

**Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting**  
**Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) meeting**  
**Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 13:30 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#apr>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Robin Gross: So let's - can we get the meeting started? I apologize for being a little bit late. We had folks here in the room when we were supposed to start. We had to wait for everything to get re-set up again. Do we have people on the phone? Can I get started? Am I okay?

All right, everybody. Welcome. My name is Robin Gross and I'm the Chair of the non-commercial stakeholder group and this is the open membership meeting of the non-commercial stakeholder group.

And let me just very briefly run through our agenda. The first order of business this morning is we've got (Stephanie Parin) here to speak with us and she is a member of the WHOIS expert working group although they don't call it WHOIS. It's called the GTO directory services group. And so this is our opportunity to talk to her about what is happening in this group and what are the objectives and how can we help.

So we'll do that for about half an hour and then we will have another guest from Sally Costerton who is the ICANN staff member responsible for outreach and stakeholder engagement. So we will talk with her for about half an hour

on ICANN's outreach and engagement plans and how we can be involved in that.

And then we can have a more substantive sort of policy issue. A discussion on a growing trend at ICANN to replace the bottom up community policy development process who's talked on staff unilateralism and how do we want to address this. It is something that we've seen in a lot of other meetings this week but I think we should have a plan for how we want to address this.

And then at 1500 to 1530 we will have a visit from ICANN's certain members of ICANN's accountability and transparency review team and it's our chance to talk to them about what they're doing and how we can feed into the process that they're working on as well.

And then we have to break at let's say 1525 because we meet with the board at 1530 in another part of the building so it's going to take us a few minutes to get over there. Yes, (Joy).

Woman: Just a quick (note), can we have some preparation time before that meeting?

Robin Gross: Can we what?

Woman: Can we have some preparation time for the meeting with the Board?

Robin Gross: We can. Yes, I think we can. I think maybe - yes is the answer. And the slot we've got on our discussion on the policy issue on the community we can talk about it then because that's one of the topics that we'll be talking about with the board and then we can also add those other topics in there as well.

Woman: Okay. Great.

Robin Gross: So that's our agenda for today and thank you all for coming. And I apologize. We usually like to go around the room and have everyone introduce

themselves but we just don't have time today. So we will send around a attendance sheet so folks can write down their names and who they represent.

So without further adieu I want to introduce once again our speaker (Stephanie Parin). She is a privacy expert from Canada and one - actually the only privacy experts who's on this working group that's supposed to solve ICANN's privacy problems.

So unfortunately the working group is largely business and intellectual property attorneys and law enforcement and so it is very difficult to get pro-privacy conditions put forward in there. But let me just actually sort of turn it over to Stephanie and I would like for us to be able to ask questions and have a direct interaction so I'll just take a queue also of people who have questions and such.

But first let me just turn it over to Stephanie and tell us a little bit more because I was very very vague on this working group and how it fits into the ICANN picture in terms of the expected outcome of the group.

(Stephanie Parin): Thanks very much, Robin. Okay. Firstly, I am a newbie to ICANN. I went to one meeting in Montreal. I did, when I was working in the private sector of the consultant, do the draft one of the first draft privacy policies for (SERA) up in Canada but I have spent most of my career working on privacy issues in the federal government and access to information and privacy coordinator in government as the director of the private sector law that passed, not the legal director but the policy director as someone working in research and policy in the office of the privacy commissioner.

I am not, however, here in my government capacity. Kathy Kleinman reached me at my normal government job and persuaded me to use my holidays and vacation time in a profitable way volunteering for this committee because obviously I would have to recuse myself from my government function.

I'm on the verge of retirement so I thought what the heck, what's a few week's vacation spent at ICANN. So that's the basis on which I'm here and I must say those few weeks of vacation are disappearing rapidly because this is not, as advertised, a 20 hour a month job. I notice Kathy is not here to feel the brunt of my ire on that score.

So I arrived at this very lately. I do not really fully understand the antecedence to this creation of our group but I gather that the WHOIS directory that has been an issue that has been going back and forth for, by anyone's count, 14 years and that they decided to (strike) an expert group.

And you will see the announcement was made on February 14th on the (news) ICANN main site you'll see all of the members and the announcement of what our purpose is. And it is a very interesting and smart group of people I hasten to assure you. So everyone of course representing a different area of expertise emphasized repeatedly that we do not represent stakeholder groups.

So the effort was to find people who were expert in certain areas and my claim to fame obviously would be data of protection and privacy. So I will tell you a little bit about my personal approach to this. I'm not sure that I can speak for all members of the group.

My personal approach that it would be that it would seem a (do novo) approach is required to this. In other words you have to kind of clear your mind of what exists and get to what the real purpose is. I keep emphasizing to my colleagues that the beauty of data protection, law and principles is that the purpose is key.

So why on earth do we have a WHOIS in the first place? Let's forget the history of how it evolved but what's it there for. In this respect the technical folks who are on that group understand that really well because of course

they're used to the concept of give us the business requirements and we'll build it.

And so I think that works really well as a way that this group is functioning and although I'm the only data protection person there although (Michael Nebo) is on our group and he has long history in the EU and was certainly around for the beginning of the directives. So pretty well aware of what might be involved in terms of the data protection.

But and I think that starting from scratch is an important principle, trying to build for the future is an important principle and trying to understand all the stakeholder requirements is an important principle.

And unfortunately there is pressure - well, you know, what we are hearing is we needed this yesterday and of course there's already been a two-year exercise gathering up the requirements for this.

So it is felt that we don't need yet another committee to study the matter for two years. We need an expert group to recommend a model. And for those of us that haven't been around for the past 10 years gawking at this it's a little bit breathtaking the speed with which we're trying to move.

So my goal in coming today to speak to you - at least one of my personal goals - is to gather up information that I can bring back to that committee. So your business requirements, your policy issues, in my view there seems to be a failure at ICANN in some quarters to understand how easily policy gets built by implementation.

In other words, if I can have a nerdy moment I am trying to quit government and get to my doctorate and that's basically what I'm looking at, social construction of technology.

So I find this fascination the discussion you folks had the other day was it the GSNO, fascinating, fascinating. So I would like to gather up all of the policy issues that you folks consider important and then try to figure out how that translates into business requirements for the construction of the new WHOIS directory. So does that give you a start and could we open the floor to comments and questions which I will dutifully note down here?

Robin Gross: I believe so. We've got Wendy first. Is there anyone else who wants to get in the queue before I give the floor to Wendy? Okay. Go ahead, Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks very much, (Stephanie) and it's wonderful to see you participating actively on the panel. One other bit of history to add to the mix, when the non-contracted parties met in Los Angeles for our intercessional, Steve Crocker talked with us and said that the Board viewed this expert panel and the reclassification from WHOIS toward directory services as a chance to bring into scope the issues of privacy and purpose that has too often been ruled out of scope when we were talking about WHOIS.

We got stalemated frequently when trying to add those privacy issues into the WHOIS discussion. And so wiping the slate clean Steve told us was the way - the board's way of saying we need to consider those issues. So we're encouraged by that. And I wanted to offer that we should find ways for privacy researchers and advocates to put input to the panel and even though you're the only one participating in there directly.

So if you can help to give us heads up when there's an issue under consideration of expert input or factual input that could be helpful please keep an open communication channel.

My particular interests are in free expression and particularly anonymous communication. I think such domain names as I'll say again and again domain names are important to free expression because they can provide stable pointer to online speech.

And so we should demand of them all of the protection that we demand for the speech itself and that means stability, opportunities for privacy, opportunities for anonymity, freedom from undue pressure. And so I think we really should be demanding a system that is capable for all of the privacy protections.

