we try, well, to find the balance in future between both of them, you know, because you need the old ones, you know, to help the others and to keep the knowledge alive but you have to engage to find a way how to engage the new ones to keep them really here engaged.

They are, at first, very much, well, they seem to be engaged. They like to get engaged. But if it comes then to the very low level of working – starting work, then it's hard, well, really to convince them that they should stay and it's – as Tony says, in some cases, they are representing small companies, it's just about (unintelligible) question. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes, I'd like to build on these last comments about outreach. Many of you were in Hyderabad, possibly you didn't have an opportunity to come to a special event that we set up with the help of the ICANN staff, for the local ISP and Internet business services community.

We had 130 people in the room from India who represented basically everybody, cell phone operators, Internet service providers, telco, it was amazing. And I think part of the success of this effort was we packaged the event with panels on subjects they are particularly interested in such as Internet of – sorry – Internet of Things and Internet exchange points.

So they came to talk about these issues that involves their daily activity very enthusiastically. And we had been in the room and were able to tell them about ICANN and why they should participate. So I just thought I would mention this as it was a very interesting experiment.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Tony. Just on that point, it was good and bad there. I mean, the good thing was the room we had was absolutely packed. The bad thing was that we could have presented that to a much broader audience if there had been space on the timetable to do that. We had the normal clashes so the rest of the community were engaged in other things. We made a particular point that we were going to hold this workshop India, which we did. And it was very successful. As Tony said, it was very focused on ISP issues that they have and the relationship with ICANN, was very much at the front of the agenda.

So it served a purpose for us. But we're now in a situation where planning the ICANN program really causes a lot of problems if you want to run an event like that. We found last time I think most of us would buy into the fact that the high-interest topics, it was a pretty lengthy program; it took a large chunk of the meeting. And one of the things that we need to put some focus on is getting that balance right.

There clearly are things that need to be spread across the whole of the community. But in ICANN meeting can be extended forever and sometimes the real benefits you gain from this sort of effort we put into running that workshop are really hard to realize against other things that are happening.

And that's an issue I think everyone can benefit from addressing because I'm sure that there are places we go to where the business community or the noncommercial side of the house could make great inroads if you had the ability to host those things. We certainly did and we plan to do it again. But it is a permanent challenge and there is always trade-offs to make to make it work.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you. This is Jimson. Well the subject of outreach is a very important one. And as you said, is an underlying subject for all of us. It's quite obvious that we got this with the developing countries and the issue of maturity of the ecosystem is not in doubt. And so (unintelligible) may need for us to do more consultations. In the BC, we have this outreach committee or we have outreach budget to complement ICANN support, approved budget requests. But it is still a lot to do.

So there has to be some form of maybe we look at it in enticing members or those that are joining from those regions. That could be something we could look at because from my experience we get people in but also to get involved in actual work, you know, as it was mentioned, is a challenge. But I think we need to grow in critical mass. When we have a critical mass then we can then count on may be some percentage of that that could be - that could really carry the load. So is a long something and I think we need to have structures in place to get it rolling.

Then secondly, (unintelligible) operations, the provisioning of this resource has been useful. MembersClick, you know, (unintelligible) we are defining the process. I do not know if you are using that service. It could help - is helping gradually and could add value to enable people to come up to serve. Because the website is very important, the resources there is very important. And for us it has to deal with members in terms of internal operation, dues payment, so that is quite useful.

So the point is this, that (unintelligible) more incentives to encourage those from developing countries and then to fine-tune our operation to be more (unintelligible) so that new comments can easily plug in to serving. But the gap is still there. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Jimson. I couldn't agree more with what you're saying. Christian.

Christian Dawson: I wanted to share our colleagues at the community that I absolutely agree, I think all of your points are very well taken. We have been focusing over the past two years I'm going out and focusing our attention on associations which collectively can represent hundreds of companies. In doing so, some of our greatest successes have been in regions that the ISPCP has not traditionally served.

Just in the past year we've seen a great uptick in associations that have come on from India and Asia and other parts of Asia. And so we're very happy with the results of there. A lot of that has come from increased policy participation, which has been a result of getting some help. Since we are one of the smaller organizations from a pilot program that was going on to help us with policy drafting.

