

Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting
Non Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) meeting
Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 09:00 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/>

Bill Drake: Good morning everybody.

Man: Good morning.

Bill Drake: My name is Bill Drake. And we know that Milton is in a cheery mood today so then that's a good start for everything. I'm Bill Drake. I'm Chair of the NCUC. This is the constituency meeting being held on Tuesday the 9th here in Beijing at the ICANN meeting.

We have a full agenda of items to go through which David Cake is heroically trying to get loaded on to the Adobe as we speak. I understand that there are a few people who are not at the meeting or logged on to Adobe, hopefully there will be others who will join us remotely later as well. There's both Adobe and a telephone bridge for connectivity and an audio cast I guess.

So before we start to go through the agenda and make any quick changes we might want to make to it I think we should try to do a quick (unintelligible) and by quick I mean quick as in if people could just simply introduce themselves and say where they're from, their institution and their country.

I assume everybody in the room - is there anybody in the room who's not an NCUC member in which case you are most welcome? Okay, good. Wow, then we have an interesting turnout of people. You're all - so diversity in (unintelligible) fantastic thing.

So you're all welcome as well but let's go around the room real quickly then, just introduce ourselves to each other so we'll know who we're with. Can we start with you down there, please?

Man: Hello, good morning. My name is (unintelligible). I'm from (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay.

Man: Hello, good morning. My name is (Lindel McDonald). I'm with the (unintelligible) program and I'm from Jamaica, employed to the Competition Authority.

Joy Liddicoat: Joy Liddicoat, Association for Progressive Communications based in New Zealand.

(Abella): My name is (Abella) (unintelligible). I come from Romania. I work at - coming from the Association for Technology and Internet. And I'm a second time fellow.

Man: Hello, my name is (unintelligible). I come from Tunisia. And I am (unintelligible).

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer from the United States, a member of NCUC and Council member on the GNSO Council from the noncommercial stakeholder's group.

Man: My name is (unintelligible). I am from Brazil. I am not a member of the NCUC but my first relationship to ICANN was through the NCUC 99 when I came to ICANN. Now I am (unintelligible) councilmember so I am an observer today.

Milton Mueller: I'm Milton Mueller. I'm a professor at Syracuse University and NCSG Executive Committee member. And I'm coming from a really good place, man.

Glen Reichart: I had no idea who I was sitting next to here. I mean I knew his name, I just didn't know what place he was coming from this morning. I am Glen Reichart and I'm with US (unintelligible), that's a program to promote next generation applications for networks.

Bill Drake: The people in the back, I know you just walked in and sat down, but would you like to say who you are real quickly anyway? The Internet Society, okay. VeriSign. We welcome the technical into this community - to our meeting. And who else do we have? Staff? And Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Hi, Rob Hoggarth from ICANN Policy Staff.

Bill Drake: Okay. Rob is our support person in the GNSO environment. I'm Bill Drake. I'm the Chair of NCUCA and I'm an international fellow and lecturer and global Internet governance at the University of Zurich in Switzerland. And you are?

Brenden Kuerbis: I am Brenden Kuerbis. I'm a post-doc researcher at Syracuse University in the Internet governance project. And I currently don't have an official NCUC role.

Man: We can find one.

Bill Drake: We'll take care of that. You won't escape.

(Ed Morris): (Ed Morris), I'm the NCUC EC from the University of Leeds in the United Kingdom.

(Stephan): (Stephan) (unintelligible) from Finland, specifically electronic (unintelligible) of Finland and presently a member of the Executive Committee of NCUC.

David Cake: I'm David Cake, Electronic Frontiers of Australia. Currently a NCSG councilor - GNSO camp.

Wilson Abigaba: I'm Wilson Abigaba. I represent African NCUC Executive Committee.

Woman: My name is (unintelligible) from the Kenya ICT Action Network but also a doctoral fellow from the (unintelligible) in Denmark.

Man: I'm (unintelligible) from Yemen, an ICANN fellow but I also research Internet filtering and circumvention technologies which I develop and that's why I am in high demand here.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

Man: My name is (unintelligible). I'm from Brazil. I'm a member from (unintelligible) to fight for freedom, (unintelligible). And (unintelligible) is a new member of (unintelligible). It is my first meeting.

Man: (Unintelligible), a member of the NCUC Executive Committee. I am an Executive Director of Institute (unintelligible) Brazil and a Board member of (unintelligible).

Man: Good morning everyone, (unintelligible) from Center of Technology Society at (unintelligible). I come from a very good place, I think they call it (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Hi, I'm (unintelligible). I'm professor of computer science at university in Brazil and I'm also Board member of (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Hi, my name is Robin Gross and I'm the Chair of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. Thank you.

Man: Hi, my name is (unintelligible) and I'm from the International Center for Free and Open Source Software in India. I applied to be a member of NCUC last night, no permission yet.

Man: Bravo.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: My name is (Wolfgang) (unintelligible), a professor for Internet policy and regulation at the University of (unintelligible) in Denmark. And I'm also a Councilor in the GNSO Council on behalf of the noncommercial stakeholder group.

Man: Hi, my name is (unintelligible), independent consultant currently based in Bangkok. This is my first ICANN, newcomer.

(Susan Anthony): Good morning, my name is (Susan Anthony). I'm from the United States, Patent and Trademark Office.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Peter Dengate Thrush, long time fan of the NCUC.

Bill Drake: Okay, and - now he tells us. Do we have anybody - we have one other person here who came in late.

(Philip): Yes, my name is (Philip) (unintelligible). I'm from Mexico. I co-lead the legal chapter for (unintelligible). And I also teach intellectual property at the national university.

Bill Drake: Okay, fantastic. So as you can see we have a very full house in this small room. We also have a very full agenda, a great welcome to all the folks who are not from NCUC, the fellows, the people from other stakeholder groups and so on.

It's great to have you. And we do everything in a very transparent and open way, as is the norm in civil society.

So we have - as I say, quite a lot of - on the agenda. And as you'll notice, in looking at it, it's an agenda that is very concerned with the internal organizational aspects of the constituency. And there's reasons for that.

One is that we have other parts of the agenda this weekend - or this week that are devoted to GNSO policy matters, more specifically in particular yesterday morning we had a two-hour meeting of the noncommercial stakeholder group policy committee and the noncommercial stakeholder group, of course, is the larger entity of which the constituency is a member alongside the (NPOCC), the Nonprofit Operational Concerns Constituency. So we took up a lot of GNSO related policy issues there.

