

ICANN

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
February 1, 2018
1:00 pm CT**

Joan Kerr: Good morning. My name is Joan and I'm Chairing Slot C, which is Community Outreach. And I have to so I'm so happy I'm Chairing - Co-Chairing with Tony Harris. And -- he's over there -- I'll go first.

And I always look for the fun in everything and so I have the fun session. So the goals of this session is for each constituency and group to highlight their goals and priorities and work plans for 2018. And so we're going to start with NCSG first. Then NCUC and NPOC second. And then Tony will do CCSG.

So without further ado I'd like to introduce - I was -- by the way- - going to let everyone do the limbo, but I didn't get the Jamaican music. So we'll pass on that. Maybe at the end -- at the reception -- we could do that? Yes? Anyway,

I do want to say something a little bit about LA, being here. I'm from Canada. And when I arrived in LA it was 48 degrees. I guess Celsius, but anyway it was like 70. And we left at minus 19. So here we are coming into the airport with these big coats and boots and didn't look good for being in LA. But anyway. Here we are.

So Ayden, if you would give us a presentation of NCSG, that would be wonderful. Thanks.

Ayden Ferdeline: Thanks. It would be my pleasure Joan. Hi everyone. Ayden Ferdeline for the record. I'll just wait for - great our slides are now up there. So thank you so much for being present here today in Los Angeles. And if you're joining us remotely, thanks. Thanks for logging on.

As I just mentioned, my name is Ayden Ferdeline and I'm pleased to be speaking to you today on behalf of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. I am one of the NCSG's representatives on the GNSO council. And we appreciate you allowing me to - indulging me a few minutes of your time this morning so that I can walk you through what we in the NCSG have accomplished in the year gone by and outline briefly what is on our agenda for 2018.

So just a brief recap if you're not aware. The NCSG is the home in the GNSO for civil society organizations, non-profit organizations, public interest groups, and individuals who are primarily interested and concerned with the non-commercial public interest orientated aspects of domain name policy.

We have two member constituencies representing non-commercial interests, the NCUC and NPOC. The NCUC you'll learn more about in a few moments' time. The NCUC advocates positions on domain name-related policies that protect and support non-commercial communication and activity online.

NPOC -- you'll also learn about in a few moments' time -- focuses on the impact of DNS policies on operational readiness and implementation of non-commercial missions and objectives.

So in 2017 you can see that we performed six key functions. Firstly, we successfully mobilized civil society actors to participate in ICANN processes. I'll elaborate on these in a moment. Secondly we developed and advocated policy positions and we'd like to think we set the agenda on issues that matter to us.

Third we had explosive growth in our membership. Fourth we organized DNS-related events and capacity building workshops around the world. Fifth we collaborated with and we interacted with stakeholders across the ICANN communities. And sixth we have continued to develop and support positions that favor non-commercial activity online.

We can go to the next slide please. So while that's loading - it's only a series of photographs of our different members showing that we've had more participation in more fora than ever before.

Man: So it's (unintelligible) content.

Ayden Ferdeline: I believe so. And how have we done this? So we've organized bottom-up, important to and represented the interests of non-commercial internet users who otherwise may have been marginalized in the face of governmental or private sector priorities.

We have fought hard for principles of free expression, privacy and data protection, fair use, freedom of association and due process in ICANN activities. We're still on the previous slide, but in 2017 we responded to over 30 public comments.

Now this is a value judgement now. I don't have historical data to hand, but it is my (susception) that this is an improvement on previous years. I believe

that we are responding to more opportunities to provide the ICANN org and ICANN Board with input on issues that matter to us. And I think we're taking the mic more than ever before.

In Abu Dhabi for instance we had our first ever bilateral meeting with the GAC. And we're looking to institutionalize this as a recurring conversation. I hope you would agree we're becoming more visible and that's important for the legitimacy of the multi-stakeholder model.

We believe that our public interest-orientated contributions provide balance against commercial interests and help keep ICANN accountable. So this is the right slide now. We like to think we're being heard, not just -- as I mentioned before by the GAC -- but throughout the community. And we had a number of victories in 2017.

We brought the data protection commissioners to Copenhagen. We've made sure that privacy and data protection matters remained the top of the agenda in the community. We've seen respect for human rights added into the ICANN bylaws.

We've raised awareness on private ordering and shadow regulation and made it clear that it would become dangerous for ICANN to become involved -- however loosely -- in content regulation. And we have brought a pragmatic and evidence-informed perspective to issues of jurisdiction. Next slide please.

And we're growing. Both of our member constituencies have grown by over 30% over the past 12 months. The NCUC has grown by 156 members. NPOC has grown by 21 members. Our organizational members now include the (unintelligible) Institute along with EFF on the left and the Heritage Foundation on the right.

We now have a membership backlog with our executive committee busily assessing applications for membership eligibility and suitability. As the interest in becoming an NCSG member is so strong, why? Because if you join the NCSG you can fight for what you believe in. Is there an issue, Tony?

Tony Harris: Could you please speak closer to the microphone...

Ayden Ferdeline: Oh...

Tony Harris: ...because it's a big room and at the back here...

Ayden Ferdeline: ...of course.

Tony Harris: ...we're not getting you very clearly.

Ayden Ferdeline: All right, absolutely. My apologies for that. So I was saying that membership in the NCSG is growing strong. A hundred and fifty-six new members in the NCUC, 21 members in NPOC.

And the reasons for why we expect this growth trajectory to continue because people know that within the NCSG you can fight for what you believe in. You can be effective in making a change. You can feel rewarded through service. You can see the multi-stakeholder model in action. You can build a network of people who are the top experts in their field.

And to be very clear, I'm not saying that this is not the case in other stakeholder groups, not at all. I'm simply saying that is why we're getting new members. Next slide please.

So our constituencies have spent 2017 promoting diversity and inclusion by leading targeted initiatives to bring new voices into our work. So we believe strongly in the NCSG that outreach, engagement, capacity building efforts are critical to maintaining a sustainable source of volunteers from diverse regions.

And we take seriously that obligation that we -- as the leaders of the NCSG -- have to ensure that our new members are well versed in ICANN policy issues and can effectively engage with other stakeholder groups.

To that effect, one of our member constituencies -- the NCUC -- organized a two-day outreach event in Johannesburg -- just prior to the ICANN meeting there last year -- where we introduced local civil society to why the DNS is a certainly internet governance issue with implications to human rights, economic development, and online access to information. This event was very successful and it raised our profile in the region. Next slide please.

But we're not just raising our profile in Africa, we're raising it globally. We've been sending our members around the world to engage and to participate in important agenda-setting and decision making processes both within and outside of the ICANN community.

We've been organized workshops at conferences and events which explore global internet governance issues and spreading the word about why the DNS matters. And I think it's also important to note that -- in many cases -- we are doing this without the support of ICANN.

So of course -- while we do participate in the same ICANN-funded regional programs like CROP that you do -- we are also funding our participation through external sources and through external donors. Next slide please.