The CROP program has helped us tremendously and we've been utilizing those resources in order to go out there and pull in new members, it's been very successful. And MemberClicks, MemberClicks has been fantastic for us in helping us disseminate information in ways that makes the information -- the policy issues that were working on really relevant to our members.

We've got our most recent newsletter here, some of the activities that we've been focusing on. And I will say that the ISPCP, as an organization I think over the past two years really have undergone a complete evolution and has -- not only do we agree with the things that you're saying there is that we are showing in how we act that we believe in those same tenets and are seeing success in implementing them.

Tony Holmes: Yes, and it's worth making the point that there that a lot of the pain that we experienced previously has been eased because of the way ICANN have viewed the importance of outreach as well. And the support that we had from people like Chris Mondini when we set up the workshop for instance in India, really was incredibly helpful to have that level of support.

The CROP program, we have taken advantage of. And I think it's worth saying now that if you utilize that program there is flexibility in it so not all of us have to do things the same way. And the same with the document production as well, I think that's something that our stakeholder group has taken advantage of. I'm not sure whether it's been the same for the noncommercial constituencies.

But again, there is flexibility within that program to actually tailor it in the way you want it to work. And those things together have helped us be successful in outreach. We've got a good template now that we will continue to use. And certainly it's helped growing our membership greatly. The challenge, as I mentioned, is when you get new members on board, the education process to get them to be really effective and to actually engage in a lot of the policy development process is something we still need to pay attention to. So that's the next stage of the challenge.

The good thing is the constituency is growing. The engagement level at the working group level is something that we still need to help those new members with so that will be a focus for the next period.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Tony. That was very helpful and turned over now the floor to Klaus who, even if he uses 22 minutes, will still provide you with a little bit of a break. So not that there's any pressure in that respect, Klaus, that you now have the mic for the NPOC. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much, Robert. And thank you very much for not pressurizing me. In the last 10 months a lot of things, and in my opinion very positive things, have happened in NPOC and a lot of change. And all - this all focuses around one single question, how can we as NPOC participate better and more effective in the Internet governance processes and contribute actually into the policymaking?

And what we did is basically we did two things. The first one was getting our own house in order, and I will talk to you about that, and also, I'm sorry I'm boring you, outreach. But let's talk about first what we did to get our house in order.

First of all what we did was to create a base document which basically spelled out what the constituency is about, why does operational concerns mean? How do we fulfill our role? What are our goals and things like that?

Secondly, we worked into NPOC agenda 2020, basically a plan how do we develop the constituency over time? We did - this culminated, and that's where I'm actually the most excited about in starting to - we recognized that our old charter quite simply didn't work. And to also know the history of NPOC a little bit now how it happened and why it happened like that.

So we asked - we started the process inside the constituency and with the help of Benedetta and Robert and some consultancy staff. I think we are working on, for me, a very very exciting charger. And that will be - that process and hopefully we will have that ready for public comment in the next four months. You will see that this is something, for example, what the charter contains is also, for example, how do we define - how do we define civil society? How do we define membership? How do we define things like why does not-for-

profit mean? Things which were always hanging in the air, never been defined.

And I'm very very pleased to say that in the whole process we are trying to coordinate everything, for example with the NCSG charter, with the NCUC charter and even with the whole ICANN processes. So there is a lot a lot of things going on on that way.

And that ends up to simple housekeeping things like for example we didn't have bank account rules; we didn't have travel support roles and things like that in place so this is all now in place. And I think our house is - our constituency is in much better shape than it was before.

The other thing is we are concentrating on - and to answer that question, how can we contribute better - was quite simply that we said look, we need to do our reach but we need to do outreach in two different ways. One outreach is to say come to ICANN, come to NPOC, come to the NCSG or is not better to try and outreach which basically explains why operational concerns are so important to our users, why it's relevant for them and especially it reflects what you said about your Hyderabad event.

And we had a Hyderabad event with 50 NGOs and so one where we basically explained to them that's why the DNS why it's important to you. And then as a second step, basically said okay now you know it's important for you, here is how you engage. And we just had recently another Africa went and we are trying to, we are trying to get more events going but we have our experience with the outreach team in ICANN is unfortunately not such a positive one that we're working on it and trying - and trying to get these things going.