And we also have in the afternoon, after lunch, the entire afternoon is devoted to further work at the level of the stakeholder group, the NCSG, where we will again be talking about policy matters and also be meeting with the Board.

So it wasn't the intention given all these other policy discussions to replicate. Very often in the past - at least my years associating with NCUC we've often had constituency days where we talked about the same topic several different

ways in several different settings. And meanwhile there's quite a lot of a more administrative organizational nature that really needs to be done.

And so we thought that we would try and focus more on those aspects here although not necessarily exclusively. The draft agenda was circulated several weeks ago on the members list, also among members of executive committee. We didn't receive any suggestions for additions, changes, whatever.

Wendy just suggested to me that she would like to have a little bit of discussion of RAA related issues in the context of this meeting and we will try to figure out how to do that. But we would certainly want to also get through the main focus of the agenda as well.

So we will try to do all those things at once. We also have several meetings with visitors coming in at 10:00 - there's a coffee break at 10:30, 10:35 depending on our timeframe. And then at 10:50 we'll have a meeting for about 20 minutes with the Noncom.

I believe (Sheryl) and (Muriel) and maybe (unintelligible) are coming over. And then we'll also have a meeting later in the afternoon with PIR. I'm not sure who, (Brian) and who else might be coming over, and that will be at 11:45. And we run until 12:30.

So that's what I've got on the agenda for right now. And let me stop right there before I launch in and just say, would anybody like to add anything, reject anything at this point, correct me, slap me around? Any other fun kinds of physical or non-physical abuse you'd love to share? All right, then, let's begin.

So there was - NCUC for those who are not familiar operates in a way that's probably a little bit different from a lot of the other constituencies in the GNSO. We have annual elections for our executive committee and our chair.

And there's also at the same time a cycle of elections running parallel at the stakeholder group level for councilors for the six people who are elected to the GNSO Council who can represent the entire stakeholder group, both our constituency and the (NPOCC), the other constituency that make up the two.

So we had an election in the - after the last annual conference, 140 people - 140 votes were cast and we had a new team come in as of mid-December, which consisted of me and (Ed) here, (Taponi), Wilson, (Carlos), and Norbert Klein who is not here.

And what - in the election, what I had proposed was that we needed to perhaps get serious about trying to do a little bit more constituency building, not that there was anything fundamentally - structurally wrong with the constituency, after all we've grown to almost 300 members.

The precise details will be provided later. And have - we've been active and in some regards influential in a wide variety of GNSO discussions.

But yet at the same time I think there was a feeling among many people that probably we could be better positioned to be more effective and have more influence if we were just a tad more organized in certain respects than we've had time to be.

Now bear in mind, of course, unlike some other parts of the community we run completely on volunteer labor so it's a matter of trying to pester friends into doing tasks that they really don't want to do, you know, for any kind of administrative work to be carried forward at all. So naturally that moves a little bit at a slower pace than it might.

But be that as it may, we had a situation where the feeling was we've got all these members but we don't have enough in a way of ability to really engage them fully in the life of the constituency, draw them into the process of

working on policy development, and really constituting an ongoing strong community that is self-identified and works effectively in the ICANN environment.

And, you know, for those of us who have participated in a lot of other civil society coalitions and networks in different international institutions such as the (OACB) or the IGF and so on, quite frankly I think NCUC in comparison has a very good story to tell. We have been around for a long time. We have been able to be effective in a lot of ways.

We had defined - I think a fairly clear profile in terms of what our intellectual political agenda are. And we have given the restructuring of the GNSO a defined space within which we can actually participate in real policy making as opposed to simply dialog and so on as per the IGF.

So we've got a lot to build on but we can make it stronger and more effective in support of our policy-making activities.

And so the desire was to think about how could we do that and I'd suggested perhaps if we could form voluntary teams, that would be open constructs that would have a facilitator in each case focusing on different key functional tasks that need to be performed that anybody could rotate in and out of and participate in trying to carry forward the building efforts of the constituency, that this might help revitalize things a bit.

And so we launched that in January and in a fairly short amount of time I would say got quite a lot done. And I want to go through some of that with some of the people who led those efforts just to give you a sense of that. There's obviously much more that can be done and will be done.

Some people have expressed a certain skepticism to me, well, the team - some of them - there's only a couple members in certain ones and some of

them seem to be kind of half dead and so forth. You know, obviously the level of activity in any particular grouping is going to wax and wane.

But I tend to think that once we get this mechanism really fully in place and the new website and have a space to work in fully in place that we'll be able to attract more engagement from a broader range of members on an ongoing basis. And that this will help in the development of the constituency as a whole.

So that's the overall thinking behind this. So what I thought we could do before the lunch break, over the next hour, is talk quickly about first - the main areas of activity in our first quarter has been to try to get our electronic platforms together and upgraded. And the folks who took a lead on that will talk a bit about that.

We can talk a little bit about - and again, for each of these there's a team of people that are all open, anybody can join. You go on the website and you just join. Then we'll talk a little bit about financing and budgetary issues.

Programming, we have a workshop tomorrow on one world one Internet which I think will probably attract a lot of interest. And we'll talk a bit about the program for that, with the substance of the (unintelligible) and then the larger effort of NCUC to play a role in providing programming on a more ongoing basis within the ICANN process.

And then we'll talk a bit - some current efforts that are just really starting to take off in terms of coordination. Then we'll break. We'll meet with the Noncom as I say. And then come back and the last chunk of the day will be a larger and kind of - perhaps slightly (unintelligible) discussion which is to say we need to talk about the revision of our bylaws.

Our bylaws are quite out of date, they're not in sync with who we are and what we do. And this discussion actually provides a way into a larger

discussion we might have on exactly how we might see the role of NCUC in relationship to the stakeholder group and our broader activities.

So that's a - quite a lot there and then hopefully there will be some time for AOB as well and we can add in pressing policy issues and other things that might be done.

So with all that said, let me then start by turning to folks who have been involved in pushing the development of our e-platforms. We had a situation where our ListSrvs and websites and everything were quite scattered in terms of where they were located and how they were being managed and so forth.

And we're trying to take a more coordinated approach to all that. And we turn to (Taponi) as person who's been the lead on this as well as Brenden and (Ed) and Wilson. So I'll leave you guys (unintelligible). There's a list of items there that you might run through.