So what does 2018 look like? We have six key objectives, which I'll just read out to you here. So firstly we want to make sure that the voice of civil society is better heard in ICANN processes. Secondly we want to be responding to more public comments than we did in 2017. And participating more actively and effectively in working groups.

Third, we want to support our constituencies as they grow and professionalize. Fourth, we want to conduct more tailored outreach at more global fora. Five, we want to be more visible within the ICANN community as we grow our in-reach and support our members and participating actively in policy development processes.

And finally we want to continue to protect and support non-commercial communication and activity online. I'm going to leave my remarks there, but I hope this brief overview has helped to demystify some of our activities over the past year.

And if you have any questions regarding our history, our activities, our principled and consistent stances in support of internet freedoms and human rights, please feel free to pull me or any of our other members aside over coffee and we'll be more than happy to share with you our non-commercial outlook on the issues. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Ayden. Is there any pressing questions right now? No? That's wonderful. On time. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Go ahead Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much. This is Jimson Olufuye. Senior Contemporary Chair of the Africa ICT Alliance and member of the business constituency of ICANN. And the Vice Chair Freelance Operation.

Ayden, thank you for that presentation. Just two things. Number one I would like to know do you have some sort of a fee structure? Like what do you - do people need to do to become a member? Do they need to pay some money or what are the...

Ayden Ferdeline: No. We have entirely open membership. We're completely bottom up open membership. If you're - yes, no membership fees.

Jimson Olufuye: No constrain, nothing. Everybody just come in and...

Ayden Ferdeline: No, some would say we've become the catchall for the community because we are that open. Anyone can join the NCUC if you are not otherwise involved in the domain name industry. Now there are some basic eligibility and suitability criteria of course, but for the most part extremely open.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, good. So it would be good to hear some of the criteria. And then the second...

Ayden Ferdeline: It's all on the website as well.

Jimson Olufuye: But yes, the second comment I have is regard to maybe just terminology. There is a trend of this that in language as (unintelligible) development go that part could be more likely to talk about capacity development. You know, developing the capacity and capability, okay. That is just so, by the way. So I would like to hear more about the criteria (at this).

Ayden Ferdeline: The membership criteria? I'm not sure I understand the question. Was that the question?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, maybe a refresher. Sorry.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Can I address it? It's just Renata. (This set) was - Johannesburg was a very important moment for NCUC. It was an NCUC CROP outreach, which doesn't exist anymore by the way. ICANN doesn't have any more this support for outreach events.

And it was a pivotal point for NCUC because we had there our members. And we had a community which was very much looking into being involved in ICANN, which was (unintelligible) of non-governmental organizations. All the non-governmental organizations of Soweto, of very important civil society organizations in Johannesburg.

So to address your question Jimson, there is a - there are very vibrant communities that want to be involved in policy making but just don't have enough information or context in this. The actions that NCUC - in NCUC and NPOC conducted really helped this community be involved.

So I guess our criteria was looking for people who wanted to be involved, had the energy, we (unintelligible) outreach events and they went voluntarily. Thanks.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you. Bruna? We now have Bruna for NCUC. So please go ahead.

Bruna Santos: Hi everyone, my name is Bruna Santos. And if we could play my - put my presentation on. Thanks. And so this a really short presentation on the year

had for NCUC. I'd like to thank Ayden for making my job way easier now so I can focus on last points of it. Can we move to the next slide?

So the presentation's being organized in - out - some of the actions that NCUC worked on in the past year, our goals for the next year, and some regional activities. I have to say that this was - this is more on the executive side. We would love to like dive deep into subjects but this was made mostly on actions and discussions that we've been dedicated to in the past. So, next slide.

Next - you can go to the next one as well. So yes, we tried to list some of the outreach actions that NCUC was involved in the past year. So we have - I mean this is only a short demonstration of them. It's been way too much, way more than that. And we have been pretty much in every single region, in every single fora trying to discuss this plethora of subjects with the civil society.

From RightsCon to IGF for passing internet freedom (possible) and some of these outreach and events they are being listed now as continuous engagement activities for NCUC right now. We can move to the next slide.

And also yes, entering the goals for 2018. We listed four main goals that NCUC's going to focus its work on. The first one would be the policy work. We acknowledge the burnout in the community and also the importance of having more people engaged with.

So the first idea is to have our members joining more working groups and PDPs and working more effectively on them. Other than just being listed as members. And the second goal -- which is pretty much similar -- is like increasing the PDP mentorship. And then we want - when we talk about

increasing our engagement as members in PDPs and working groups we are talking about mentorship of newcomers.

So there's like this - we sort of acknowledge this gap between newcomers and the ones who are already engaged in these actions. So the idea is to try to work with, like, groups of newcomers and try to teach them what's the PDP on and what's the NCUC's view on that and make them become themselves in our constituency as well.

Entering the third goal, we were talking about capacity building. So also from the mentorship, also from the community onboarding program. And our NCUC fellowship program. We are trying to build up efforts on our members.

Last but not least the fourth goal will be to identify opportunities and form alliances with strategic members and communities just so we can work better in our different regions. And have some more engagement opportunities such as one of our newest organizations -- (De Punta Tech) from Panama -- has already offered to cohost with us outreach meeting in ICANN 62.

So it's - the idea is to identify opportunities within our membership. We can move to the next slide. Also we listed what is going to be the ICANN year for NCUC. So from the intersessional that we are at right now to the joint outreach with NPOC for the first time that's going to be held in - before San Juan.

Also the outreach that is going to - that we are going to do in Panama with (De Punta Tech) probably. And also the outreach named as joint civil society meeting with EURALO before the person that we're meeting. All of these events have in mind those four goals in which we'd like to have more

members and having people understanding what we're about and what we discuss and how they could help NCUC. We can move to the next one.

Moving to the policy work, we tried to identify new main names and contact names for pre-made PDPs and working groups that we could identify. So the names were already listed. They are either stars in the discussions or people we want to become new leaders on the named discussion.

So for RDS we already know (Stefan) and (Nadan) for doing this. And we have identified (Pharel) -- another member of ours -- to work on. RPMs we are talking again with (Louise) and (Cathy) but we are also having (Zena) coming in. New GTLDs, myself I still consider myself a newcomer on the discussion but we are already thinking about - also thinking about (Robin) on this discussion. For work WS2, (Nick Sharie) is a member of our NCSG Policy Committee and the idea is for him to work with (Antonella).

And we'll have (Michael) for CCWP Chart and (Mallory). And last but not least, NCCT is not a working group -- neither are PDP -- but it's something that we identified as a main action for the year. And we'll have (Nadira) and (Shahou) on that, working. So, can you move to the next slide. And the next one as well. Oh no.

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Yes. Yes, we have a sort of a problem. But the - yes. The rest of it was only per region. We were listing some activities we did on 2017. And some continue to be either continuous engagement or other actions that we've identified. So for every single region of the EC and CC we identified as a continuous engagement.

The national and regional governance forums we are at Brazilian IGS, CD, EOD, IGF. So the idea is to continue working with these forums. And like I could even highlight - oh another, we are also working with some internet governance schools in the Asia-Pacific region. We are - we have spoken as NPOC, NC, and APC as well. And that's it.