I think the problem is what we are having is that we are having that strict two-step methodology saying okay, we're having outreach event basically in the context of ICANN without talking about ICANN. So for example, that Hyderabad event was mainly financed I asked and a lot of stuff actually is coming from constituency funds and it's not supported by ICANN. But the Africa event, for example, CROP event and were using it.

Where do we want to go? What we want to do now is - and some of you already commented on that, the house is now in order, the strategy is there, the plan is there. Now it's time to go for the old farts like me to step back and let another generation basically take over that ship and steer it, and I think they will make a much better job than the old generation did.

But they also -- but I will also staying always in the background trying, for example, remind them this is not, non-passenger ship. We have to talk, for example, I find it very very interesting there are so many parallels with the ISP sector in the outreach and what we are trying to achieve. We have to work more together and, for example, I could imagine that there will be joint events where basically those strengths are from both constituencies will be presented to people.

We can't just limit to our outreach just through the ISPs or just through the civil society, we have to get all these groups together. So I'm open to question. I think we are in a much better shape and did a very good position really to develop that constituency as something which, in my opinion, operational concerns is at the heart of ICANN therefore the simple reason what good is it if the DNS is running smoothly and is perfect but people are not able to use it in an efficient, safe and secure way?

So that's why I think that what we are doing is important. Thank you. Was it short enough, Robert?

Rob Hoggarth: I make no judgments, but I do note that you - I note that you have a least one question with Tony, you've got Chris and you've got Ed.

Tony Holmes: Well just make the point again that the secrets that we found I think, where we had such a successful workshop was that we really hit topics that were really important for ISPs, and as you said, covering things like Internet of Things enabled us to talk about not only the infrastructure aspects around IoT and look ahead to the future but also IPv6, the way domain names relate, all of that stuff came out in a conversation.

And then there were clearly big hooks back into ICANN, ICANN policy and some of those aspects. So it really tied the thing together. And that seems to be the secret that we did unlock there is getting engagement from them by focusing on things that they already recognize are important and then show how they relate back to the things that we do here in those areas.

Klaus Stoll: And, Tony, just coming straight back to you, the things you just mentioned, IPv6, Internet of Things, that's exactly what also is the interest in our constituency, our people are. They are basically clear - clear overlaps which we can exploit.

Tony Harris: So yes, mine is very brief on what's just been said. That relates to something I am particularly interested in. I've just bought a book in Amazon about it which is called Blue Ocean Strategy, and that's exactly what we tried to do in Hyderabad.

Klaus Stoll: Can you repeat it, Tony? Sorry, didn't understand it. Blue Ocean Strategy?

Tony Harris: Blue Ocean Strategy. It's written by two professors from Stanford.

Klaus Stoll: Okay.

Tony Harris: It's well worth reading, and it - actually what we tried to do in Hyderabad ties into that. I found that out after we did it. I didn't, you know, but it's interesting.

Klaus Stoll: Okay next is Chris.

Chris Wilson: Can I – sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Wilson: Just, I don't want to get off – too much off this because it's related to this line of thought. My question - which is more general and more from a - I still consider myself a relatively new person with regard to ICANN. But I'm starting to see some other faces in the room. Could you maybe, Klaus, give us a little bit better sense of a line of demarcation between NPOC and NCUC and what the differences are between the memberships, if you will, that constituencies and how the interplay?

Klaus Stoll: I think there is a very clear line of demarcation, even if some - sometimes it looks blurred. Our concern is only with how the NTUs, as a noncommercial user, can make the best use of the DNS, of the operational level, not on the content level. We are only about pure operational concerns as the title is.

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: Okay, Ed, you were next.

Ed Morris: Okay thanks, Klaus. I actually think on that I might ask the question. You had mentioned the work that NPOC has done on taking a look at what noncommercial means. And you shared with me - I've been fortunate, you've shared with me some great work that I believe Sam did on looking at that question. Is that available on a Website or is that available to the wider group here because that could be quite useful for folks to have, and would answer some of Chris's questions.

Klaus Stoll: Sorry, Ed. just straightforward answer, no it isn't. Out of the simple reason that we still haven't managed for personal or whatever you want to call later reasons to get our domain name transferred from the last chair to the new group. So we will - we will either use the old domain name if we get it in the next few days or we just simply move over to the new one which is simply NPOC.ngo.