(Taponi): Okay, so I'm (Taponi) (unintelligible) from the Executive Board and member of the (unintelligible) platform team along with Dave who's trying to get my slides visible but we don't have all our problems solved out yet.

As Bill told you, we started with a situation - we have lots of resources that have been scattered among various member (unintelligible) on the ICANN side, some on - things like three different membership rosters that were not quite in sync and without any process for updating them and otherwise outdated information on the website.

And mailing list we did not have or even were supposed to have so we decided to set up a single consistent place to keep all our - all the stuff in. And we decided to get the server of our own. We purchased a virtual private server for NCUC.

The first thing we moved there were mailing lists. I'd prefer to avoid the term ListServ because that's trademark term for one specific mailing list service so talk about mailing lists.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Taponi): So we created mailing lists for the various teams we set up for doing tasks. It seems my slides won't be forthcoming so I'll have to talk without them.

So we had the team lists and we moved Executive Committee list over there which had been hosted by yet another - now former (unintelligible) and until now it had been working fine, we just wanted to collect everything in place.

And last we created (unintelligible) for members which we are supposed to have by the bylaws but we had kind of disappeared due to some strange turns of history.

And we used to have a list for noncommercial domain name holders, constituency way back in 2001, 2003, which has already disappeared with the (unintelligible) but I found it. I'll have for it (unintelligible) searching.

Then let's move to (unintelligible) discussed was first (unintelligible) university in 2003 as a temporary measure which lasted ten years very well, although it was renamed in the process a couple of times for us to NCSG discuss, then NCSG - NCUC discuss and then again to NCSG discuss when the stakeholder group responded and at that time in 2011 (unintelligible) started their own list but NCUC did not have a dedicated list of their own for - since 2011 actually. So now we have one.

One problem with that was that (unintelligible) member list was outdated so the first thing before doing that we had to create a new member database and send a query to all members to please update your data. I think it's

mostly complete now or (unintelligible) everybody replied. And last week we started the list and it has been really successful so far.

Man: (Unintelligible), could I ask you, could give the numbers for the membership breakdown that you labored so hard and long at assembling?

(Taponi): Yes, just a second and I'll have - we have 281 members at the moment, which 87 organizations and 194 individuals. And they come from 70 different countries.

So the slides seem to be sort of coming up, not that there is much to say. That's the first slide and that's the main thing actually. Okay, (unintelligible) background picture is the northern lights, I took it two weeks ago in Lapland.

That's the business besides the new mailing list and member database, we've been doing - trying to set up various other collaborative tools. We have (unintelligible) already running although at the moment it's usable only for public stuff.

We are going to set up some modification in case we want to do more confidential stuff later or at least prevent spammers from (ruining) them.

And we are creating official contact addresses. We have now one for NCUC (unintelligible) NCUC.org so we don't have to use people's personal addresses for contacts.

Man: So just to emphasize, about 200 and what?

(Taponi): Two-hundred-and-eighty-one.

Man: Two-hundred-and-eighty members, 80 something organizational...

(Taponi): Eighty-seven organizations.

Man: And 200 individuals. And I think you told me two-thirds of them are from outside the United States.

(Taponi): Approximately yes, there are about 20 members whose country we don't know so - but...

Man: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Taponi): Most likely they are from earth.

Man: But so we are clearly - we're clearly a very globalized constituency.

Man: Not yet, well, universe wide.

(Taponi): Yes, we don't have any Martian members as far as I know.

Man: No, yes. Yes.

Man: Okay.

(Taponi): Okay, the next issue would be the new website construction. We created a new setup and I'll hand that over to Wilson, I think, who's been working on that but we basically set up - decided to use Wordpress as a fairly common platform and Wilson has been working on that. So over to you, Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Thank you. Thank you, (Taponi).

Man: So we are experiencing technical (unintelligible).

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, and that's why (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, but part of what the (unintelligible) - the (ETM) (unintelligible) to set up the tools that we can - that members can use to - another tool to enable everyone participates because we are - we're all limited to things (unintelligible) working.

And (unintelligible) because they don't know what (unintelligible) or they can't easily figure it out. And part of - but (unintelligible) is the Internet and (unintelligible) to update the tools that can be used on the Internet to help everyone participate.

One of them was the website to (unintelligible). We also need - we also have collaboration tools for mainly the policy working - for the policy staff who (works with) the policy, they can easily work together and collaborate and other tools we are coming up with.

Those things can be reviewed at the moment from new.NCUC.org and (unintelligible) quite a number of those new features and others coming out.

David, is it possible to show the website? New.NCUC.org. Okay, this is the old website, which was hosted on a cloud platform called (unintelligible) but we couldn't have the contract we need to have everyone participate (unintelligible) collaboration tools. We can only put the blog and that's not enough.

So we said to have (unintelligible) have our own platform which we are now working on. Can you bring up the new website? Yes, just that. This is the new one we are working...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Under construction, look who's there. (Unintelligible).

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, yes, that's one of the videos that also Brenden has been working on and he (unintelligible) for us. But - and those are some of the things we couldn't have on the old website. We needed to (unintelligible) we are doing so that we can encourage new members to come and participate.

We (unintelligible). We aim to have it better organized for people to find information easily and also (unintelligible) the mailing list, the (unintelligible) for collaborative working. There are - there's (unintelligible) for tracking and (unintelligible) that we are working on.

Then we also are updating our confluence to also - because it's official website for us, for the NC - within ICANN. And we shall have it - (unintelligible) updated (unintelligible) have to (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible), okay. Okay. I'll (unintelligible) about the (unintelligible) slides, members of the old blogs from the (unintelligible) website to this one, that's already been done. (Unintelligible), yes, it's now there and updated.

Like (Taponi) said, he sent out - we sent out an email requesting members to update the information but less than 60% responded and - but we are (unintelligible) some of those who did respond the information is not actually correct.

So (unintelligible) who did not respond to do it and if you didn't receive an email you can contact us through the email that (Edward) is going to talk to (unintelligible) NCUC.org because that's how we can update - keep reaching everyone and have (unintelligible).

Then (unintelligible) having all the (unintelligible) names and the public (unintelligible) that we issue officially on the website. So that would be

(unintelligible) for what we are doing and then the collaborative groups for the (unintelligible), for the various working groups.