(Stephanie Parin): Thanks and if I could just comment on that. I am trying to develop use cases that would demonstrate the need to have anonymous registration and as you know better than I the concept of anonymous registration is an (unintelligible) to many parties.

And when I - and even when this concept that this wouldn't be out there in the publicly available WHOIS - let's just keep calling it the WHOIS for the sake of gravity rather than the new undecipherable acronym. I want to call it (WHO2) and we have enough copyright lawyers there to take on (bono) when it comes knocking but nobody's going for that so what the heck.

Anyway, those use case scenarios that demonstrate why you need more than just a proxy server because a person who is under a death threat, whether it's because they're a secret agent, a human rights worker in a hostile environment, a (armored) elected victim in the latest election that has fled the country and is now doing political propagandizing, a journalist dropped down in enemy territory, all of those use cases, any you can give me is much appreciate because those are the kinds of arguments I need to sort of place that stake in the ground.

And I have been consulting my (techie) colleagues at the table who are delightful I must say and I have a number of questions about the construction at IATS and I've been assured that that will be a complex enough system that it will be able to encompass such a thing as synonymous credentials to validate a truly anonymous registration.

And so technically I have great confidence that there's a way of building it. I do understand that of course you still got to deal with traffic data and all of these sorts of things if you're protecting identity but that's a whole other problem.

And another thing I would encourage you to - one of the exercises I'm going through kind of privately is sorting the policy issues. Okay. Which ones don't belong within the (unintelligible) of ICANN either by my estimation or their own and in that case then whose job is it.

So a question of having worked sort of peripherally in this area and had the pleasure of going to the (GA) conferences when I was in the private sector what's the due process regime for - well, for criminal law enforcement, why the lack of clarity at this point in time over what's a cyber crime and what's a what I would call a (meet space) crime that is facilitated by the use of the Internet.

You know, these were arguments that we were having back at the end of the 90s. It's not by using a telephone in the middle of doing a bank robbery that becomes a telecommunications crime, right? So that lack of clarity doesn't seem to have trickled down over the years.

Milton Mueller: If ICANN were in charge of telephone design they would try to find a way to make sure that the phone was designed in a way that you could not use it in a bank robbery.

Robin Gross: Do we have any other questions here? Yes, Milton?

Milton Mueller: So probably these are ignorant questions in the sense that I should just probably read the charter of your directory services group. But I'm just curious as to what the heck do they mean by wiping the slate clean? What do they mean by - there was this review team that you're building on, right?

So the review team was supposed to have done certain things and made certain recommendations and then we have the GNSO to develop policy. So what exactly is this committee supposed to do? I just don't think I have a handle on it. Is it supposed to be the equivalent to the STI that's sort of extra (ultraverous) policy making progress where we settle all the disputes in a special committee and then gives you a full blown proposal like the strawman proposal? What is it exactly?

(Stephanie Parin): Excellent questions, Milton. And ones that I of all the members I'm probably able to answer because I've asked the same questions myself. Okay, you had a two-year process of good report with a number of recommendations. When I say that we are encouraged to wipe the slate clean, that's language from the facilitator. It's (not) in our enabling charter if we have one.

Our goal is to look at the report that was done and make recommendations which will be then taken to a PDP to build this thing apparently. Why an expert group had to be struck, I think that's an excellent question for council and I hear that they're hearing from constituents later today so that's what you call a (punt).

Robin Gross: I think the WHOIS review team was confined by its charter to looking at the existing WHOIS and all of the restrictions around it as the solution to the problem. So while there may have been good things in that report I don't think it was overall a good report on where we should go in the future and it was confined by accuracy and must display all this stuff and it never got to consider privacy at all.

(Stephanie Parin): Thanks. That really helps me. I wish I had talked to you two months ago. It is difficult because you don't really know where to start in this and being of course the newbie I'm asking all the annoying questions like for instance there was a discussion at one of these sessions I was at the other day about - oh, I guess it was our session. I remember being there.

Yes. I think it was one of the board members whose name I'm going to forget at the moment who said, you know, basically isn't a land registry or is it a motor vehicle license domain name.

Well, that's kind of a fundamental question if you're constructing a registry and you're trying to figure out which elements belong in the registry, is it a land registry or motor vehicle registry and is it a right or is it a privilege.

My own position is we are constructing for the future and everyone is doing everything on the Internet including government then you can hardly say it is a privilege and you can hardly make the argument that you don't really need a domain name to function on the Internet. You can go and blog on Blogspot or something or you can get a Facebook page.

Why should an individual be forced into a private sector solution you should be able to get into name and run your own show in my view. That's only my view.

Robin Gross: I'm enjoying this conversation across the table (unintelligible). An example that comes to my mind is the whole saga around Wiki (leaks) in the pressure that they were pretty under and the pressure all of their providers of services were put under when the diplomatic cables (leaked) and (belaborment) came out arguing that not only should their hosting providers be held in contempt but their domain name registry and registrar and their payment providers and the more different people you have to depend on for provision of services and the more different people that claim they offered yearly licenses rather than transfer of ownership I think the more tenuous our speech rights are.

So I am 100% behind you that we shouldn't be putting ourselves in reliance of loss of third parties to uphold these rights. Is the microphone working?

Man: (Unintelligible) 10,000 pages in the archives since the last 10 years this discussion in ICANN. And I have sometimes the feeling we are dealing

circling around and round and round this without any real focus. And I think the time its more than right that somebody goes and this is a new start and here we have very clear things. And we have this debate even government's are very split. It's good to hear that (Michael Nebo) is there but the U.S. seems to argue article 20 movement clearly important body. (Susan) has (sworn it) just an advisory body and my working group is saying that's irrelevant. So we have a conflict between governments when it comes to this issue and this makes your life even more complicated.

(Stephanie Parin): I should just say that I have been a painful participant and in the eyes of many on this because I have encountered a lack of awareness that for instance the article 29 group is not just on an advisory body that is mandated by European directives. I mean, it is constituted under Article 29, hello, and the Article 31 group, the response to that is the government group also similarly constituted under the directive.

Now what happens in the future of course I'm not up-to-date on that. I'd welcome a little quick update because I haven't had time. But yeah I think that I also dragged people through a discussion of the refusal to deal clause which cost me a year and several quarts of blood when we were drafting the Canadian legislation which basically that refusal to deal clause since you cannot refuse an individual a service if they refuse to give more information than is strictly necessary for the provision of that service and that is defined in the purpose.

So I think that's rather critical to the WHOIS discussion. What critically required for the provision of the service of giving a name? And then there are of course layers. Obviously the registrar paid but that's not the same as what the registrars are obliged to put into the WHOIS. Right?

And I am still continually mixing up registrars and registries and the way the domains are segregated here and who does what. So please excuse me if I use the wrong I or E here. But basically it falls what goes out there in the

public record here and it is. Of course I'm giving you my personal views as a data protection (airquotes) for those on the line experts here because our committee has not made public pronouncements all of this. I can really only talk freely about what I'm saying. And if you have other views please, you know, feel free to yell at me and contradicts me because I'm not necessarily correct. I'm just telling you what my position that I'm advancing is.

Robin Gross: Okay thank you and in the queue I've got Avri and then KK. Sorry and then Konstantinos and then the other KK, Kathy Kleinman.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. I am really actually sure I am really actually glad this is happening because as early as 2007 people were already writing I think were using directory services but the fact that the tools were not complicated enough or complex enough to accommodate the notion of policy that we needed.