I mean RightsCon is a continuous engagement for us. We've been at the 2017 edition. We are having a booth at the 2018 edition. And we're also - we have also submitted NCUC sessions. And yes. I guess that's pretty much it. I mean, continuous engagement and keep working on. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Excellent Bruna. Any questions for Bruna right now? Great. Thank you so much. And now we have Juan who will present on behalf of NPOC. That's my favorite.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Hello, good morning everyone. My name is Juan Manuel Rojas from NPOC. And I'm going to talk about NPOC goals, priorities, challenges, and we are planning for this year. Okay.

The first thing that I have to say is, okay one of the biggest responsibilities for this new team is policy statement. This responsibility is needed internal organization. And now this executive committee is working together. Many of our job has been done organizing the constituency.

One of our tasks is reviewing the charter. That's one thing that we are doing right now. Okay, first slide please. Okay, that's - I'm - we are going to talk about goals, priorities, and work plans. Next. Okay. These are our goals. We have three major goals.

The first is map out a specific task for each member of the executive committee. Because we are realizing that we have done - we don't have how to measure what we are doing right now. This is very important to do the outreach that we want to do.

The next one, it's create - no, the next point, thank you. Create a promotion package. This includes the new logo, a booklet, and the banners for a brand new strategy. Like a marketing strategy to - you know that NPOC is changing and it's evolving right now.

And another one is outreach and engagement. We want to inform and educate the not-for-profit organizations and involve these organizations on what a policy process - policy development process is. So we are working on that.

In (overage), we want to attract more volunteers to be part of NPOC team. Because we are always - the few people there. And we want to the people engage with us. Also -- as Ayden said before -- we want to also participate actively in policy comments from NCSG and engage our members to do it. And on the final is to have approved new charter inside this FY.

Okay, next please. Okay. Our plurities (sic). Priorities, I'm sorry. It's - lives inside NCSG the following topics that we are related with NPOC mission. We are - we have identified these topics as operational concerns. These also have to do with our priority is enhance our participation in public comments.

These - okay, I would like to name some of the comments that we were participate, but of course we expect to improve it this year. We participated in a consumer competition, consumer trust public comment. Enhancing accountability. Draft framework for registry for security trades. And diversity questionnaire. This year, right? Next please.

Our challenges. Okay, we talked before that it's maximize member engagement for participation in - for policy comments. Create value added involvement for not-for-profits. They - we want to - the not-for-profits understand that what NPOC does for inside ICANN world. Manage staff for EC, NCUC and their members. And communicate with our members consistently. Next please.

This is our work plans. These are our - the minor activities for one of the goals that I said before. Inside they map out the specific tasks for each member of the executive committee. We have some activities us. Finalize charter review and build regional presence. In this charter review we want to release that hopeful before Panama we think. And we are doing our job for that. The next one, please.

It's create a promotion package. This is made with the support of ICANN Communications and of course the onboarding program. We have new logo. It was selected by our members. Banners for social media. And a booklet that we hope to release soon. Next we are - you are - we are going to show you our new logo. This is our new logo.

Joan Kerr: Yay.

Juan Manuel Rojas: And as I already said, it was selected by our members and our new banner for social media is on the next slide. Next please.

Those are going to be in our booklet that we are working on at - right now. And we have - we hope to release soon, as I said. We hope to be printed for Puerto Rico meeting. Next please. In approach and outreach our engagement. We have activities that inform and engage not-for-profit that I already said.

Policy statements to submit officially as a constituency with EC approval, not only in some comments -- not only to be part of NCSG comments -- but also we have - we think that maybe we could do this as NPOC in some kind with all support that we need that. And house outreach sessions, you know, like meetings.

We have a joint session -- as Bruna said -- in Puerto Rico with civil society organizations. And of course increase collaboration with various constituency groups. That's all for us. Okay, thank you very much. Any questions?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich Knochen. I have a question more to all of them you know, to presentations.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Well you mentioned in one of your slides that you are leading well, specific topics. Leading inside the NCSG discussion. Well just for the understanding of - for me, well how is that going to do it? Are you - did you allocate, you know, specific items to specific constituencies in order to find decision - to find consensus within the NCSG? Or how is that done?

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh Badii speaking. I am the Chair of Non-commercial Stakeholder Group. Policy at Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. So we have two constituencies but policy takes place at the NCSG. So whatever issue we have and we are working on and we want to issue a public comment -- or we want to go to different PDPs -- what we do is we go there as the NCSG representative.

Of course at the constituencies themselves also can go and participate and represent their constituency. But what we have tried to do is to channel all the policy efforts through the Non-commercial Stakeholder Group and our GNSO councils and the volunteers at that level.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: So just an additional question. Just for one example. For example, public comments in policy-related question. It's just done with support of the NCSG, is that the case?

Farzaneh Badii: So it is the support of NCSG which includes the constituency. We have a policy committee, which includes representatives of NPOC and NCUC as well as the GNSO council members. And they come up with the public comments and agree to submit the public comments. And there will - there's extensive consultation with the NCSG members.

Also you can be -- as in not you but in general -- you can be a member of NCSG and do not belong to any of the constituencies.

Joan Kerr: Any other questions? Great. So Tony, maybe you do yours and then we can talk about the key messaging afterwards?

Tony Harris: Thank you Joan. And thank you also for your very well-organized and timely session. We're going to do a slight different thing here. When - before I speak -- as I actually present -- we're going to say a couple words about them. Because you - some of you may not know much about the person who's speaking.

First we're going to ask Claudia Selli to make her presentation. And I'll make a brief introduction. She is a European Government Affairs Director of AT and T International External Affairs. Her main task is to advocate AT and T

positions in Brussels to European institutions as well as in other European member states. Especially Germany.

She is current Chair of the Digital Economy Committee in AmCham Europe. And since January 2017 she is Chair of the Business Constituency. She previously worked at the Europe Commission and the European Parliament. She holds a Master in International Politics from ULB University and Graduated from La Tuscia University, which is in Viterbo Italy.

So Claudia, you have 10 minutes.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much for the kind introduction. And as Tony said, you know, since January this year I became Chair of the Business Constituency. So my first objective -- personal objective -- is to get to know all of you better. And to strengthen corporation where it's already existing and create new corporation if and where it's missing.

So don't hesitate to reach out to me and I will do the same. Now moving to the BC, we have come up with - well first of all I just wanted to flag some of the achievement in 2017. I was forgetting that. But we filed about 36 comments and statements in 2017, up from 28 in the prior year.

And as far as we can tell the BC contribution was the most among ICANN stakeholder groups and advisory committees. Also we have increased the participation of BC members into policy process. And we are doing pretty well in terms of diversity as you can see. So as far as our priorities are concerned, we have come up with four main themes.

And the first -- as you can imagine -- which is I mean worrying the whole community is preserving the legitimate use of WhoIs while complying with

the GDPR. And you know, BC members take privacy issues very seriously. But we are equally concerned about the impact that the GDPR can have and might have on the accuracy of the UE's - the WhoIs registry.