Bill Drake: One suspects that once you've built it and people see it that that will draw more response as well. When it's an abstraction the process - you know, project that's kind of being imagined is kind of hard to get people engaged. But once the thing is up and visible I think people will feel much more incented to join and add - build in the member tools.

And then what we really want to do also - the point that's on there about institutional memory I think is really important. NCUC's been around for a long time and unfortunately all the documentation that's been produced by NCUC in terms of policy positions and things like that is scattered about to the four winds, much of it's on computers of individual members.

So it's in various places - and ICANN where it's been submitted and so on. It would be really useful I think to pull that material together so we really have a clear profile of the positions and roles of NCUC over time and spaces on the website where the teams that are doing collaboration around the different functional challenges work together with different types of tools at their disposal and so on.

So I think all this looks really, really positive once it (unintelligible) which is - you imagine how long, Wilson?

Wilson Abigaba: We - by the end of this week we shall have migrated to the (unintelligible) the new one because it's pretty finished. And then we shall start - we shall (unintelligible) new tools with time.

Bill Drake: Okay. (Unintelligible), yes. And please, of course, any questions, suggestions, comments, so on.

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer, just want to say thank you and congratulations. This is very exciting looking and it's wonderful to see all of the energy going into building up these tools. I'm already starting something on the etherpad. It's great to have these tools to work with and thank you.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, thank you.

Bill Drake: These guys have done a lot of work, let me just tell you. They've been at this quite a bit with me poking them continuously. Now one of the other things that - not quite reflected here but that we will also be trying to do is build a better integration between our own website and the (unintelligible) space that ICANN provides for keeping track of meetings and documents and so on.

The wiki is used for - by most parts of the ICANN community for planning during meetings and so on. Where - you were telling me something yesterday about how that worked.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, we have plans to at least have the member data and some other dynamically generated data can be automatically incorporated in the (unintelligible) so it's up real time update so the updated member data is always up to date and other information we want to keep. (Unintelligible) generating our own site can be completed automatically.

Bill Drake: Brenden?

Brenden Kuerbis: Yes, this is a good point and actually I'm glad we have (Robert) in the room. So, you know, one of the issues that we had with having information in two different places is maintaining consistency between that information. And so (Taponi) has proposed, you know, a pretty good way to do that in terms of creating dynamically generated pages.

But I'm curious, you know, what kind of feedback are you getting from other organizations that try and maintain - you know, they have their own presence

and - for instance, all the other constituencies. And then there's the confluence platform. And it's constantly changing. I don't really - it's hard to keep a grasp of what actually is happening there. So can you let us know?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff, Mr. Chair, I'll make an effort to be brief. Please stop me if I go too long.

For a good period of time the ICANN staff has been looking to develop some tools you all can use in a consistent way with the theory that they'd be a baseline of tools that everyone at least has access to. Much of that concept was the wiki web presence recognizing that individual groups would pursue their own website strategies.

In the new FY14 budget process a number of groups have come forward and said, can you help us with website hosting, with content production, with organization recordkeeping and the rest? Some things that we've been thinking about for a long time and simply internally didn't have the resources to deliver.

At the NCSG meeting on Thursday (Rom) has asked me to attend and I'm bringing along (Chris Giff) who's our new Vice President of Online Services at ICANN and he's going to be talking about what we need to be doing in terms of gathering the information about specific needs, talking about some of the ideas he has about agile product development and things like that to really help fine tune a lot of these tools.

Wilson's recently begun collaborating with Ken Bour who had set up a template on the wiki that just about all the individual GNSO communities are beginning to use.

The concept was to create a common type of template, one that existed so that you didn't have to do a lot of work yourself, but essentially had all the

major components of membership and organization and participation in ICANN.

You guys will make the determination whether that's the exact tool you want to use. What we'd hope to find over time is feedback where you say that works, that doesn't work, this is great, this is lousy, let's play around with it.

And you should look at all of this in the broader context I think of ICANN developing the myICANN tool and other collaborative mechanisms that in, I think, (Fade)'s vision would all come together ultimately under the same umbrella.

Again, it's presented to the community as an option. I remember many conversations in the past with Milton about, we want to maintain our own system versus joining the ICANN system. But a tremendous number of options in terms of how you want to approach it.

Bill Drake: Anything else on that one? So these are all things that are going forward. And did you want to show (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: A video that we've produced as part of our sort of visual engagement with members and so it will be an item that we'll develop as well.

But the bottom line is that - the hope is here that with new revised and more flexible and customer friendly tools we can find ways other than simply ListServ discussion to try to get people connected, particular (unintelligible) in the level of participating in working groups and the production of policy statements and so on.

And we're not doing all of this for the simple purpose of community construction for its own sake but of course we're doing this with an eye to

actually being able to weigh in together more effectively on various ICANN processes and develop positions within the NCUC, which would then feed into the larger efforts of the stakeholder group in the Council and so on.

So this is a - what all this is about and like I say, a lot of energy and time that's gone into these technical things, which we thought had to be developed first. It's been substantial. And so I really do thank you guys for doing all this.

There's just one other item that's on here that's not mentioned and that was - has not been mentioned which is whether we wanted to (unintelligible) whether we wanted to do much in the way of having - making use of other kinds of platforms like Facebook, Twitter, blah, blah, blah.

I know we have a Twitter account. I don't know how much it gets used.

Brenden Kuerbis: It was used today.

Bill Drake: Used today, that's good. Brenden (unintelligible).

Wilson Abigaba: Right now.

Bill Drake: Wilson's doing it, okay, good. But this is something also for the group to consider going forward so just to take a holistic view point which we've never really done before in the collectivity to how we design our electronic infrastructure and make sure that it's attuned to what our prospective needs are I think is a really important step forward. So I thank the team that's been pushing this.

Is this room warm enough for everybody? Just want to make sure. Is there anything that can be done about, Rob, do you think? Or should we all just bake until our eyes close?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: That would be fantastic, thank you. So let's turn then to the next item on the list of things that we're trying to get going here as part of our renovation efforts and that is finance and budget.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: If David could go back to the agenda, it's on the document I shared with him. Okay. So finance and budget. Now of course as a completely volunteer-based society initiative we are not unlike perhaps some other stakeholder groups or constituencies in a position to be rolling in big time cash money that allows us to do all kinds of things.

Nevertheless, we are not in a horrifically bad position either thanks in particular to the kind and consistent effort of people like CGI.BR, our friends here at the table who have supported us over the years and with very generous resources which we really deeply appreciate.