I wanted to go back to one thing though and it's a discussion I constantly find myself and you seem to be comfortable with it which is that notion is that because the government and all these things may make Internet access a human right or right, having the notion of being able to register for a domain name, not having that same and because I sort of live in both the at large where the philosophy is users have rights of access but there's no right to registration, and here where there kind of is a presumption to the right of registration, but I always feel that we are hand waving when we argue that there is a right to registration.

And I always feel like I am sort of arguing from quicksand when I do it that I don't have a firm footing. So it sounded like you felt there was a firm footing in that right to registration and I don't - I'd be happy if you told me how I have that.

(Stephanie Parin): I'm only giving you my view and what I'm expressing. And in my view since it's hard to predict what shape e-commerce will take in the next 20 years, how

necessary it is. If you are looking at the full suite of democratic rights that we hold dear surely this comes into and, you know, unfortunately I should have memorized the U.N. charter by now but I haven't so isn't this the right to own property, you know? It seems it sits in that.

And this of course will be considered to be well outside the domain of what we're supposed to be doing in this committee but I think it's a very interesting discussion from a policy perspective to have because nobody's really defining this for ICANN.

I guess I can fix it some way about what's within a certain restriction but at least you have to allow if you're building something in my view you cannot construct something that implicitly by its very construction makes a decision as to whether something is a right or whether it isn't. You have to be neutral unless you're prepared to embrace the policy. So I'm just being nerdy there for a minute. Does that answer your question?

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'd be happy to quote Article 17 from now on. Thank you.

(Stephanie Parin): Okay.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So Konstantinos?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Thank you, Robin. I am very very pleased to see there's work doesn't in this area and for you being here. Very briefly I was wondering whether the team in talking the duration the work that is being of the views of other organizations. I know for a fact that the country of Europe has a privacy committee which is looking amongst other things WHOIS issues.

(Stephanie Parin): No. I didn't know that.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes. I mean, ICANN and they're also looking into more than privacy aspect but they're also - there's also the WHOIS (unintelligible) and I

know that because I was at a different committee and we were updated by them. So was wondering whether you are speaking to them or any other body for that body for that matter who is looking.

(Stephanie Parin): No, and I would love a contact so that I could reach out to them because there has been a certain amount of reaching to the data protection commissioners and to the Berlin group. Robin certainly gave that a try. I think it's late in the game to add another person on the committee but that doesn't mean that we don't want to hear the latest input and to prepare them to respond when this thing comes out.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes, I mean, exactly. I just at least to be some sort of solicitation in some years of exchange. If it's okay, I'll let you know, thanks.

(Stephanie Parin): Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay. Next in the queue is Kathy Klein. Can someone give her a microphone? And then we're going to have to cut it off after Kathy and Stephanie responds because our next guest is here. Go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Klein: First I apologize for being late and second I just wanted to thank Stephanie for stepping into an amazingly complicated, difficult, massively time consuming expert working group. And she brings an immense background. I know you introduced her, Robin, I'm sure of it.

And if people here don't know in the last few months you've been to Los Angeles, London, now Beijing. It's a huge amount of work and I can't imagine the work you do without the balance of Stephanie's expertise and understanding and thought on definitions and structures that has been missing - not missing but incomplete from the debate for so long. I'm so glad the WHOIS discussion now grounded in law and experts and people who wrote the law.

Stephanie was the keynote of our WHOIS conference in Vancouver in 2005 so thank you. I'd love to see a round of applause because she is just (unintelligible).

(Stephanie Parin): You make me feel very bad because before you got here I was blaming you for telling me this was 20 hours a month of work so I'm humbled.

Robin Gross: All right. I want to second everything that Kathy just said. And thank you. Thank you so much. Let us know if at any time if there's anything we can do to help you in the work that you're doing because we really want to support you and contribute to this process and we will come up with this need use case scenario for why we need anonymous domains and such and get that back to you. So thank you again.

(Stephanie Parin): Perfect. And by all means obviously as I complained earlier, Kathy has my number but so does Robin and if any of you think of anything feel free to email me and give me your contact. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay, moving on to new agenda. The next speaker is Sally Costerton. She is ICANN's staff member responsible for outreach and (unintelligible) engagement, and so we thought this would be a good opportunity to talk with her about ICANN's outreach and (unintelligible) engagement plans and how can we contribute to that. So let me just sort of turn it over to you if you want to get this started here and then we'll take a QA session if you just want to get...

((Crosstalk))

Sally Costerton: I do have stuff at 3:45 just...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: Okay.

Sally Costerton: Otherwise the business (unintelligible) will be coming in here to rattle me out.

Robin Gross: Maybe I should just keep going.

Sally Costerton: Thank you very much for inviting me. It's very good to be here: this is my second ICANN meeting and it's notably different from my first, which mostly felt like I'd fallen down a hole and joined a cult by accident without an exit door. And now I just know that that's true. I spent the last six months simply validating that initial assumption. But this has been - the last - since the last meeting I've been focusing intently on two or three things - well, many things but they're in two or three areas which I think will be helpful. So what I'll do for just a few minutes is explain to you how we're approaching this.

I'm going to make a couple of - well, one big caveat, which is that this is all going on as we speak. So it's in real-time: new things are coming on all the time that we have to accommodate. There's quite a lot of internal changes going on in the way that we're structuring the team ICANN on the staff side. So there's a bit of building the plane and flying the plane at the same time: that's one caveat.

The other thing which I wanted to just mention - which is not a caveat but kind of a addressment, motion - is my team and the PPC, which is our board committee that oversees activity or partner to this in activity are cohosting an open meeting on Thursday morning between 11:00 and 12:30, and I'm going to remember where the room is in a second - it's a big one, it's the auditorium where we had the opening ceremony, I think.

And we will - any of you in this room who are part of the community outreach group already you probably know about this meeting and you've been on the mailing list. But anybody that's not part of it but is interested in community outreach we will do three things in that 90 minute session. The first thing we will do is I will give a very brief interview, so if you're in this meeting you can

perhaps not turn up for that bit. I will - I've asked all my colleagues - even ones that don't work in my team - do be part of this group, so people like - but who are very involved in engagement, because they get asked to do things like Jeff Moss.

On the security side we do a lot of DNSX community, for example the digital guys will be there, David Olive will be there. There's a very high level of overlap in terms of what David's team does - not in terms of policy but in terms of engaging with (unintelligible) structures - and what my team needs to do. And I've also asked Xavier, our CFO, and David and Xavier will address the group very briefly - literally: no slides, just a brief address - after me, just in David's case to give an overview of how this all fits together as we're doing things at the moment.

So the external relationship, if you like, inside the community. And Xavier I've asked to give an overview of where we're at in the budget process: most of the issues that come up to staff or many of the issues that come up to staff in the community on outreach issues are about budget, so not necessarily the budget process itself but what we should with this, what we do with websites.

And then we'll go into four facilitated groups. So if you come to the session if you have a strong preference I'll tell you what the groups are now. If you don't have a strong preference (Janis) will give you a number at the door, 1, 2, 3 or 4 and be part of that group. And we will facilitate half our discussion with the most important thing: across community groups the most important thing that this group feels we should focus on in this particular area in order that we can take out of that meeting eight really key initiatives, so the most important thing and the 'nice to haves.'

So that's - I would say there's 80 initiatives that we can really work on together - and maybe some of them by self, maybe none of them by self, some by the community and we'll have a rough-up discussion about next steps. And this is very much carrying on from the work that (Kurt) did with the

original community outreach group. The core group which we did on debate and some of you were in on the call that we had to discuss this - which was very helpful - one on, I would say, things that you like to collateral: websites, music, letters, PowerPoint decks, all those kinds of things.