So of course we appreciate as well the ICANN engagement and efforts towards member states, to our CPAs, towards policy maker as well as with the community. Because I think a dialogue here is really needed to find the right model, the right balance between complying with the GDPR and preserving a good and accurate WhoIs Registry.

So we have filed comments to the models -- the three models -- that were published on January 12. And I don't know if you have - are familiar with that, but our preferred model we are suggesting is model number one. Because we think it's much more closer to the WhoIs Registry.

And also we think that any self-certification should be consistent across the registry and registrars to ensure quick access -- when necessary -- to contracted party and any third party. We - and so this is our view and I'm looking also as (Steven) in case he wants to jump in.

The second -- and please, if you want to intervene or if you have question just raise your hand and I will stop -- but the second priority that we have is accepting, you know, the work recommendations from the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. As we have also been reiterating in several occasion, you know, a strong and effective accountability measures are the foundation for ICANN.

And the community to continue working in a very healthy environment now that - in the absence of the historical contractual relationship with the US government. At BC we have filed comments and responded to the different,

you know, recommendation that have been put forward so far. And certainly we will continue to engage on that, because it's really a key priority for us.

Then moving on in - of course another priority we have is restarting the security and stability review. And we're eager to have the team restarting their activities, we were posed by the Board in October last year. Completing this review is not only required by ICANN bylaws, but it's essential to a secure and stable system of unique identifier, which we really care about.

So there are certainly two aspects, which worries us. From one side there is the concern linked to the security and stability, which is really critical but also the process here. Then for the other priority that we have is completing the new GTLD review and subsequent procedure.

And before starting any round we do believe that we should have completed all reviews including, for example, improving also the applicant guide book, the contract of compliance, and so far and so forth. Tony, I will stop here.

Tony Harris: Thank you Claudia. The floor is open if anybody would like to ask a question to Claudia. Please, go ahead Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. This is Rafik speaking. So, thanks Claudia for the presentation. But I want to know more about the kind of policy discussion process you have in BC. I know that Steve, you are the Vice Chair for the Policy. But just I want to know more how you do the consultation, the drafting, and so on.

And I think it's interesting for us also to learn more. We have our policy committee, and maybe different way how we manage the policy drafting. I want to -- if you can -- clarify more about that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Rafik. Steve DelBianco, Vice Chair for Policy at the BC. I'll give you a very quick answer. The BC does it a little differently than the NCSG. We don't have a Policy Committee.

And as the Vice Chair for Policy Coordination, I make it my job to tee up a calendar of comment opportunities which occur within PDPs but also across the public comment process at ICANN. When I tee it up I typically try to summarize issues that are salient to the BC. And then catalog prior comments that the BC has put in over the past couple of years.

They're usually - build a foundation. Or we might fine tune or slightly modify our comments going forward. I then do the difficult task of soliciting volunteers from among the full BC membership. And we do this on our bi-weekly phone calls, which last only an hour.

And those volunteers then become the core of our drafting team for that particular issue, as opposed to a committee who has to comment on all issues. So we have these ad hoc committees will come together. And when the draft is there I coordinate the editing of the draft and circulate it.

And our charter requires a 14-day review period for BC members. And that's subject to expedited review for comment periods that are shorter than that. And then we submit. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: So just one - just to clarify. I mean, the policy committee is not drafting the comments. We also do a call for volunteers. It's more like to review the comments and to kind of to make the consensus for the position. But in fact, we do have a call for volunteers.

Tony Harris: No further questions? Oh, please go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, this is Jimson Olufuye. Well just to thank our Chair for that robust presentation. And just a little more points for information.

We concluded our legal standing last year. We're a legal organization registered as a not-for-profit in Washington, DC. Yes, we're (sent to) business (includes) us of the internet commercial users and the internet. And also we passed our new charter last year. It was approved by the Board.

And we thank you all for your input and comment leading to that. And also last year we did outreaches in Abuja and in JoBurg. Very productive, created more awareness and great more membership. And we continue to diversify the BC as the Chair mentioned.

As you can see, four out of our officers women and diverse language ability and so forth. So we continue to grow in 2018 across all the continents ICANN reach or around the world. Thank you.

Tony Harris: So we can move on. Our next speaker is from the Internet Intellectual Property Constituency. Brian Winterfeldt. I'll say a few words about Brian before he speaks.

Brian is the founder and principle of Winterfeldt IP Group. He advises clients on creation of global trademarks and branding strategies. He develops programs to register and enforce clients' IP rights and protect against infringement of their trademarks. And advises clients on all domain name issues. Specializing also on the New GLTD Program.

He also counsels and trains clients on cutting-edge issues such as social media platforms and policies and promoting brands in this evolving space. Brian is

currently President of the intellectual property constituency. So Brian, you have 10 minutes.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much Tony. And welcome everyone. I'm - appreciate the introduction. And looking forward to spending a few minutes with you all introducing the intellectual property constituency. First I'd like to introduce you to the IPC Delegates that are here at the intersessional.

We have IPC Vice President Vicky Sheckler from the RIAA. IPC Secretary Kiran Malancharuvil from Winterfeldt IP Group. IPC Treasurer John McElwaine from Nelson Mullins. GNSO Councillor Paul McGrady from Winston and Strong. GNSO Council Chair Heather Forrest from the University of Tasmania. And our only delegate not on the executive team is (Gene Marks) from the Coalition for Online Accountability.

I'd like to quickly run through for you the mission of the IPC, and overview of our membership, as well as some examples of our organizational members. We're also going to go through a quick list of current officers -- most of whom are here -- and a partial list of our evolving 2018 priorities.

The IPC has two main focuses. The first is intellectual property and the second are internet consumers. We want to further the interest of IP owners and educate them about the important issues being discussed and vital policies being formed here at ICANN.

We have an additional focus on consumer protection and the role that IP serves to further consumer interests. The IPC seeks to ensure that IP and consumer interests are preserved and protected on the internet and are appropriately balanced with legitimate privacy and internet infrastructure concerns.

The IPC represents the views and interests of the IP community worldwide at ICANN with the particular emphasis on trademark, copyright, and related intellectual property rights and their effect and interaction with the domain name system or DNS. The IPC performs a lot of industry outreach through organization members, law firms, and more to ensure that the views of IP owners are appropriately and accurately represented in working groups, to the GNSO Council, and to the ICANN Board.

The IPC has three main categories of membership. International IP organizations. Local, state, and national IP organizations. And third, companies, law firms, and individuals. Companies or law firms must have an interest in IP matters. Individuals must have demonstrated an interest in intellectual property, particularly as it relates to the operation of the domain name system.

Some of the IP organizations that are members include the American Bar Association, the Coalition for Online Accountability -- that we mentioned (Gene Marks) is here representing -- the European Trademark Association, the International Federation of Phonographic Industry, the International Trademark Association, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Recording Industry Association of America, and many more.

Our membership list is public and is available on our website at IP Constituency dot org, so I would encourage anyone interested in learning more about our members and who they are to go there and feel free to check us out.

So the majority of the leadership team is here and I've actually already introduced them. The one exception is Brian Scarpelli from ACT is our Participation Coordinator and he is not here as part of our delegation.