We've also had over the years a good deal of support from some other important players, most notably in the public industry, public (unintelligible) registry and affiliates and at times the Internet society. So these have all been very, very important to keeping us afloat.

But it looks - it seemed to me as I dug around a little bit we didn't have a real strong tradition of having a group process around finance and budget issues. So we did try to create a team that would deal with this.

Unfortunately work in this team has lagged a bit and we're hoping that we can revitalize it more in the future with new leadership and anybody who wants to participate in this would be greatly, greatly welcomed.

One of the questions - and this comes back to the rewriting of the bylaws is exactly how the organization and function of the finance team is fit in - in

relation to the Executive Committee and the currently defined roles in our bylaws and secretary treasury.

At present Milton is the Secretary Treasury but not really wish to be the secretary and with all of that entails. And so we need to sort of have a team that is really dealing with the issues - the member issues but also the long term identifying possible sources of budgetary support, cultivating them, working with them, etc., and trying to maintain a concept of a strategic long term budgetary plan.

I will tell you what our current situation is. I don't know if this has been done in previous NCUC meetings but I have the numbers here from the bank account just to share to give you an idea.

At the end of December 2012 NCUC had in its account \$57,519, which is not so bad. It gives us enough to work with for a number of important points, in particular - and this is something we need and the Executive Committee to think about for the future meetings, is, one, possibility is to try to extend a bit more travel support to key members. And we need to define a clear travel policy.

The discussions that we've had in the past around that issue have been basically along the lines of, well, we're obviously very limited and we can't fully fund anybody but we could provide some partial funding for people who are active, who are actually doing stuff, who are in a working group for example that is meeting in a particular ICANN meeting and where they need to be there, that kind of situation is something where we might be able to do more in trying to get some members in place.

And I gather - according to these numbers that \$10,000 was spent last year along these lines. I was not on the Executive Committee then so I don't really recall exactly how well that money was dispersed.

But it also goes to organizing events such as our big public conferences that we've done several of now which have been very successful and about which more in a moment. Production of the video, which Brenden will be showing in the website, things like that.

We need to have, I think, just to make this long and complex story very short, a team that will try to sit together and think a bit about outreach to finance - potential financial sources and how we present NCUC to funders and why they should think that supporting us is an important ongoing goal. We've not really had that effectively enough.

It's - generally the work has fallen to one or two people to do, mostly to Robin in the context of organizing conferences. But if we want to have something that's a little bit less episodic, a little bit more reliable structure, it would be useful to have a more inclusive team oriented effort to some extent. So that's something for us to work on in the future and we do need a group that will do that.

Let me tell you a little bit about some current financial issues. We - could you click on the link for fast track requests? So we just had under the new ICANN budgetary request process which I've quickly had to learn all about - no, further up, please, the one - under finances.

There is a process now where ICANN's budgetary team has a bifurcated structure, people looking for resources that would be extended during - or before October, before the annual, could file a fast track budgetary request for some small bits of change. Is it not opening? Just (unintelligible) good time.

So if you've scaled - scroll down there you'll see - further, further, okay. The NCUC fast track request IGF Mali. So if you click that. So I put in a request for support to do several workshops at IGF, one which would be a joint

workshop together with NCSG and (NPOCC) that would look at the role of civil society players within the GNSO.

In other words, move beyond the general IGF, blah, blah, blah and rhetoric about multi-stakeholder is good and wonderful to actually looking at what are the possibilities for civil society actors to engage in and influence decision-making in real decision-making environments such as ICANN.

So I think that workshop will be approved so if I - funding is forthcoming and we are waiting to hear later this week, I think we can have ea very good session around that. Yes, Joy?

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Bill. It might be helpful to (unintelligible) indication now of those (unintelligible) members or others who are here that might be attending the IGF or planning on thinking about that and that might also help in planning sort of the workshops to proceed or even if they don't (unintelligible) activities around (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Yes, I was going to do that. I also ask previously on the ListServ and people replied there.

Joy Liddicoat: Okay.

Bill Drake: Just to finish the point. So the point is that the first workshop would be then something that all of us work together across the constituencies and in the stakeholder - and Robin's involved in this as well, to try to do a little bit of show and tell, sort of an outreach event, encourage people to get engaged in supporting civil society activity within GNSO, which I think is a very useful thing.

Second one was the workshop proposal I put together on the question of generic top level domains, the new - the controversial generics, .book and so on which a lot of people are very obsessed about these days.

And which raises a number of interesting issues about the clash between different business models and also sociocultural dimensions and I think that's quite appropriate for NCUC to be doing and to foster that kind of discussion.

So those are two workshop proposals we put in to - for support for three people to go to the IGF in Bali in order to help make these happen and also to help distribute materials, which we hope to print and other items that will come later and so on.

So basically the idea - we did not participate in the IGF as a constituency in a funded way last year, many other parts of ICANN did. Our hope is to this year make more of a (unintelligible) and be more visible and try to draw attention to the opportunities to participate in NCUC.

Now I did ask on the ListServ who all was coming from NCUC and I had a response from about a dozen different people. Maybe we could have a quick show of hands here. Joy's suggestion, how many people here think they'll be in Bali? So I think we're going to have a substantial range of people to pull on.

Now of course, bear in mind, workshops have to be multi-stakeholder. Workshops can't be just loaded up with NCUC members. We can only have a couple and we have to have business and technical and government as well and include them in discussions of how they see the role of civil society.

I should also add that Robin in parallel submitted requests for NCSG to do a workshop on - was it, human rights? It's not NCSG? Okay. What is it? It was for (unintelligible) justice, okay. So there you go. So (unintelligible) with that, with fast track budget requests.

Now the question comes - in the next few weeks, the precise date is April - Friday, April 19, regular budget requests for the year are due with ICANN.

So we have basically one week - a little more than a week to decide - and unfortunately as I say, the person who had volunteered to be the facilitator for the finance team has been ill and otherwise preoccupied and so has not performed the role.

So we need some help here to try to move quickly to pull together a team that will work on financing and think about what our longer term needs are and what items we might want to put in.

In looking right now on the list - a list of the current fiscal year 14 budget requests from different players. And if you scroll down you'll see NCSG has five - the business community has five requests, the registries have four requests, ISPs have several requests.