One on things that you go to, so events, training like DNSX, workshops, speaker groups panels and things we're invited to, events this size. The third will be digital tools, digital platforms: so everything from really how we're engaging when we're working online, giving you a bit of insight into how we're planning to change that - and I'll give you some of that in a second - or to expand it. To compliment what we have already: not to change it but to compliment it.

And then finally some of you will have been involved in the creation - which precedes me - my arrival - of a measurement model, which was referred to some people colloquially as the 'waffle iron model,' which turned out to be confusing on the call because I thought everyone knew what this was and it turns out that they didn't. But it's a very simple kind of adoption model, measuring participation, engagement, as we recruit or grow members in the different parts of the community and the different parts of the world.

So that model is a super model but it doesn't have any data in it: it stops before that happened. So we'll have one group looking at how are we going to populate that model: what should we do, what's the right way to look for ways we could do it? So we'll run a discussion on, you know, what's the view of this eclectic group as to what we should do.

At the end 30 minutes we'll ask each group facilitator to share those number one and number twos from each group so everyone can hear. We'll have remote dial-in: we can't put Adobe into each of the workgroups so we'll - we can, but we can only do it in chat. And we'll then - but the whole session will be happening remotely, so that part's belabored but I think it'll be important that you know that we're doing that.

Now the reason we're doing that primarily is to get a better rhythm and a better understanding between what the staff are doing and the community are doing. Most of them are the same things, so we don't get in each other's way, but there's a high-level where we're more joined up, we're more sharing understanding of what we think is important, what gets results properly, whether that's by people or by dollars. It doesn't mean you won't do other things, by the way, apart from the eight, but it's a prioritization exercise and trying to do that in a collaborative way so that everyone feels that they've had their say. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks, Wendy Seltzer. And I guess I have a question. It sounds like an interesting exercise. I wonder about using it as a prioritization when it's sort of those who show up are involved and how do you play that against the other ways that the community balances stakeholders and tries to ensure that it's hearing from all of the different parts in developing priorities?

Sally Costerton: That's quite a point. Well, the two things I would say to that - well, three. Firstly I think we need to discuss that as we go along for sure. I don't think we should view that as an absolute or a final view. We should - there's no reason to my mind why the result of this discussion shouldn't be published. I don't know that I'd put it out to public comment: you know, this is implementation, not policy for sure, but certainly there's no reason we shouldn't share that on a blog and make sure that the community is aware of it and can come in and comment and have reviews. So that is absolutely fine and (unintelligible).

Secondly we'll make sure we will have remote participation in the room. So - and we have done our very best to promote this session to the best of our ability, so we really hope that anybody who is interested is either here in person or on the phone. And we have - again, to the best of our ability, and it's not perfect - tried to make it in a nonconflicted slot. Not perfect, but it's the best that we could do.

The final thing, I'd say, is that many of the ideas have come from the work that had already been done by this group with (Kurt). Most of this is not new. But what has happened is that it has stalled. So this is - and it was also in a different sort of - different staff fit in ICANN, without wishing to be so non-technical about it. So once it became obvious to me that this work - which I had not previously been aware of, to be frank - once it became obvious that this great work had been complacent when I reviewed it with Wendy and (Janis), I kind of needed some advice.

I mean, it was obvious to me to join these two things together as quickly as we can, and the first opportunity to do that is here at Beijing, so hopefully we can - and I can - and if this model works, if this works - that's an 'if,' we've never done something like this before, it's an experiment, it might be chaos, I hope it isn't - then I think it would - I would love to run something similar every meeting. And there's no reason that this community outreach group should not become more engaged on an ongoing basis if people want it. And so that - I hope that puzzled.

Robin Gross: Okay. Could we maybe get a queue going: (Klaus), anyone else? Alan? Okay, and who's that? (Joy), okay.

Klaus Stoll: All right. So first of all this is an absolute pleasure to be able to finally to talk to you. And I apologize in advance that what I'm to saying might be a little bit on the long end but I'll try to keep it under three minutes. First of all I think we've got a fundamentally different understanding of the word 'outreach' or the direction where outreach should go. I think a large number of the (unintelligible) stakeholder group is seeing what (Rich) has described, more or less, as 'inreach' -- it's strengthening existing people who are engaged or stakeholders of ICANN.

Now what I think is for us a very high priority - because it is essential and the basis of a multi-stakeholder model - is that we need to start outreaching to the general public. That is something where I think our emphasis is - for

example, the emphasis of input. And I think also the emphasis you see is going in the same direction, in the near future is happening.

I'll give you two examples from (Enbrook). One is an initiative that we started called (unintelligible), where we trying basically to get all of the stakeholders who have an interest in informing the general public about internet government together and to bring all the different forces together and the different strengths together and establish some programs. Because the frustration with the multi-stakeholder is - and the danger of the multi-stakeholder model is - that internet government in a country where 1% of the people rule for 99% of the people and 98% of the 99% don't even know that the 1% exists.

And that's - that is the point where for example one of the outreach attempts of this - of inform, hopefully as concrete as possible: for example you get something like a six-part series on internet governance going in the BBC (unintelligible). Just very quick, there is one meeting in the Hague on the ninth of May, there is a meeting on this in at the (unintelligible) in Geneva, it's a big afterwards. And we are also looking at a conference in - later this year, a largish, probably in Africa.

And the second thing we are talking about is, for example, the problem is that - and it's all our problem - that we don't have enough GTLD registration in developing countries. And the problem is not that there is no interest in Africa, for example, for the creation of media. It is quite simply a business model, not a sustainability model in there. If we, you know, if people in Africa would know how to make it financially work they would register.

And, for example, coming out of the developments of this we have this model. For example, the planning for the in October conference is 100 entrepreneurs in Africa just simply to explain to them what opportunities the GTLD in the second round will offer and explain to them available business models. So

hopefully - and when just a few of them go into the second round, our work is done.

That brings me to the last point: thank God it's my last point. We don't as staff need to do everything on our own. There is a lot of help. There is a lot of initiatives where you simply can fall back on. There is not the expectations from the community to go out there and do it. There is also no expectation that you engage in what you are doing and (unintelligible) lots of stuff: all we are doing for you are (unintelligible). That is all, thank you.

Sally Costerton: Thank you: that's all extremely helpful. And because we have a very short time here - and I wanted to explain to you the meeting on Thursday - what I haven't done is tell you what our strategy is. But you've actually hit on quite a few key points, so thank you for that. The meeting on Thursday is not an expression of our outreach strategy. The meeting on Thursday is an engagement meeting that we want to have with the community to have some very specific things, that do allow us, by the way, to meet to some extent your third point.

It's the first staged engagement for my whole staff team with everybody that we can drum up from the community that wants to talk about this to make sure we're all in the same place at the same time having the same conversation. Sounds very basic, but it's actually I think it's really important, because I'm totally with you, actually, on everything you that - and I couldn't agree with you more that making - actually making it possible for the staff and the community to A, understand what's going on, inform each other and B, help each other in the right way. I think we actually need to spend a bit of face time to get the level set. And I think we can do that on Thursday. If it goes well what will of course happen is we will go "Wow, we need to do a lot more of this," which is kind of - which is a good thing. I hope that's what will happen.

Now to your point about the overall strategy - and this is a subject of a much longer discussion - but - so my team is not just focusing on assisting the community. It will be on Thursday, but it's an overall. Far from it: the reason I came to ICANN - and this sounds a bit pretentious, but - was kind of to help ICANN engage with the next (unintelligible). I mean, no, seriously, I want to be super-clear about that. The second reason I came was to try and bring some international and kind of higher-profile skills and bring together and communications, engagement, participation, some of the tools, and try to bring this together in a much more logical siloed way.