Ed Morris: Thanks, Klaus. Actually what was my initial question, which I would like to ask, we're coming up to a NomComm review, and you didn't mention in priorities trying to get NPOC a seat because you are, I believe, the only constituency that does not have a representative on the NomComm. Are you going to try to be engaged in that process?

Klaus Stoll: Certainly, but I think this is also something which has to be driven not only by the whole team, by the whole NPOC team and the whole team has to make that point that we have the right and have the privilege to take that seat.

Ed Morris: Thanks.

Erika Mann: I just have maybe two general question. You mentioned that you -- I wasn't in Hyderabad, I couldn't go. So you mentioned that you debated Internet of Things. So my question is - this relates to other work from other groups as well, this was Internet of Things in relation to the use of domain name system? Or was it a general topic? Because I think sometimes you have to many general topics which not always automatically relate to our environment.

Klaus Stoll: What we are doing is quite simply we are saying, for example, everything we are doing is related to the DNS. But first of all we have to explain why the DNS is relevant. For example, one of the first things we did two years ago is quite simply what is the difference between using a domain and what is - and for not-for-profit organization and what is the difference to using Facebook or social media?

And then it's turned out and Sam did a very good paper at the end of it that if there is a real advantage, yes, for not-for-profit organizations to use the DNS, that's where we are starting from. We could - going on this is why that's relevant for users, that's what's happening and then talk about policymaking and trying to integrate people into the process.

I realize it's a long-term process. I realize it's a more difficult process. But I think we owe it to our constituency and both sides, the members and the constituency itself to build a solid foundation instead of building something which is a little bit wobbly. Tatiana.

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm so shy about speaking that sometimes somebody has to help me. Yes, no, and it was originally when it came up the question of the difference between NCUC and NPOC. And one of the things I wanted to point that was actually the essential difference between CSG and NCSG in terms of the way

we look at the organization in terms that NCSG is indeed the first approach organization; everyone needs to be a member of NCSG.

Then if they want to make him join a constituency, they can join NPOC, they can join NCUC, they could join still though were not sure whether it's active enough to remain our candidate constituency which is consumer interest.

Now though voting is all done at the NCSG level so it doesn't matter whether a community is a member of – I mean, as a member of NPOC and NCUC. In fact I think we have several people here that are in both. They have different rules about what it takes to be a member. And they have, as was explained, different objectives.

But the point is they are NCSG members and then that constituencies are differentiated on issues, on campaigns on such. So it's a very different way of -- it's sort of a mirror imaging almost of the CSG where, as I understand it, your constituencies are your primary interest and NCSG thing is sort of an add-on that was superimposed on you that you're not all that happy with, whereas the NCSG was the primary organization at the time that the GNSO was switched, and NCUC and NPOC are sort of sub organizations within that but everyone is first and foremost has to be a member of the NCSG.

I don't know if that helps differentiate it. But basically we could have 15 constituencies where we subdivide that level, and every member of NCSG could be a member of three of them because our only voting is done at the NCSG level.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, don't blame me about the break. Tony, Sam and Jonathan.

Tony Holmes: Yes, just a quick follow-up to Avri if I may? Avri, I really understand the way you described that, but it gets more complex when you go beyond GNSO because obviously the NCUC view is incredibly important in policy development. But then there is that relationship with ALAC. Can you summarize how that fits together as well?

Avri Doria: I think that's just affinity. I think that very often there have been issues that they have worked on together. Now the issue - the existence of the two is very different because ALAC, first of all At Large, we talk about ALAC but ALAC is just the equivalent of the GNSO Council. You know, it is not the entity. The entity is At Large. Now of course, what that looks like after this review is anybody's guess.

But, At Large, you know, it's that division between, first of all, they are users. They do not differentiate between business users and noncommercial users. You know, a lot of ISOC organizations are ALSs, are At Large Structures. So and most of those have both business people in them and civil society people in them; they're not purely civil society.

So only NCSG is really the only place where you can only be it if you are noncommercial, not for profit, civil society. The words definition is difficult but the user community is different. And then of course the other part is it's been consistent to the architecture of ICANN community where we have the specialist organizations that give recommendations and we have that nonspecialists that can give advice on any subject under the sun. So there's the architectural element and there's the fact that At Large if not civil society, At Large is users.