Our priorities evolve throughout the year depending on what's happening obviously in the ICANN space. What the policy issues are that are ongoing. Here are some examples of what we are planning to focus on in 2018, but I guess -- as everyone knows -- at ICANN things can change very rapidly. But this is where we think our focus is going to be most likely.

The first one is understanding the impact of GDPR compliance and ensuring continued transparency and accessibility of website ownership data for IP enforcement and consumer protection purposes. Another priority is preparing for the review of the UDRP -- the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy -- which everyone is probably aware it's pretty critical to the enforcement and consumer protection that is really important for brand owners.

Evaluating the impact of the New GTLD Program on brand and IP owners and consumers, including evaluating the Rights Protection Mechanisms and Accountability Mechanisms. We're also likely going to be focused on assessing the proper balance of government interest, community interest, and international law as it relates to ICANN policies. For example, the use of geographic names in the domain name space.

So again, these are just some of the priorities that we're anticipating for 2018. Like everything else at ICANN, they could be evolving and changing. But this is what we're kind of acknowledging as our priorities most likely for the coming year.

So that is kind of our brief introduction to who we are and who our offices - our slates are. I would like to mention that our officers are elected annually, so our new slate of officers actually came in this past October. And there will be elections again in the coming October timeframe. And with that I think that's our brief overview. Back to Tony.

Tony Harris: Thank you Brian. Are there any questions for Brian from the floor? Oh yes. Please, go ahead.

Remmy Nweke: Thanks Brian the presentation. Thank you very much. My name is Remmy Nweke, I'm the Vice Chair of the Africa Information Society on - and Information Society and a member of NPOC constituency. I also work for Digital Sense Africa.

Well my concern or little wisdom if you like is having looked at the (unintelligible) property is a group of issues. And your membership model is restricted -- if you like -- to America. Looking at what you have presented to us I am deeply concerned that the developing countries seems not to be well represented in the constituency.

And I would like to know what you are doing in terms of trying to bridge that gap. Especially with Africa. Nowadays you see -- for instance -- in Nigeria where we have a lot of knowledgeable productions being showcased all over the world. And many a times a lot of them cry out that they don't have the wherewithal to (unintelligible) beyond their shows.

So I would like to know what IPC is doing in terms of bridging the gap in between them and developing countries especially in Africa. Thank you very much.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much, that's an excellent question. Our membership is actually more diverse I think than you're stating. It's not just US organizations. It is a global membership. And we are continually looking for opportunities to conduct outreach and to encourage membership.

We actually do a lot of work on the ground at the ICANN meetings wherever we land to try and bring in additional members and engage stakeholders in those areas. One of the things that we would like to do is obviously to continue to build our membership representation and to make it more global.

And we would actually welcome everyone's help here in the room including yours. If you know organizations in Africa that you think would be eligible for the IPC and benefit from participation, please encourage them to reach out to me. We are very open and we very much would like to expand our representation.

And we would like to see more organizations in Africa and other regions that are not as represented currently in our membership. And I think Paul McGrady would like to add on to that.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. This is Paul McGrady. One of the features of the IPC is that it has association members. So for example, INTA has -- according to Wikipedia so hopefully fingers crossed -- but it says that INTA -- which is a member of the IPC -- has over 400 members from Africa. And that's consistent with my experience at the INTA annual meeting.

And so I do think that there is a diversity of representation within the IPC through the association members that it has. But that doesn't, you know, that doesn't diminish Brian's important point that we should continue to strive for, you know, fulsome representation regardless of the geographic location.

Tony Harris: Are there any other questions for the intellectual property constituency?

Kiran Malancharuvil: This is - so this is Kiran Malancharuvil. I'm the IPC Secretary over the Outreach and Engagement efforts. I would just like to point out that both of our candidates for the community onboarding program for Puerto Rico are African. They're coming from a law firm in South Africa.

And we have - we do - we were rewarded for our outreach efforts in Johannesburg with their engagement and participation. So again, we are building our participation. And then of course to Paul's great point, you can look at the international organizations that are members on our website. They are category three members.

And a number of those international organizations have significant or at least representatives' participation from the global (unintelligible). Thanks.

Tony Harris: Any further questions? Ah yes, there's one here. Please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: I'm Farzaneh Badii, the Non-commercial Stakeholder Group Chair. So I was wondering if you had membership fee? And the other thing is that -- at NCUC -- they have the regional representation in their leadership positions by design.

So our bylaws actually require that the officers -- the executive committee -- come from various regions. And this has helped us a lot with bringing forward diversity in our leadership group. And both at NCUC and NCSG and NPOC we are a diverse group. And I think that design in the bylaws helped a lot. However, I know there are shortcomings to that. But just a suggestion.

And yes, I just want to add if you charge fees this is something that we also considered. We discussed at the NCSG. But when you charge fees it is less probably the global south to participate and become an actual member. So that's another thing to consider. Thanks.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much. So we do actually charge membership fees. It's \$100 for individuals and it's \$500 for organizations. We do have a program in place however to allow parties who don't have the means to pay the membership dues to ask for a decrease or even potentially a waiver of those membership fees.

So that's an excellent point and that's something that we are aware of. And we don't want that fee to be a barrier to entry into the IPC. Also I think your recommendation is an excellent one. We're actually in the process of redoing our bylaws, so that's something that we can look at and definitely consider.

And I've noticed that it's made a big difference in the diversity of your membership in the NCSG. And so that's something that we'll definitely take into account.

Tony Harris: Any other question? Okay. We'll move on to the presentation from the Commercial Stakeholder Group. I'm going to say a few words first to introduce Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

Wolf-Ulrich has worked close to 40 years in the telecommunications industry. He has participated in ICANN since 2007 as a member of the ISGCP - I can't read my own writing here. Currently represents DE-CIX -- the German Internet Exchange Node -- which is the largest internet exchange point in the world, by the way, with branches in other countries.

He has served on the GNSO Council for seven years, even being Vice Chair for three years. Since 2017 Wolf-Ulrich Knoben is the Chair of Intellect - of the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency. It's a complicated Name. Wolf-Ulrich, you have 10 minutes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Tony. Yes, let's move to the next slide while we are - I am - have three blocks to talk about. This is our activities and priorities for policy development, reviews, and with regards to outreach. Similar I heard from other constituencies. Next slide please. I'm sorry, what? I cannot - that's better. Good. Thank you.

I thought the line was too short, but it's okay. Thanks very much. So these are in a role, you know, the priorities and activities in the priority form for this year. What GDP Outcomes because of the deadline we have set. Maybe I'll face this in May of this year.

And it's an item which is all over the community about touching on all of us. And especially also our members. There's an item -- the KSK rollover -- which you may remember from last year. Which was postponed by ICANN. The Key Signing Key Rollover.

And our members -- ISPs -- they have a role on that. Because many of them are operating resolvers in context with the KSK Rollover. And there's a corporation between ICANN and us, so we offered to ICANN that we could support them in order to contact our members and get support of them. In order to get it right -- the KSK Rollover -- done in order to implement the new software which is needed for resolver to that.