So the second big initiative - you know about the internationalization piece, because Friday's talk was extensively about it. But if you want - if, for example, your (Iform) initiative - which I think sounds great - definitely, if you haven't already spoken to (Nigel) about that, please do. And he will want to help you and he should help you and he should at least know what's going on, okay?

The - so they - for those who of you who want to engage regionally - and I know that is not everyone in this group, I do understand that - it is absolutely the job of the Regional Vice President to work at a regional and even eventually I hope at a national level to work with the community like I was going to say a mini-ICANN. I do not mean that in a full sense, I mean that in an engagement sense, in a participation sense. That would be my longer-term vision. So there is a blend of staffers and volunteers using our bottom-up model, extremely - explicitly pushing out across the world over time. If I could wave a magic wand tomorrow I would do that like that.

But I can't which leads me to my third point which speaks very much I think to what you were saying: so how are we going to - if we want to bring new people into ICANN, how are we going to do it? Now some of it is being practical about what we're doing already and doing it better. And that's kind of what we're touching on Thursday: it's a little bit, but it's better than nothing.

But the real way we're going to do it is we are going to do it is we are going to need to create a proper engagement strategy which due to - and this is my view - should use the focus - and I know it's not the right word - and push the audience focus, consumer focus, registrar focus, individual focus, you know what we mean. Internet user focus which helps them go on a journey from the very, very beginning where they are the 98% who do not know that they 1% exists - I love that, I'm going to quote you on that - because you're dead right. You're dead right. That's the big challenge.

And I'm working at the moment - and I'm working on one of those at the moment - you'll see, if you're interested in that, come to the digital tool session on Thursday, because we're going to focus on that issue then. Looking at - and I'm getting some help from people who've put large government departments online because we got in the shoes of public participation, issues of participation and government.

Huge question marks: how are we going to put the right content on the platform? How do we make those platforms work asynchronously as well as synchronously? How do we fill and knock on the heads of the language issue? Big strategic question: how long is it all going to take? How much is it going to cost? What are the priorities? The goal being six concentric circles: so we're right on the outside and we know nothing.

So there's this awareness raising issue, an explanation issue is the next line in. Why should I care? The next circle in from that is what should I know? Okay, you've piqued my attention, what do I need to know? How do we help the user take themselves on a journey, educate themselves as they go on that journey to the point where they might then say how do I participate?

And even then it might not be straight to policy-making. It might be to join a group: it might be to be a part of this group or these groups. That where it kind of ties together with the recruitment objective that you have. So I think being the difficult thing as ever with ICANN is trying to be very clear about

what the task is that we're trying to achieve, so we don't get so lost in the weeds of execution before we actually solve the problem that we never get to solving the problem.

So that's a very kind of - let me just say one more thing. If I never - if I did nothing else in time at ICANN but crack that issue, that journey issue, I would feel that my work was done. Because I think it is the most important thing that my team and we - and this part of our lives at ICANN. That everyone wants the same thing. I know they do, right across the community -- it's how do we make that happen? They're trying to get the right tools and press in place that the community's engaged with and sort it out and probably with good communication: that's where I'm at right now. So I hope that's helpful. Sorry, Robin...

Robin Gross: No, not at all.

Sally Costerton: ...but I kind of did that in the wrong way around. I should have said that bit first.

Robin Gross: Great, thanks. Okay, let me move along in the queue. We've got Alan, then (Joy), then Kathy, and then Rafik? Anyone else? And if I could ask you to keep your remarks somewhat brief because we don't have a whole lot of time and Sally does have a deadline that she has for another meeting. So okay, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, Sally, for this presentation. We will be there and since you've last looked we've put a pause in the oven - the waffle oven package. We did a 2013 outreach plan, so it wasn't meant to fit into the call but I think it pretty much fits in the call. So that's what we did.

Sally Costerton: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: We already have a contribution, at least one.

Sally Costerton: Great.

Robin Gross: Great, thank you very much. (Joy)?

Joy Liddicoat: Thank you, thanks Sally. And yes, really great to see the enthusiasm and energy for the work that you're doing and that your office is doing. I know that the noncommercial sect of the group had a particular interest in this, particularly, you know, as a group that advocated in the new African guiding process, having financial support from developing countries. And that being very, very actively resisted for quite a long time, and now, you know, it's the benefit of hindsight, people saying, 'gosh, we probably should have done more of it.'

So I think, you know, we're obviously fully supportive of it. I think in terms of innovation I would encourage you to think about - particularly in the regional offices that ICANN is setting up - you know, taking some of the noncommercial people with you to those so that the faces of the community that you're trying to encourage in reflects those who already there and who want more. And also to think of it literally and connect more with some of the networks, for example (unintelligible) networks, internet governance networks, where naturally there are some synergies to be made. So thank you for that.

Robin Gross: Great, thank you very much. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. I wanted to tell everybody that I love so much what Sally is doing. For so long we were secret: people didn't know. So forget the second million users: the first million users still need to know what we're doing and the outreach is amazing. I hope I'm not breaking any confidentiality but I called Sally to talk about what we do after people get interested. So you talked about the questions: what is ICANN, what is ICANN doing? And when you get to the question 'what can I do?' and people - I urged her to - you

know, we talked about what do you do when someone gets so interested they say 'what can I do?'

And it's very difficult. You don't participate directly in ICANN: you participate through stakeholder groups and constituencies. And so, you know, we talked about that, how to feed people through and it may take a while but into our stakeholder group. To help us make policies so we don't have three people, you know, doing all the working groups. So this is our future. And I wanted to be sure to say that I was glad that Alan spoke - because otherwise I was going to volunteer you to speak - about the constituency outreach efforts here.

And I wasn't sure if you've met (Ed), who's the head of our outreach and engagement effort in the noncommercial constituency. But I've told him to contact - that I thought you guys should spend some time together. He's got amazing ideas and amazing outreach to regions in areas where we barely have representation, including from Russia. And he drafted my son to head a (unintelligible).

So there's a lot that's going on here and it's all in the same direction and energy. So thank you and hopefully we can coordinate efforts and resources.

Sally Costerton: Well, I know I'm going to have to go in a minute but thank you for your kind words, Kathy and I would reciprocate. You did have a very good discussion and it really helped shape my thinking. And when I went back to the group - the strategy group that I've just been describing on the digital engagement strategy - I'll tell you what I think she met my standards. Kathy said to me "I'm a bit worried that you're not going to have meetings anymore."

Just Kathy I wanted to say this because I want you to know that it's really important that you said that to me. Because it had never occurred to me that people might think that we weren't going to have meetings, but it was such a great observation. And it really helped me when I was going after we spoke. It

coincided a few days later, I had a session with the team and I said - I didn't name you - but I said, "I've had this conversation and it was very thought-provoking both in terms of what you've just described, at the stage of the process, but also remembering that however well-intentioned, sitting in a room somewhere saying 'we need to solve this problem, this is the obvious way to us' just assuming that certain things are obvious and given is extremely dangerous." And that was extremely helpful, so it's reciprocated. And I'm very glad to meet you and I look forward to seeing more of you.

Robin Gross: Thank you. And then Rafik has the last...

Rafik Dammak: I have the last one? That's good. Thank you, Sally, for the presentation. I think I'm going to (unintelligible) what some people said. I think it's the most important for you to engage groups who are already involved with you to participate more and I want to highlight that when the leadership or high council of some countries, it's not just the facility operator or the (unintelligible) industry or the government but also to care about the (unintelligible) aside and try to meet them, even if it's really a short meeting. I think you understand what I am talking about.