Tony Holmes: A bit off-topic but helpful.

Klaus Stoll: Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay thank you. Sam for the record. I wanted to just elaborate on a couple of things here and that's it been dealing with that not-for-profit NGO sector from the NPOC side. And I think the key difference between what I find myself doing and what NCSG and NCUC are doing is somebody comes to NCSG and says, we are interested. Well, you can go to NPOC, you can go to NCUC, where you want to go; that's sort of a up to you.

What I encounter is NGOs, civil society groups, nonprofit groups going, we have a concern about something in the Internet ecosystem. And so we end up having a discussion about rights, obligations and engagement in the Internet ecosystem. But then they have two other comments.

We cannot afford a Website, which is why we're on social media. So we have a discussion around that. And what's in it for us to be involved with ICANN, NCSG, NCUC, NPOC? And so that's the challenge – challenge for us, it's to go out and find – not to say to somebody who's got there who's come representing an organization or themselves or themselves in an organization and saying, we know why we need to be, why we want to be here. We're going out to deal with people who are just beginning to think about this and don't have the resources.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Sam. Jonathan, we got about 30 seconds left, sorry. I've been informed about that.

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry. I don't want to be in the way of the break. I know that part of what we're going to be trying to ascertain here at this intercessional is whether to ever have another one again. And if the last 90 minutes is any indication, my vote would be no. And I don't mean to be the bad guy so early on but I feel

like I just lost 90 minutes of my life. And I see a lot of heads down in computers doing emails and instant messaging and things like that. And I feel like we need to really figure out how to get engaged in the conversation.

We just did a bunch of accountability reforms which is one of the most unifying things that community has ever been engaged in, and I think that one of the things that gets lost in that is that we as a community have been largely responsible for the Board becoming too much of an activist board because we handed them non-compromise positions and polar opposites and ask the Board to resolve them.

And I think that the onus is on us to do a better job of finding common ground and discussing the topics that matter to us. And I almost feel like we just spent 90 minutes trying really hard not to see anything controversial. And I don't know that that's going to serve us well in trying to reach some unified positions going forward and bringing some productive outcome from the meeting. So that's my only general comment.

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: Can I beg for your patience and quite simply please wait. The key and me are cheering the NCPH procedural in-house issues at 1315. And please, you're the first one allowed to speak.

Chris Wilson: So this is Chris. Real quick, I rarely want to disagree with Jonathan but I'm going to actually disagree now. And part of the reason why is because, Jonathan, you've been so involved in ICANN for a long time and this is frankly probably old hat for you, listening to this. This is nothing new for you.

I will say as we talk about getting new blood into this mix, and presumably were going to have sort of new people coming to these hopefully future interessionals, I think there's value in just learning - speaking personally there's value in learning more about what NPOC is doing and what other constituencies are doing.

I haven't found it to be necessarily waste of time. I fully admit, I had to do a little site work while - the last hour and a half. But I think we've got, you know, plenty of other times this next two days to dive into policy discussions or so forth. So I take a little bit with a grain of salt because I think there actually is an element of benefit just generally speaking from, again from someone who hasn't been as involved as others, to learn a little more about what challenges they're facing, etcetera.

So I take your point. I think there's more important things we can and will be doing in the next couple of days. But I don't want to suggest -- I don't think this was a waste of time. But that's just from where I come from.

Greg Shatan: Maybe we should've had - instead of priorities our 12 biggest challenges.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. Quick comment from George to sort of wrap up this session may be in response to the last exchange. Go ahead, George.

George Sadowsky: I'm not sure this is going to wrap it up. I can't help but applaud what Jonathan just said that, that sometimes you come to the board and you come with unresolved issues and you don't ask us to solve it but we sort of feel that if there's any progress to be made maybe we should try.

I have a somewhat anthropological view of what just happened. And I would say -- we've been talking about constituencies and I see it as -- I see you as a

set of tribes. You have your tribal customs, your tribal loyalties, your values and maybe you even have sacrificial rituals that are clothes...