So we keep an eye on that and are working with our members on that. It's up to ICANN at the time being. We're still expecting an answer from them with

regards to which resolvers which locations should be covered. And then we are going to match with our members.

Universal acceptance of all GTLDs is a big item since years where we are engaged. So we are in the Steering Committee engaged. (Chris Dorsen) is here as well and other members are also engaged in that effort. This is an ongoing effort. This is an educative effort to many in the world. And so we are engaged in order to work on the program of this.

Further part -- which maybe may come up also on the ICANN 61 meeting as a cross-community item -- is names collision. Where the - we -- our members - - are in parts the front runners on getting accused in case if there is something wrong on the networks now running. So and that could happen -- obviously the names collision -- if some resolvers are not resolving in the right way. Especially on IDNs.

And so our customers and our - the customers of our networks and our ISPs maybe may have concern with that. And so we are interested we are to solve problems coming up with this item. In addition, so we are engaged and continuing in the working groups for rights protection mechanisms as well.

From a - let me say in that way. Because members -- companies and associations we have as members -- are also covering, you know, these point in the internet. And last not least we have an - we are engaged in the New GTLDs Auction Proceeds Community Working Group. And this maybe also, well it's a big point of interest of members of us here. Next slide please.

The next block is with regards to reviews. And especially the GNSO review implementation. I put in brackets that is the GNSO review which started in 2014. So we are still in the face of implementing and we have a timeline to

finish that implementation by the end of this year. So you can see it takes five years well to go from the starting point of a review up to that time when it is implemented. Or the recommendations.

So our goal this year well to charter all the recommendations, to cooperate on that way. To determine the right processes, time, and attribute needed and staff if needed to implement those recommendations. And also to support in order to create a port - the IT ports the GNSO Council and the OEC, a committee from the Board.

And that leads us to the next review, which I guess the other - it will start with discussions in this year's that we are going to be prepared for the next review. And as we discussed several times it is our goal -- especially and also (unintelligible) now -- to implement into it, incorporate in that review also a structural review of the GNSO itself.

Last not least, under this item I would also summarize the related processes we have to be faced in the NCPH. We'll come to that later in the afternoon when we have this specific session on NCPH in house issues, which I'm going Chair with Rafik here on that.

That's about board receipts, election as well as, you know, Council, Vice Chair election -- GNSO Council Vice Chair -- nomination. Well this is our too review. It's also in focus from our side. So we are in support of that. With what was started and what was also summarized on Council last week or over this week.

And so a goal should be -- and we are keen on that, we'll too support -- that similar reviews remain fully under the community control in the future. And that we can overcome the situation we had end of last year. Next slide please.

Third block is outreach. We are focusing on areas where we have slow participation. That's what we did in the last years, and we were successful. So we had in 2016 an event in Hyderabad. We had one at the end of last year in Abu Dhabi. (Unintelligible) event and we are planning as well in the event in Barcelona to have a specific ISP CP related event.

So that brought up to - us to a big amount of reactions from and also participation from others which are not familiar -- not yet -- with the - with ICANN, especially of ISP CPs. We are doing this outreach also in specific areas to specific events. Like the so-called MOG-related events. Metro Operating Groups. So they are meant for Operating Groups, which we had also engaged in the Middle East, for Abu Dhabi.

We are going to do that in Moscow in - this year. I think it's - should be in May this year. And so we are close to other Metro Operating Groups in different areas. So because the - they are covering and usually their events are attracting participants from the ISP CP, from the ISP sector. Next slide.

The last one, a now look to the future. But which is also accompanying us throughout various ICANN meetings. Is a view on the future of the technology future which may challenge the DNS in future. And that is especially with regards to new identifier technologies and the IOT -- Internet of Things -- in the future.

So we are following up and follow these developments in various other groups. And when it comes up to ICANN -- so on ICANN levels -- we are going to participate in these development and the related discussions.

The same as applies with regards to finance and budgeting planning. So we are keen on and we have a budgeting team here in our constituency to contribute to the budgeting process and to the budgetary process. So that's in total what we covered this year. If you have any questions, please come up.

Tony Harris: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. The floor is open if anybody has a question. I see somebody in front over there.

Remmy Nweke: Thank you sir. My name is Remmy Nweke again for the records. The Vice Chair Africa Information Society and Information Society. I lead the team at Africa Digital Sense Media. Well my question is I'm a little bit confused and I would like to do some explanation with that.

Initially when I saw the name -- ISP CT -- I was still looking to see what the name is until you started your presentation. And when I went through it I understand it's Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency.

For me -- or for a layman -- I think there's a little ambiguity in the name. Which does not really help in following what the constituency may represent. And that could also bring about conflict of purpose.

So I would like to first of all seek a clear demarcation between Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers. Because some of us -- especially from developing countries -- thought every Internet Service Provider is a Connectivity Provider. So I just wondering why you need the one then. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So also I am the Chair of the Constituency. Well I have more esteemed colleagues here. So they are longer with the ISP CP and know the history exactly. So Tony Harris, please.

Tony Harris: Yes. That's a very interesting question, thank you for that. Actually you can look at it this way.

We ought to connect to the internet through a service provider, you're quite correct. But there are companies that are part of the infrastructure that allows an Internet Service Provider to get to provide service to you as the end user.

And these are companies -- we can call them carriers or they have different names depending on the region -- but they are companies that have, let's say property of the submarine cables for example. Or have satellite facilities. Or they might also be the owners of the backbone, let's say the bandwidth backbone -- the internet bandwidth backbone -- in your country.

And these do not necessarily provide, these companies do not necessarily provide service to the end user. But they provide bandwidth to Internet Service Providers who then provide you -- as the end user -- with the service that you're using. I hope that clarifies your question. Or - unless I misunderstood.

Remmy Nweke: Thank you. That tried to do justice to it. But my concern is the simplicity that name should apply for easy understanding. And probably - because the issue of provider, provider in the name is a bit ambiguous. Thank you, sir.

Man: Tony, you want to go with this?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well -- it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking -- so in fact to just add in, for example so from the past so we have companies -- big companies -- like telecommunication providers.

They used to be the incumbents in former time, you know, for example France Telecom from France. And British Telecom as well as AT and T and others. So and Deutsch Telecom for example. And now over the year they're coming in more with the privatization of these services. And these -- the network structure for example -- they came others in as well in addition.

But all they have in common, they should give access -- they should provide access -- to the Internet. So through any means. So that is the basis of what it makes, well the membership of others - of our constituency. Thanks.

Tony Harris: Any other questions for Wolf-Ulrich? There's one here. Go ahead, please.

Farzaneh Badii: I'm Farzaneh. So I am very interested in the last slide. The IOT new technologies and identifier assistant. What is your position on projects like (DONA) -- you know, (DONA), the ITU thing -- and - oh yes, the company is called - yes, DOA. Digital Object Architecture.

And how the company's called I think (DONA). They work with ITU. Do you think that would go anywhere? What is your position?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So before I hand over to Tony, let me say we do not have a constituency position on that. But we have specialists looking in that. And if it comes up then to the ICANN level so we will formulate a position.