I was really frustrated in the time I could meet you: it was under quite a strange condition but I think if you developed some rule of conduct when you go somewhere to avoid to go in some political (unintelligible) political to try to meet everybody who are operating and not just the first stakeholder because calculate them you are talking about (unintelligible).

Sally Costerton: It's very good feedback and we've had this discussion before, which is why we're looking at each other. The - one of the things that - I'm not really going to apologize but I'm going to explain and I think you will probably all see this. You know, we are moving quickly in terms of trying to get things done at ICANN and so when Fadi in particular is moving around and doing his bit, he is also learning and we are learning as a team what the right kind of -- what's the right word, not 'etiquette,' that's not quite the right word -- but it is what

you say. It's an appropriate kind of rhythm of meetings that you're having with the stakeholder groups as you go around the world. And where it's all possible, that is what you do.

I would just make one point, which is occasionally we may have to fit in things at very short notice because there's a very specific reason why we're in a country to see a specific person. So it isn't actually a 'country visit' if that makes sense. It's like just a meeting, which physically involves getting into a plane to Argentina or Spain or wherever, because that happens to be where the meeting is. So - but I am very conscious of A, the fact that it's not just Fadi but the rest of the senior leadership team should want to engage right round the stakeholder group in different countries.

This is part of internationalization and the only way in which we are going to build the relationship to back to what (Joy) was saying at a country and regional level with the right community and the individuals who are on the ground as community members who we need to really make part of - I hate to use the word 'team,' because I know it sounds like corporate, but I can't think of another word - part of our community kind of engagement activities, if that's more comfortable.

Because at the end of the day it is about individuals who are prepared to volunteer and prepared to connect. And we have to make those relationships: we have to connect with them and then we have to deliver them on the ground, and you can't do that if you don't go out and meet people. I mean, it's obviously true.

So I would give you my commitment that we - that I hear that and we learned a good lesson in Japan - which, thank you - Fadi, if he was here, would say "I learned a lot from you." But it's true: we did, you know, and it's an important lesson. But I would also ask you to be - to portion to the fact that Fadi is now getting - and not because he really wants it, frankly, as he said he'd like for ICANN to get less interesting.

The reality is for whatever reason Fadi is becoming better known, certainly in the community. And when he does get somewhere, gets off a plane, there is sometimes just an automatic expectation that everybody kind of can just jump in. Which is why we ended up having a meeting at 10:00 at night or whatever it was, which is never ideal.

So we'll - I want you to know that the understanding is here and the intent will always be here but not everything is long enough for us to see everybody in one day. I'm going to have to go or I'm going to get into serious trouble. I really look forward to seeing as many of you as want to on Thursday. And I really appreciate discussion: you're a very important part of the community for many reasons and I feel very strongly that our process of really outreach it won't be lead only by this group but I think you're a very important voice.

And I hope that, you know, we'll all be working together a lot more closely and developing some of these issues and as we go - now we've done more of the sort of central building of things, so I think we're really much rather want to implement. So I've got to go.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Thank you very much: I really appreciate your coming today to speak with us. Go ahead (unintelligible).

Man: I just - before the next thing I wanted to pass on from the online chat, he wasn't able to say it at the time due to a connection clear but (unintelligible) wanted to say that he strongly supports anonymous registration who is on that item and just to let you know that he (unintelligible) internet ownership countries, anonymous who is very important. Now that I've done my comment, thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much. Okay, so last thing on our agenda: we've got an opportunity to talk about the issues that we will be speaking with the board about today, or at least some of them. We came up with our list of topics to

suggest to the board but we haven't received the board's list of topics they want to discuss with us yet. Usually we get that about a day or two before the meeting but I have yet to receive it. So I don't know what the board wants to talk to us about but we know what our issues are and (Dave's) going to put that up on the projector in a moment.

But the first issue is the issue of the replacement of the bottom-up multi-stakeholder development process with staff unilateralism. And so that was an issue that we wanted to raise with the board as well, when we meet with them today. So let's start there and let me open up the queue. I know - because we've talked a lot about this this week, so I don't think I need to lay it out, but I want to hear what you guys have to say and what you want to say to the board on this issue. So let me get a queue going. I've got Rafik and then Wendy and then Alan and that will get us started. Okay, go ahead Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: I was just wishing how will we do that? We will...

Robin Gross: Could you speak up a little bit?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry. How we will proceed? How we will proceed? If we will have someone for each topic, or...

Robin Gross: I think - yes, I think that's right. Once we talk about it in here I think we'll get a sense for - if we don't know yet, some of these issues, who we want to sort of be our primary or out first lead to discuss it with the board. But of course everyone is welcome and encouraged to speak. But before we leave this room we will make sure that we have at least one person who will be the primary discussor or the initial discussor for these topics. Okay, so Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Wendy Seltzer. Let's see, looking at the topics: if we - I guess I might refrain the 'who is privacy in the new directory services?' and maybe drop that one down because just as a thank the board for convening the new directory services discussion and open up to - we'll look forward to coming

back as that starts reporting back in. Or did we put that on the agenda to note our concerns that there weren't more privacy experts on the panel and to reflect some suggestions that the panel consult with outside privacy experts?

And I just didn't remember...

Robin Gross: Yes I mean I think it was just sort of raising this issue with the board once again. Letting them know they we're still concerned.

That we still want these kinds of privacy protections and - on this working group or we're concerned there isn't enough there. And okay.

Wendy Seltzer: So let me then suggest that we frame it as we understand that this is a new look at the domain registration data and that it's important to get privacy considerations in - at the ground floor so we invite the group to use creative questions and outreach to the privacy experts in the community to get privacy input there.

On the other subject I'm particularly interested in the new gTLDs and registrant rights. We understand now - I'm given to understand that the RAA is basically an agreement in principle at this point.

Of course we haven't seen even the principle of the document much less the language. And so we - I've been preparing a draft registrant rights appendix to replace the really anodyne Registrant Rights and Responsibilities document that was - is currently attached there.

I would love it if we were prepared to submit a letter to the board before we leave Beijing because from the timeline I've heard the board is going to be asked on April 20 to approve the registrar accreditation agreement.

Council I would like to have for council to say we must at least review this document. But from the noncommercial stakeholders group it would be great

as we represent noncommercial registrants of domains to say registrants' rights are not merely the right to know the terms of service of a registrar but actually to have registration be persistent, and stable, and free of censorship at the registrar and a few other actual protections for the registrant.

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you so much for that Wendy. Next I've got Alan, (David) and then (Joy) and Kathy.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. A short point on topic number one it ends with the word we need (unintelligible). I don't necessarily disagree with the description but I was wondering if we could for the sake of opening up discussion try something else.

I am bored implementation or I mean it's probably more than...

Robin Gross: Yes I see your point.

Alan Greenberg: Do you see what I mean?

Robin Gross: It might be a bit off putting. But we could talk about the expanding role of staff that might be one way to phrase that circumvention that might a word of the week. I'm not sure this is meeting Alan's answer.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Okay great. That's a very good comment. Okay and then I've got (David), and then (Joy) and then Kathy.

(David): Certainly if we do need someone to speak on the first point I'm willing to do it. And I think one of the points we should make very much in this one is that it is not coming just from us.

We are - it's a very strong concern for us. But we've had exactly the same concerns from some of our colleagues within the GNSO.

And if there need to be new we've not been offered any explanation of why it is necessary really.

It could be for reasons that sort of urgency we will come up with, you know, if we're asked to come up with a quick process we'll do what we can but what we've had so far is just - I don't think we can prevent - I don't think there's any point in presenting this one without presenting specifics.

It's an ongoing issue throughout ICANN. If we present it without linking it to specific issues it's going to be just another, you know, just hear the same words again.