Right now all we have is two temporary NCUC requests. So we've been quite thin in our efforts to pull on ICANN resources. We've always been kind of shy about that. (NPOCC) has requests of course. We've always been quite shy about asking for money but I think that we might want to consider this going forward and what our priorities are.

Yes, please? And then (unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: Milton Mueller at Syracuse University. So we have a bit of a difference of philosophy here. In my opinion ICANN has a budget that has really helped these constituencies sort of get basic infrastructure and participation - make it possible.

And the danger now is that we have all of the other constituencies grabbing for more and more. They want full colored glossy newsletters. They want stipends for their staff members. They want to have a secretariat.

I believe that the proper response to this situation which is basically an arms race situation in which if we don't grab part of that budget somebody else will, tragedy of the commons if you will.

The proper response that we should really make every effort to convince the staff of is to say to them, every constituency gets the exact same thing. We don't want to have an arms race. We don't want to be cooking up projects just so we'll get some of that money and Marilyn Cade won't or somebody else won't.

I really think it's a - not a constructive form of competition to be sitting there thinking of things to do with that money when, you know, we can in fact - and do raise our own money and, you know, they're going to have the same idea.

So it's going to be this competitive process by which we're always looking at what they're doing and trying to - the other constituencies that is, and trying to mimic that and get some of our own.

So - and I don't understand why the ICANN staff doesn't understand this and just put an end to it. And just say, every constituency gets X thousand dollars. You budget it how you like. Wouldn't that be simple? Why are we doing these proposals? I mean think about how much time goes into these things.

So why don't you say, every constituency gets a fixed amount of money, (unintelligible) constituency? And if there's some joint thing that they all come together with some special project, maybe we'll do that but that would be rare. And otherwise, you guys get a platform of support and that's it.

Bill Drake: And of course, this is a conversation we've been having for a long time and some of us did actually make the suggestion at the Los Angeles intercessional meeting and it did, of course, go down like a lead balloon with everybody. There was not great interest in it. If you want to - you would have - and everybody just stared.

So my point again, to you Milton, is rather than constantly saying this to me and others in NCUC, if we really want to try to make this an issue we need to write something up, formalize a proposal, elevate it up the agenda, and present it to the Board and go from there.

Right now, this is the budgetary process we have. And so I am not necessarily looking at what others are doing and jealously coveting their goodies and trying to decide, how can I get a piece of that action.

I'm looking what people are doing and saying, is there anything there that might be a useful model for us to think about as we try to make this organization a little bit more functional.

If we could - as we did last year, say we are high principled aesthetics, we will go off of the mountain and with our third eye meditate while everybody else asks for money, that's fine. But I don't think it's the most effective thing when everybody else is getting cash and moving forward and doing things that are useful.

So I would like to change the process. I agree with your direction and I would suggest to you that we should take some action to promote that view. In the mean time, we've got one week to put together a budget proposal.

One thing that in particular will come up in this context will be the question of programming and funding for an annual conference. And I'll come back to that next.

But if we are going to do - it's been made very clear to me by (Xavier), the head of the finance department, that if we want to have more policy conferences with any support from ICANN, let's just say for the room and so on, that we would have to put in budgetary requests.

Now we have our friends from CGI.BR who of course have helped us with so many of these things in the past and (unintelligible), yes?

Man: I wonder if - you mentioned that we have to put up a budget proposal. Is there any thing already prepared - initial proposal, some basic ideas? Or we are starting from zero?

Like, for instance, who is going to maintain the new beautiful fantastic site we will have? Is this a thing we should consider in the budget, like, a person we will keep - we (unintelligible) that this site is maintained, etc., regularly, etc.? And other items that we could consider I wonder?

Bill Drake: This is precisely the conversation I'd like to have now.

Man: Okay.

Bill Drake: I'm asking that. We can continue to say, money makes us dirty, we shouldn't ask for anything, and rely on volunteers sitting in their hotel rooms at 4 o'clock in the morning trying to design slides that can be shown the next day or we could sully ourselves by asking for a small amount of cash and provide support for somebody to do some professional work in order to make the website at all smoothly functioning.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Yes?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: I don't mean to denigrate the point. I mean I recognize the principled side of Milton's libertarian view of rent-seeking behavior and the ways in which institutions can turn people into pigs at the trough and it's not always a pretty sight. It's no question.

But the fact of the matter is I think that if we want to sustain and grow this activity a bit we're not going to be like - you know, there are other parts of the ICANN ecosystem where they have five staffers to fluff their pillows and put mints on them, things like that. We're not going to be that. But we could try to get the resources to take care of our own needs a little bit more effectively.

And I would suggest to you to some administrative support for the e-platforms might be a place to start.

Carlos Afonso: Carlos Afonso from (unintelligible) Foundation. I don't want to bring this issue back but maybe one thing for us to considered not right now but it's something to put on the table is when you mention our effort to go out on the street and try to find some (unintelligible) funding for the NCUC we usually get to the barrier which is the restriction which is the fact that NCUC is not a legal entity on itself.

And we have been discussing this for a long time now. I'm not sure if that's the case for us to bring this back in the table in at some point in time. But that would definitely be something helpful if you want to approach the Ford Foundations and the (OISAS) and the IDRCs of the world to gain some specific grants for the NCUC.

Bill Drake: I take your point. It's a constant problem whenever you say we're in network. People say what's a network. And the founders just don't know how to think about that and there are tax issues.

Carlos Afonso: And by the end of the day the - there is very interesting situation in which most of us end up being funded and sponsored by some of our projects.

So we've got - some of us got including grants for us to take on some issues, take on some projects. But NCUC itself is not supported by any of the institutions or (unintelligible) approach it on itself.

So maybe together with the discussion on the legal entity itself we could have some discussion on which type of grants are for (it) we want to apply for something very specific we need to take on a specific subject or something as broad as please support the NCUC as a whole but just something for later on but just to put on the table.

Bill Drake: Wolfgang were you showing interest?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: That's the good question. Did somebody discuss the two options Milton's approach and your approach with ICANN itself? So it means what would the preferential approach from ICANN's point of view?

Would they prefer to have a, you know, a clear budget for all the constituencies or do they prefer to hand out money on an individual basis based on what Milton has called the arms race?

Bill Drake: Okay I want to avoid a binary being constructed here between Milton's approach and my approach okay? This is not what we're talking about.

This - what Milton's suggesting which I think we all support basic concept of parity I think it's a good idea and then there's what ICANN does.