Man 2: Yes, thanks for that. I've certainly been involved in a lot of those debates around that technology. And was interested to see ICANN's assessment of that technology as well.

And certainly the DOA technology's been around for a long time in some form. In a private networking environment -- particularly publishing industry, things like that -- it's ideal for that situation. Unfortunately, the use of that technology was very much the focus within ITU.

And some of the uses that's it's been put forward there -- in terms of dealing with counterfeit equipment, in terms of its role in IOT -- I would share the view that was independently assessed by the ICANN CTO Office. I think there are some significant flaws in that technology. And to promote it in the way that it's been promoted without doing any form of real evaluation of that - - particularly with the management system of that -- there are some real issues around that.

And certainly that's a concern for those of us in the constituency. Because the one thing we do want to see is a really successful implementation of all aspects of IOT. If we hurtle down the (DONA) path in particular, at this stage -- without addressing many of the flaws of that system -- then I think that would be challenging.

So the view we have currently is we don't have a constituency position -- as Wolf-Ulrich said -- but we do have a lot of individual concerns around our members about the promotion of that system.

Tony Harris: Any other questions for Wolf-Ulrich? I think I see Steve over there.

Steve DelBianco: Hey Tony, it's not a question for the ISP CP. It was a general matter of interest to all of the constituencies and stakeholder groups. So I want to hold if there's something else you want to cover for Tony.

Tony Harris: Go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Great, thank you. Steve DelBianco. All of the constituencies and stakeholder groups in this room fought pretty hard to execute the transition, but there were nine little tasks that didn't get completed by October 2016. They're known as WorkStream Two.

You'll hear about one of them tomorrow when (Michael), (Kara Nicolaus), and (Barbara Warner) discuss transparency. But Farzaneh and I -- Farzaneh Badii and I -- wanted to bring to your attention one of the WorkStream Two projects that is applicable to all of us. It was the SOAC Accountability. Our other co-leader was Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

And this was a situation where -- during the transition -- the Board started pushing back. Saying "Well wait a minute, you're trying to hold the Board accountable, but who's holding you accountable? Who's going to make you accountable? Who's watching the watchers?"

This was an exercise that we punted to WorkStream Two but nonetheless we had to complete it. And I think all of our groups will be called upon as the chartering organization to approve the final recommendations. What Farzaneh and I and Cheryl ended up doing was coming up with a list of good practices.

And there's about 30 good practices that we collected from each of you. If you recall we were harassing you for copies of your charter, how do you do

outreach, how do you do transparency, do you have term limits on your officers for instance? Do you have requirements for diversity in your membership?

And we collected all of that in a giant document. It'll be published once again. And then we've asked ICANN to put a website together so that all of these good practices are available. I wanted to let you know that we stopped short of recommending that the good practices be mandatory, they are simply good practices.

We also didn't inquire the ATRT to assess whether they'd been implemented, but we invited these organizational reviews that ICANN organizes every five years, they could look at the degree to which they're implemented.

And then one other area we pushed back hard on was the idea that there be a mutual accountability structure put in place at ICANN. This was proposed by one of the outside experts, who suggested that -- I don't know -- the NCSG could hold the GAC sort of accountable across a round table for whether the GAC was appropriately transparent.

That would have been interesting, right? Or that IPC would impose an accountability question to the contract parties. So we said no. We were not going to recommend that there be mutual accountability. Because we were very clear that the bylaws established the SOs and ACs to be accountable to the membership -- the groups -- that they represent.

So the I - the BC is accountable to the Business Users and Registrants and the interests that they represent through the BC. So vertical accountability, fine. But not horizontal accountability.

And finally there was a recommendation that the review panels or review process -- or IRP -- should that be turned loose that an aggrieved party could bring an IRP complaint against the IPC for something that had happened there? We saw the IRP as a very heavyweight legalistic process. And we felt that the ombudsman was the appropriate place to have a complaint if an aggrieved party felt mistreated by the actions or inactions of a constituency or stakeholder group.

So I'll stop there just to say that I think we have solidarity among the entire non-contract party house -- and I hope we do across GNSO -- to push this across the finish line later this year when the chartering organizations approve these recommendations for WorkStream Two. Thank you.

Tony Harris: Thank you Steve. Actually, I have a final comment and then I'll give Joan and opportunity. I didn't hear any questions on universal acceptance. I'll - guys, this is not an ISP thing. Universal acceptance involves users.

If new GTLD registrations don't resolve the user is going to suffer and not the ISP or anybody else. So there's a lot of interesting a heavy work being done on that for the last couple of years. Christian could probably say a word about that. But I would mention something that which might interest you.

I'm sure the NCSG is interested in social inclusion. Correct me if I'm wrong. Well India has just announced that their intention is to give every single person who lives in India an email address with an IDN - in other words the email address will be based on IDN characters. And every single inhabitant of India will be getting one.

I thought I'd mention that. Do you want to add anything to that, Christian?

Christian Dawson: Sure. I'll simply add that -- and this is Christian Dawson for the record -- that the work of the universal acceptance steering group is not just focused on new GTLD work.

The issues surrounding universal acceptance have gone back to as long as we've had more than three-digit strings. And the work that we are doing I liken to the work being done on other what they call broccoli issues. Like IPv6. Some issues surrounding DNS Sec. All of which groups like the ISP CP -- who man help desks -- are very interested in pushing forward.

So yes, I'm very proud of the work that we're doing and think that it's moving the ball forward beyond the just universal awareness of new GTLDs, which is not a focus of what it is we're doing.

Tony Harris: Thank you Christian. Joan, you have the floor to finish up.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Tony. Excellent everyone for staying on track. If it's okay with everyone I'd like to just introduce (Genge Pende) and (Irola Somadi) from - this is their first visit for NPOC. And I know how I felt when I first was at the intersessional. So if you could give them a hand and yourself, that would be really great. So welcome, both of you.

So we've learned so much. Renata has asked for some key messages and has created a document. So if you have any key messages, please send them to Renata. She is the key person for that. And thank you again. I learned a lot about the other party house. Every time I think of that word I think it's funny. Party house.

Anyway, I do want to point out that we do have our Mr. Xavier Calvez in our presence. And that he'll be around for the next few hours. And so if you have

any questions regarding financing or budget that he's your key person. Would you like to say a quick 30 second anything?

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Just to introduce myself. Thank you for the introduction. I'm very happy to see that you have -- in Further Areas of Interest -- the finance and budgeting planning. I would like that it's a core area of interest rather than a further area of interest, but it's great that you look at this.

It's very important that all the community organizations take time to look at this operating plan and budget. Steve was speaking earlier about GNSO and accountability as part of the new powers that the community has at its disposal.

There is the rejection of the operating plan and budget, but in order to be able to exercise that power the community has to have the ability to understand what is or what is not in the budget, and therefore be able to comment on it.

And only if comments have been submitted but have not been addressed by the organization can the power be exercised. Therefore, there's a requirement to put through comments. And in order to be able to put through comments you need to have a look at it.