Well listen we're trying, you know, you're not listening very hard, you're not trying very hard. We need to look at the specific things and ask for specific sort of justifications, and explanations and responses.

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you. That's really helpful. (Joy)?

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks. I just wanted to offer a lead on item number four which essentially I sort of see as a standing topic really standing (unintelligible).

But the particular tradition I had for how to - for the things to highlight at this time we're just to reflect on the Toronto event that UCUZ had and also the (unintelligible) work.

Since then that the particular - the policy sort of things that have happened recently is that the independent objector has released a number of decisions around public interest objection assimilation new gTLDs.

And I think - so I think we should note that. I think it might affect almost all cases the independent objector has decided not to (unintelligible) the preliminary system is not to intervene on public interest ground or objection grounds.

I think it's important to say that we think for the most part the work that's been done there is very good.

It's been excellent to see the human rights discussion and considerations independent objectives been taking into account even though and amongst ourselves as a constituency group may (unintelligible) aspects of in (unintelligible) in particular cases.

And just ask them if they have had any response or any opportunity to consider, you know, themselves independent objectives, you know, comments without asking them to bind themselves to make statements around that and so just to assume that process. So that was my position but open to discussions of course.

Robin Gross: That's great. And thank you so much for being willing to get us started on the human rights topic early. Appreciate that. Thank you. Okay so next in the queue is Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Let's see as I look at the four topics up there and think about how busy the board is right now I wonder exactly what we're asking the board to do on the, you know, it's nice to brief them on our concerns or issues that we want them to take into account.

And I heard a little bit but to the extent that the action items I think that's what there tentacles are up for is what can they do next?

So to - I wasn't sure if that had been talked about during the meeting. I wanted to see if adding another number five would be possible? I don't know if it's a closed list.

Robin Gross: We can try.

Kathy Kleiman: And it has to do -and Brian's here so he might be able to help us with this. The Registrar Accreditation Agreement is one thing and there may be disagreements here but that's traditionally a bilateral agreement.

The base registry agreement is not. And let me explain what that is. The base registry agreement is the agreement that is in the applicant guidebook that it's the model in agreement by which new gTLD registry is supposed to sign on to.

And we negotiated that together guys. That was right - I mean that was done by the community. And what's like the Registry Code of Conduct comes out of the work of the Vertical Integration Working group.

And I believe a new committee has been created to help negotiate that -- Brian maybe you can help us -- and that certainly be reviewed by the community before it gets finalized because we're talking about the model agreement for new gTLDs.

And I know there are a number of concerns and we probably share them. So I think we'd probably be supportive of where the registries are coming in on this.

But I would add number five that before the base registry agreement is finalized we - it needs to come back to the GNSO.

Brian can you help? I feel like I'm talking in code here...

Brian Cute: Sure.

Kathy Kleiman: ...and you've talked to the...

Brian Cute: No happy to Kathy. Thank you. So speaking in my capacity as CEO of Public Interest Registry can give you at least an update on where we are.

There has been obviously some proposed contract provisions. It started out on February 5 and was characterized rightly so as a unilateral right to amend.

It has gone through some iterations as Fadi has talked to contracting parties and members of the community not in perhaps a structured way.

And where we are right now is there's been a lot of back and forth between the registrars and ICANN to work out the final details of the 2013 RAA.

And on the base registry agreement in the guidebook as you correctly note we are still in process.

And the registries stakeholder group has just decided to put together or reassemble a negotiating team for the purpose of working with ICANN staff now and in the coming days to get the final agreement on the provisions of the new base registry services agreement which includes this what was called the Public Interest Amendment is now called an Extraordinary Amendment.

So all of these things are in process...

Woman: Okay.

Brian Cute: ...you're correct we are indeed engaged trying to hammer out the final details whatever they're going to look like.

I have and others in the registries stakeholder group have voiced clearly our concerns about the nature of this process. So yes I can affirm the points that you've made and I'll leave you to your agenda.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you. So point number five propose.

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you very much. And then we've got Rafik and then we will move to the ATRT members. Go ahead Rafik. You have once again the last word.

Rafik Dammak: So an item that Kathy highlighted we need to ask about actions. The last time with the board we talk too (unintelligible) right and we mentioned GNI and even Transmit International.

So I wanted to ask them clearly whether it's based on something or you have a plan or strategy so GNI (unintelligible) global network initiative.

Woman: Rafik do want them to have an initiative with GNI?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. We talked about that last time. And (unintelligible) he is - yes they would start to check or to do some study or something so.

Robin Gross: Okay thanks. Great thank you very much. Okay let's move on to the next issues on our agenda and we are going to talk to members of the accountability and transparency review team who are here to talk to us about what they've been doing, what their process is, and how we can help, how we can sort of feed into them and help them try to - to meet their goals and objectives and understand our concerns.

So if I could just sort of I don't know if you guys have a person who's sort of going to - let me first introduce we have here.

We've got Brian Cute once again from PIR. He's a member of this team and we've got Alan Greenberg from At-Large. And he's a member of this team and Avri Doria from NCSG and she's a member of this team and pardon me?

Man: (Jamie).

Robin Gross: (Jamie Getchko) again he is a member of this team. And (Liza Ferr) and she is a member of this team as well. So Brian why don't sort of get us started and just kind of walk us through what the purpose of this group is and how we can help you to at least carry out its mission. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you Robin and thank you all for having us my name is Brian Cute. I now have my ATRT 2 hat on.

I am the Chair of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team that is chartered under the Affirmation of Commitments.

We have just begun our work. We formally commenced in February of this year. The review team process is laid out and agreed to between ICANN and the community, the international community, Department of Commerce, and international community more broadly speaking to undertake a periodic reviews of ICANN's accountability and transparency.

There have been three prior reviews that have taken place. The first Accountability and Transparency Review Team, the Security stability and Resiliency Review Team, and the Whois review team.

Each of those review teams made recommendations to the ICANN Board of Directors that our either implemented are in the process of implementation to some degree.

The role of this team the second Accountability and Transparency Review Team is to review ICANN's implementation of each of those three review

teams recommendations to make an assessment, on how ICANN has effectively or not implemented those recommendations, and make recommendations of our own.

We are also chartered to assess a fourth category which is a broad assessment of ICANN's accountability and transparency and with an eye toward the overall review process.

So we have four distinct work streams. We have to deliver recommendations to the ICANN board by December 31 of this year.

We are in the initial phases where we will be collecting data. And our calendar as we've mapped it out so far would have us putting out for public comment draft proposed recommendations at the beginning of October.

So between now and the beginning of October we will be collecting data, interacting with the community.

We will have structured interactions with all of the entities AC's, SO's, ICANN board in Durban. And we will be reaching out to you in advance of Durban providing you some advance questions or discussion points.

And again collecting data systematically between now and October with the goal of making an objective independent assessment of ICANN's implementation of those recommendations and making recommendations about (unintelligible) at the end of the year.

I think that's a good overview at this point. (Tom) I'd welcome any of the ATRT 2 members to please add their own thoughts at this point. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Brian. Just for clarity on the SSR and Whois review team our task is to review the review team and the implementations but not to make additional recommendations on those subjects.

Whereas on the ATRT we are to review the review team and the implementation and fill in any gaps or make additions that we feel are necessary.

ATRT 1 for instance focused on some of the issues in the AOC did not put a lot of focus on others.

Among the other things we've discussed we're proud - we're going to try to put at least some focus on the issues that were not fully addressed in the previous one and of course critique the previous one and the implementation as necessary.