((Crosstalk))

George Sadowsky: ...that are clothed and civilized clothing. And we spent a lot of time in restructuring the tribes understanding what the tribes do. And what we've had here is a discussion of tribal values. And yet what's downplayed in this is the tribes have problems and they need to get together to solve them. And the issue is somehow don't come out as being the most important thing here. It leads me to believe that ICANN is badly structured and that the constituencies are much less important than the cross community working groups.

And maybe those should be the focus, the organizing principle because those are the problems that need solving. We're not going to get anywhere talking about our tribal customs and trying to figure out how to work together across tribes; why don't we talk about working together with issues and then going home to our tribes and reporting what we've done? I hope that's coherent enough.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, George. I'm trying to play that facilitation role, help keep you on time but also take advantage of the conversation. I just got two final comments. We have Avri and then Phil. And then I will give you some quick logistics and move forward to the other tribal ritual or sacrifice that somebody was referring to with Jamie. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I was moved to make a comment by some of the things that George said. First of all I think yes, we do see a problem with the Board. And I'll try to be more controversial now that I realize that I've been misbehaving by trying to avoid controversy. I thought I was (unintelligible) been good. But

anyway, I think part of the problem with the Board is the Board mistakes a report on what's going on and a report of challenges with a ask for solution.

And it's perhaps the Board is kind of acting like, you know, the typical husband, you know. So I would check that at the Board that just because we come and tell you, as we should, that we are having a problem here, we're having a problem there that therefore that doesn't mean you have to solve it; it means you have to know about it, you have to be aware of it.

And if you can help bring people together talking, you know, and assist that's good. But the idea that because you know what problem you have to solve the problem is the problem.

In terms of tribalism, I try to hang out with as many tribes as I can. I actually don't see tribes. Yes, people naturally aggregate by interests but, you know, I'm interested in everything so I will go be in anybody's tribe. So I don't see that. And so I think the idea that oh well cross community works well everything should be a cross community is kind of like saying I had a really good time pounding this nail in with a hammer so I'm going to use a hammer for everything from now on.

I think one of the things people on the Board really need to understand is the architecture of the organization they are allegedly leading, that they don't understand that there are different roles for SOs and ACs, that sometimes yes, cross community is the perfect way to go, and sometimes it's not. It's not one tool fits all. Have I helped at all?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Avri. Phil, you'll have the last word.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you. Phil for the record. Personally I'm not going to opine here as to whether these meetings are useful until we've gone through the full 2 1/2 days and see what we'd accomplished here. Reacting to something as George just said, it is true that sometimes we're - have a difficult time getting our act together and speaking with a more unified voice.

On the other hand there are times when the community on policy matters, through the GNSO Council which is the primary policymaking organization of ICANN, speaks with one voice as it did on permanent protections for IGOs in the new TLDs and the GAC gave conflicting advice and the Board completely abdicated its responsibility to make a decision for more than 2 1/2 years.

And now it's encouraging a dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC as a way to further avoid its responsibility. Now I'm not against having a dialogue but I am concerned about the precedent that's going to set whether on every issue in which the GNSO and the GAC have differing opinions the board is going to encourage those parties to work it out rather than making a decision.

And so far as CCWG replacing the GNSO policymaking role, that would be a C-change in the organization because that would be granting elevating governments from an advisory role to a co-equal role in the development of policy. So you've raised some interesting issues that I think we should have a full and frank discussion of that. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you all very much. I'll be very interested in your feedback in terms of how that session went. A number of different perspectives and points of view so it will be very helpful to hear your feedback from a survey perspective.

Let's take 10 minutes. There is food outside the stores. You can gather a plate. We will give Jamie a few moments to get a bite as well. We're going to now shift to the cochair format. Anna and Jonathan are going to be our first chairs; they'll take over the session with Jamie and they will work collectively on it.

This afternoon I think we can be a little bit flexible with sort of looking at about four o'clock timeframe as a time that we have to hit, we have to hit the mark on that, we've got a little break before it. So we will be conscious of the flow of the other sessions that are coming up, try to keep them within 10 to 15 minutes of their timeframes. And so please take a quick break, go out and get some food, and we will reconvene with talking on the microphones in 12 minutes. Mark.

And, Jamie, you can stay sitting right there if you'd like. Thank you.

END