Now what ICANN does is it makes resources available to them that comes and asks -- that's it. They're not coming knocking on our door and saying please let us give cash. They're saying we have a little pot of money right now and if you have some specific defined purposes here's the window in which you can ask for it. That's it.

And we have now one week to decide do we want to ask for some support?

So the broader philosophical issue we could address. And I'm happy to take them on at. But I want to know now we've got a week left, can we muster the

energy to put in their proposal? I wrote the last two the day before they're due okay? That's not the model...

Joy Liddicoat: I'm not hearing any disagreement that there should be a proposal other than Milton's point of principal I'm not hearing any disagreement...

Bill Drake: Okay thank you Joy for calling consensus. All right so then...

Man: Well that's because nobody recognizes the BEC member who's been raising his hand. I agree with Milton but wholeheartedly. I know you don't like Bill. I know I'm going to work with you to get money.

But when I was in Los Angeles it felt like (house) at a trial. You and (Marilyn) were almost engaged. You guys were complementing each other back and forth. And that's unusual. That's unnatural.

And I saw...

Bill Drake: I don't recall it that way but anyway.

Man: But Bill was also right Milton. There was an effort on Robin's part to bring your point of view across. And it hit the floor with a dud, staff, everybody else in the room. It was an effort.

So the reality is as Bill describes if we want any money we have to participate in the circus in the zoo.

I think Carlos has a brilliant point. This is something Robin I talked about in Los Angeles. We were at the meeting while icon was presenting their budget in a very tedious boring way. And I was posturing my iPad with open society grants we can get.

There are possibilities but we do need to have a legal personality. We need to be (unintelligible).

And if we're going to go down that road to go down parallel roads that's the first step to be coming to the - a normal charitable organization.

Bill Drake: Rafik is waving at me.

Rafik Dammak: Yes what - we can solve that problem in week so we have to deal with it. Okay so it's Rafik speaking. Back to what Carlos said, and what (Ed) we can have a solution like (right) in their OCD CSAC I do it is not a legal entity but they get funds from - for foundation and OC through that.

Another organization that can (unintelligible) them and manage everything and the how to right now it is and to explain why you need such money and then they can (even).

The point it is (you know), who do this (unintelligible) thing. So we can - and there is other network doing that is we can do.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Wolf from CGI in response your NCOC and with (accreditor) help it's no problem to send money the way which we are doing today.

But it's very difficult sometimes to explain that NCOC don't have any part in ICANN budget. And some of the question that I receive with everyone in the ICANN family that had support is there any reason that NCOC don't receive?

So we need to have a way that we have some money coming in from ICANN and CGI is willing to support NCOC the way that we are doing today.

We sponsor a lot of entities in Brazil and sometimes we need to use let's say non-bureaucratic ways to solve the problem.

I am in favor to be very informal because if we start with a big structure we will have more new problems coming that you'll be on the end use part of our money for other objectives.

So I don't see any problem to use (selected) university or other facilities.

We are now in May supporting in Brazil that was 2013, a big international conference.

My entity in CGI and Carlos and (unintelligible) knows that we don't like to receive money coming from (governments).

If we have some supporting entities from the (government). So we use another entity to receive this money and they'll repay all the expenses for us. So we need to be flexible.

My understanding is in 15 years learning to work with ICANN and CDI we can do a very good job. We are willing to do the job and we need to avoid strong structures on the end. We are discussing more time on the structure and not on the objectives.

So we are willing to support. Let us be flexible. I think there are options that we can have both ways. And because the time is very short let's request money from ICANN. That will help us to have more money coming from others.

Because if our ecosystem don't support us there is some question remark is there any problem with NCOC not a son or daughter or not part of the family? Is NCOC an outsider? Let's be part of this. Let's request and use our money.

Bill Drake: I (take) your point. Thank you very much.

Milton quickly and then (Marie) and then I hope we can wrap this because we need to move to other items before the coffee break.

Milton Mueller: Yes just specifically on the issue of incorporation I don't think it's necessary. As (Hartlo) just pointed out we've gotten contributions directly to the NCUC account from not only (Carlos Hartmut)'s organization but several others.

And for more serious long term forms of support it could be gone - going through one of the organizational members for example when the Ford Foundation was supporting IGP a lot of the work we did was actually for NCUC and they knew that and approved of it.

Somebody wanted to give the NCSG chair support they could contribute to IP justice and that would be the mission. It doesn't necessarily require incorporation.

Bill Drake: Fair point. Yes?

(Walid Osacut): And just briefly I mean add to that last point...

Bill Drake: Could you identify the...

(Walid Osacut): Yes from - an outsider. The last point mentioned by you as well as the point by Dammak is very popular and it's named Google. It's fiscal sponsorship. So there are many organizations that can do that.

Bill Drake: Okay I think what we'll do is Joy to finish it and then...

Joy Liddicoat: Yes my feeling is that it's right and I'm grateful for Milton the need for calling on our conscious and making sure that we have all the principles we stand for.

I don't see in the scheme of things that asking ICANN for to fund specific activities for quite discrete objectives compromises those principles in anyway. And I think that we can always be open and accountable should we think that it's actually happening.

So I'm comfortable with a financial pitch. Only one of the ways in which we get income and it certainly won't and anyway change the balance of their voluntary input which still far outweighs any fiscal support we get.

Bill Drake: Great. Thank you very much. And it should be noted that many people put in requests and do not get what they ask for.

So we may request and not receive. So we shouldn't presume anything anyway.

I think though we've had this conversation before. We talked a lot in LA. The CSG in particular was very enthusiastic about needing more secretariat staff and everything else. You can see their budgetary requests from the BC in particular there asking for a lot of that.

I think we, the shared view was of an administrative nature. We - it was something that was bounded and subject to or control and of a administrative nature would be of interest. But then we didn't necessarily need staff to be helping us with our policy positions and so on.

So I think we should try to put together a proposal that does that in the next week. And I'll send a message to the members list soliciting support and participation in going there together.

I should also point out that in addition to this fast-track budgetary process we had just recently with annual process in the GNSO a toolkit review where the

GNSO staff asked us what kinds of resources we need for particular functions.

And I just wanted to let you know that we did put in a number of requests there including I suggested that it would be helpful -- and I don't know if this will happen -- that because we have our election after the annual and we have a globally dispersed membership and new leadership coming in we need to have - it would be helpful to have a face to face retreat of one day prior to the spring meeting where the new executive committee and any other interested participants could attend and get together and try to plan for the year and so on.