Brian Cute: Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. Avri Doria. In this case the one of you also speaking as a member of the ATRT. With the questionnaire that's coming out I think one of the things that's really important is sort of a brutal honesty from the people that are looking at it in terms of where they see needs for greater accountability and transparency, what the group sees as the need, where should the focus of the team be placed?

And especially you'll see when you look at the questionnaire -- it's been out I don't know if any of you have looked at it -- in several different places we say and what questions haven't we asked that we should be asking? And what objects what issues haven't we mentioned that we should that should be looked into?

So take that questionnaire please and really take putting information in that as a serious sort of command to the group of these are things that need attention.

And also be sure to look at the sort of negative space that stuff that's not there that we looking at what last year did, and what the year before did, and what the year before that did have gotten sort of into a shaped view that sort of says these are the things we're doing.

Whereas anything that's in the AOC anything that's pertinent to accountability and transparency of ICANN is fair game for you to bring up in that form and, you know, ask for something to be done about it.

Any issues that you see any results that you've seen that look like they were very successful say so. Any results that you've seen that look like they were less than completely successful point that out.

The questionnaire tries to be very neutral. And it looks for the good stuff as well as the less than good stuff because the good stuff is important to point out.

If indeed something got done right which I'm sure it did then it's good to say this one this one, you know, that's an exemplar of what is good, et cetera.

So I beseech you as the group to take that questionnaire very seriously because it shapes the work that will get done in a large sense.

Brian Cute: I'd like to add a couple of thoughts to Avri's points. And first of all Alan, Avri, and (Liza) are Vice Chairs of the ATRT too as well. Pardon my admission in the introduction.

In addition to Avri's points which I fully support we did put out request for public comment. There are a lot of questions.

We asked ICANN's team to -- and Alice Jensen is here with us giving us very good support -- to publish that just before the Beijing meeting knowing that

that is not in keeping with good practice. And for that reason asked that that comment period the open 21 days (unintelligible) closes.

There will be a reply comment cycle. But we recognize also that there are a lot of questions. This is a first request for input. Don't be daunted by the long list of questions.

If you only - want to provide answers to two of them and you have good observations and good data please do that.

And if you don't want to answer the entire thing don't just put it to the side because you think we want the whole response.

So I'd add that and then ask (Liza) if you had some additional observations at this point? No (Denny)? No okay.

Robin Gross: Okay we've got Wolfgang. And then does anybody else want to get in the queue on this? Go ahead Wolfgang.

Wolfgang Ulrich-Knoben: Thanks Brian and NDSS. I think the ATRT team is one of the rare committees where all stakeholders are represented including governments on a real equal footing.

I think this is really an important thing. And so it would be interest although for the community as a whole if you develop in the process certain procedures of how the stakeholders impact that this would be very useful for the further enhancement of the multi-stakeholder model because the multi-stakeholder model is certainly learning by doing.

And what you are due that you work together with governments with Vice Ministers and other as high leading officials, you know, this practice which will emerge in the process could be extremely useful for in terms of development of the multi-stakeholder model.

So keep this in mind this could be a very interesting side effect of your work if you can say okay here look we can work together on an equal footing in our respective roles and (unintelligible) decision making if it comes to recommendation.

I think this is unique chance a unique opportunity for your group to produce this in the process. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. You raise an interesting point. Now it hadn't dawned on me actually that this is one of the few groups where GAC members or GAC representatives -- because they're not all GAC members -- actually participate in the work without fearing that they're talking on behalf of their government. It's rather interesting.

One of the tasks in the AOC that was not addressed in the first ATRT but we plan to is how do you get the community to work together?

If you have any good ideas but you may have identified one right now simply the ATRT itself or the other review teams are a model.

But if you have any further ideas a lot of things we've tried over the years haven't worked real well so...

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you very much. (Joy).

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks. Just as a follow up, you know, one thing that I've pondered a lot is in other forums that I'm involved in particularly where governments are present often governments say that they speak, you know, they represent the states and as part of (unintelligible) society voices.

And one thing that I've been pondering sort of for a while now is how to join the dots around some of the GAC role, and its representational role, and it's

advisory role in ICANN with the constituents it supports to represent who are also here in ICANN constituencies in other capacities for example in this stakeholder group, or, you know, or business or others.

So I'm just sort of curious in thinking out loud a little whether the ATRT team can whenever this agreement might also cover some scope for thinking about transparency mechanisms or ways to connect some of those dots across the GAC as well as sort of a ICANN tree itself. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you (Joy). So while we absolutely love to hear everything positive, critique, negative space that's on your mind we do have a scope.

Our scope is Paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments. So I encourage you to read that carefully. That is our scope of work.

To your question (Joy) there may in fact be a couple places in 9.1 where your question is relevant. The section that relates to the effectiveness of the role of the GAC is one where that question may fit.

We know already that were likely to take a hard look at the PDP process. And that may lead to some questions about how different parts of the community interact when policy is being made.

But there is a scope of our work. It's clear. It's open to some interpretation but use that as a roadmap if you would in submitting.

And I'd also like to add Wolfgang it's a great point and it hadn't occurred to me either. And all I can say is from the first ATRT 1 it really was equal footing work.

There was no status of any one member another there was operation on consensus. It was very collegial.

I can't speak for the other review teams but I know Kathy can. I think capturing that as part of our working methodologies could be valuable in deed and so I appreciate that suggestion as well. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes the same with the Whois review team. I mean we did have a GAC member (Peter Nettleford) from Australia. And it was incredible. It was actually a very special experience.

I'm not sure it's scales to all of ICANN. We still have our silos in ICANN. And that's okay and our bridges across the silos but the review teams are special places.

And the Whois review team will be meeting tomorrow with ATRT to talk -- our recommendations are still fairly new. So it'll be an interesting process to review something still in formation.

Having now done a review team let me - I'd like to thank the current ATRT. It's an enormous, enormous amount of work, and effort, and thinking, and sleepless nights and long lists, and so endless list so thank you.

Brian Cute: Don't scare the new members off yet Kathy.

Man: As another review team veteran I'll second that.

Robin Gross: Great. And (Carlos) will have the last question or comment on this topic.

(Carlos): Really the last so this is (Carlos) (unintelligible) from (unintelligible), Brazil . I would like just to very quickly second Wolfgang's comment on the ATRT.

Being part of the ATRT 1 for a very short period of time I was there just for two months I was really impressed to see how we could implement the (new) stakeholder philosophy and practice.

And it was really a very interesting experience. And I'm very excited to see Avri and (Danny) and some of her friends in the ATRT 2.

And I really would appreciate very much if you guys could do some record on the practice, on the best practice of the ATRT and other review teams because (unintelligible) the information of commitment is such this important moment in changing the way ICANN operates.

Definitely it will be very helpful for the whole ICANN community if you guys put some effort in record and analyze and reflect upon the practices that you guys are doing. So (unintelligible).

Brian Cute: Thank you (Carlos) and good to see you again. If I can add one final thought from me. Every member of the ATRT by design comes from some corner of this community.

And the validity of our output will depend on our ability to be objective and independent. And maybe as objective as we can be an independent but it's an important ethos those for us as we approach the work.

With respect to your inputs any thought you have is welcome. Opinion is welcome, facts are helpful. We are trying to gather facts and assess facts. So if I could leave you with one thought facts are helpful.

Robin Gross: Thank you. And that's a great, great ending there. I think we can remember that.

Man: Beijing is the capital of China.

Robin Gross: That was very helpful. Now we are meeting with the board in three minutes so we have to quickly race off to the Grand Hall A.

And first let me thank the members of the ATRT for coming and speaking with us. I really, really very much appreciate it.

And I will need to call this meeting to a close and we'll see you all in a few minutes in Grand Hall A. Thank you.

END