Now, there's 198 pages in the documents that we have published about a week ago. It's a lot of documents, but we have tried to structure them in a fashion that has very high level documents if you have limited amount of time and then very detailed documents if you have more time or more detailed interest.

We've tried to cater for either a little bit of time and a little bit of interest or a lot of time and a lot of interest. I know you don't have a lot of time, so I'm

very happy if any of you have looked at the documents that have been published and have any questions. I'm very happy to answer them. I

If you haven't looked at the documents and you would like to participate I'm very happy to try to help you as well. So thank you for your part and for the introduction. And I'm here during lunch if you have any questions or thoughts to share. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Great. Heather, you have a question?

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Heather Forrest for the record. So -- to follow up on the (intimation) that Xavier just made -- I'll remind you all that the way that that power is exercised is through the council. We formed a standing committee and budget and operations.

Ayden has very kindly volunteered to chair that committee. Ayden has reached already to Xavier. And Xavier, we understood in the council session that you were very will -- although the formal deadline for questions has passed -- that you were willing to have those channeled through that committee. And that's - I very much thank you for that opportunity.

So we can all safely not say ignore, but we can all let's say not take the formal deadline for questions too seriously. May I also use this as an opportunity to remind while we're all in the room that the standing committee on budget and operations is open to members of the GNSO community.

And in fact we've had two meetings now and our community folks were not actually on those calls. I'm not sure that it's making its way through the communications channels or food chain, but those folks need to be added to the list. So may I please ask that -- while we're all together and we have

Ayden here -- if you are one of the folks from the community -- or you know of someone from your community who needs to be added to this committee -- could you please reach out to Ayden while you're here?

And the sooner we get that full complement of people together the better, because we really have a very limited period of time. We're dealing with a matter of a few weeks to get that comment done. So if I could seize this as an opportunity to get that happening.

And Ayden, please feel free to be proactive and any communities that you haven't heard from, this is an opportunity at least from our house to poke some of the folks at the table and say are you sending or someone or not? And if so can you please tell them to show up. Yes? Thank you very much.

Joan Kerr: Great. Thank you everyone - oh, one other comment. Quick.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Joan. Xavier, this is Steve DelBianco. Last week Cherine Chalaby -- Chairman of the Board -- was in Washington DC and gave a very top-level message on his priorities as Chair and one of them is financial responsibility.

He suggested that ICANN's revenue growth is leveling off, but at the same time the expense growth has been faster than that. So he talked about some measurable cuts in ICANN's expenditures in the budget ahead.

In an audience of civil society there was real concern about fellowship funding and in an audience of businesses there was concerns about compliance as you might imagine. But do you have a top line, 30-second message on the magnitude of spending reductions that the community should look for in the budget you've just published?

Xavier Calvez: Thank you Steve. You're putting me in tough spot, because I'm right between you and lunch, so I'll try to be quick. And I'm moving here so that I'm not in the back of some people in the back room. Thank you for that.

Yes, Cherine mentioned -- and we are all carrying out similar message -- that -
- and to try to be precise -- ICANN's funding is expectedly stabilizing after a period of really strong growth. Which is very logical because four years ago we had no New GTLD -- the top level domain names -- in the root.

Now we have 1200. And from 0 to 1200 that means a growth of funding for ICANN of \$30 million. Twenty-five thousand dollars of fixed fee for one TLD. Twelve hundred TLDs. It's \$30 million. So four years ago we had zero of that money. Now we have \$30 million per year of that money. But of course we are at the end of delegating new top level domain names in the root. We are at the end of the batch of 1200 or so.

So that number is not going to grow any more. That's one of the drivers of why the funding of ICANN is simply stabilizing at the level that it has had now in 17 or 18. So that's one thing.

ICANN's expenses along the same path over the past few years have also increased a lot. And as we are looking at funding stabilizing the expenses of the organization should also stabilize. There are always factors that make these expenses grow if you - even if you don't do anything different. Inflation is a parameter for expenses growing.

So the budget -- to come back more directly to the question that Steve just asked -- in the FY 19 budget documents that we have published -- sorry -- we have displayed a number of activities or actions that we are taking to ensure

that the budget of the organization is not growing further. So let me take an example.

In FY 19 the ICANN meetings -- locations where we are planning to go that have already been established, chosen, and sometimes contracted with the hotels -- are more expensive locations to be at and go to than those that we have during FY 18. So we're going to Panama. We're going to San Juan.

In FY 19 we're going to go to Barcelona, we're going to go to Kobe. Those locations are more expensive. We don't have more money year on year. We have the same amount of money but we're going to more expensive places. So we need to find ways to simply do some things differently or some things less in order to be able to accommodate that higher cost.

So without going into the details, in the budget there are a number of documents - so from memory, Document Two Page 19. And in the Document Four there's also - there are descriptions of a number of activities that we are suggesting to do less of, and we would like comments on that. Right?

That's exactly the type of things we want comments on. Because if there's a majority of the community that says no, you shouldn't reduce that, reduce something else instead. This is exactly what we want to know. So that then we alter the plan.

Another approach that we've retained is to only plan and budget for -- for example -- implementation of policies that have been approved by the Board and that there is very solid and tangible plans of implementation for. What does that mean?

That means we have less than in the past included in the operating plan and budget. Speculative possible processes of implementation that we don't know exactly what will need to be implemented, we don't know exactly when it will need to be implemented, nor how it will be implemented.

And in the past sometimes we've tried to make estimates of that, stick that into the budget. And of course it never happens in that fashion. So we have refrained from doing that this year. We have a much more clear list of -- for example -- policy implementation processes that have more clear plans. But that also means that we have excluded some others.

So sorry, Steve, to use your help there, but you've mentioned WS Two. So for example, we know WS Two is coming towards the end of its process of recommendation -- sorry -- but we have - we don't yet know what the final recommendations will be. We don't yet know when the Board will approve what recommendations in what format.

There's still community consultation that needs to happen. And of course -- because we don't know all that -- then we don't know what we'll need to implement. As a result, we have not included -- in the FY 19 draft budget -- funds for implementations of WS Two recommendations simply because we feel there is too many questions unanswered as of yet to do so.

Now you would tell me what if? What if these recommendations become well known quickly? They're approved by the Board, there is fast community consultation. And then suddenly there would be implementation that would - that should happen in FY 19.

Well this is why we have a contingency in the budget. We have flexibility in the budget to say there's some funds that is existing, budgeted for, but

unallocated to any specific activities exactly for that purpose. To cater for those activities that need to be done in a given year and were not visible at the time we budgeted.

So that's how we would handle that. I'll stop there and see if there's other questions. Thank you.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Xavier. I think we're ready for lunch, right? Yes. You have a question? Yes. So are we good for having - do we want to continue with these questions? I guess it's everyone. So we want to get lunch and continue with the questions? Yes?

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Yes, that's what I thought. So Xavier, you're going to be around though, right? If anybody wants to ask you a question individually. So I -- as Tony says -- I'm going to make this session closed then so we can have our lunch. Great, thank you very much. Bye-bye.

END