So I've added that into the request for toolkit support as well as some other items that you could look at the toolkit support requests later on having to do with for example support for things like Web casts.

We would like to do Web casts more often, Webinars both on policy matters and when necessary perhaps quarterly before the sessions to get our act together preparing for conferences.

So that toolkits is another source of resources that we should be aware of for our overall.

Finally something else that has to be finally finalized by this finance team which is kind of lagging as I say is the rules pertaining to travel funding.

And we have to decide how much we want to disperse on an annual basis and to whom based on what principles. There is a recognition that it has to be need-based and somebody who's actively engaged in something and so on.

But we've not written it down. And given that we have 300 members and eventually people come around and say I'd like to get funding to go to a

meeting we need some principled way to respond to people. So that's something else that has to be done through that finance team.

So the finance team as boring as it may sound really does need some participation. And we would greatly encourage anybody who is willing to join to do so.

If you join any of the teams you are not making a life commitment. We do not take your blood sample. And we do not chase you down and make sure that you can never leave.

You can participate in a team for a while well some things of interest to you and then go away if you want.

Man: If you join the finance team I think you are possibly making a life commitment because the possibility of death from boredom is extremely high. The risks are really just out there as somebody who has sat through some of these.

Bill Drake: And that was especially helpful thank you.

Man: Yes.

Bill Drake: Well anyway we...

Man: Whoever is on the finance team has to be very patient and very focus.

Bill Drake: Actually what was done in the world of finance the past few weeks was done very quickly and painlessly by a few of us because the team wasn't moving.

So okay moving on...

Man: It was basically done by you. We should give credit where credit is due.

Bill Drake: Basically done by me. So we have.

Man: And Bill I'll also volunteer. I used to be with PWC and I have some talents in that area.

Bill Drake: That'd be fantastic. We have five to ten minutes before we break for coffee and I know Wendy's eager. However I do want to start the conversation about programming.

So we had this concept that we were going to be doing a lot of programming. We had very successful one day summit hours both in San Francisco and Toronto that were very well received by a lot of people and which also were thanks to Robin's efforts as a fundraiser financially successful for NCUC because the generous funders of CGI (PR) affiliates and PIR were willing to allow us to retain the unspecified funds and up and into our general funds because of Robin's efforts absolutely. She deserves a big bow there.

The question then has become how much more of this do we want to do on an ongoing basis?

We had quite a robust discussion after the Toronto experience. And some folks thought like well we could do these every conference. Well it turns out that's kind of hard to do number one.

Number two, it also depends on staff political support which may or may not be there.

We had proposed initially to have a one-day conference here in Rome - in Rome...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: You could tell by...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: I'm Italian-American. You could tell where, you know, I'd like to be meeting right now.

Man: (Unintelligible) in China.

Bill Drake: Yes but alas not in Rome, in Beijing. And we had hoped to have a one-day conference here for various reasons that I don't want to get into. That did not work out.

We do have a two-hour workshop tomorrow the substance about which I would like to talk a little bit after the break because I think it's important that we get clear what we're going to do in that workshop nevertheless just to give you the larger overview.

So we have found another team, the program team that will try to take responsibilities for on an ongoing basis programming our different types of workshops and other events.

Sometimes we may do full-fledged full-day conferences. Sometimes like this we may opt to simply have a workshop within the main ICANN program, depends on what's the most expedient and works best for everybody.

So for this meeting we've gone with latter model of having a two-hour workshop tomorrow from 1:00 to 3:00 about which more later.

For the - then the question was what we're going to do for Durban.

And we ultimately decided not to submit a fast-track budgetary request for Durban because there was some misunderstandings about A, whether we

needed to and then B, it wasn't clear exactly what the parameters of that request would've been.

Nevertheless I will tell you that I have since had conversations with people in South Africa who think that there could be resources via a large search company the name of which I shall not mention that could provide the resources for us to do some sort of an event, an outreach event for civil society in Africa and civil society and also governmental and other people in Africa associated with the Durban conference.

So that's something that we will continue to discuss in the program group. And again the program group is open anybody's participation.

The chair of the program group is Wolfgang. And when we come back after the break you can talk a bit about the program for tomorrow.

Looking forward beyond that though what I wanted to say is the general concept I think we've reached closure on is that we would - we try to do one annual big conference a year.

And the question is whether we should try to do that during the annual, the ICANN annual and in the fall which was complicated by the fact that it comes very close to the IGF and a lot of people are maxed out or we could do it in the spring of the following year when we have a new executive committee or in the summer.

So those are the choices. We have to make a decision and we have to build this into our budgetary request in the next week.

So again there is a program group that has to talk these through and a finance group that has to talk these things through. And we have to make a request to ICANN within the next week for support for whenever we want to start the cycle of doing these annual conferences.

So I want everybody to be aware of that okay?

Questions about that?

Okay can you just click on the link for tomorrow and then we'll take a break?

Woman: Sorry I'm just well were waiting on the Durban proposal I think it would be good to (unintelligible) talk through the African regional (wits) end and network to see whether it might be useful to have something (unintelligible) focus on either issues in the region or, you know, what be thinking is about the level of engagement that might be possible given that it is in Durban from in the region. So I think that's one thing I'd really like to get (to them) put on.

And yes sort of the - I'm not sure if we're discussing it typically from the idea of a proposal for an annual event.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Woman: Yes okay. So I'm (unintelligible) deal with it are the ones you put there. I just wanted to...

Bill Drake: We...

Woman: Yes.

Bill Drake: Yes. We could not on the fast-track get together to make Durban the start of the annual cycle.

Woman: All right. Okay.

Bill Drake: So we're doing the Durban meeting without asking ICANN for support. But it appears that we may have financed to be able to hold a civil society event anyway tied to the summer school and so on.

Are we not able to show...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Not working. Can't you - the Beijing event link? Have you tried...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: It is link Control K?

Man: It's (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay so then let's take a break and we will find the link and make it work. Tomorrow we do have a very good workshop tomorrow. Wendy looks very pained. I'm sorry for that. There's coffee downstairs. We'll reconvene in 15, 20 minutes and we'll have a visit from the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Would you like to (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: In 15 minutes we will reconvene. And in 20 minutes we will be visited by the noncom committee prior to leaving though Wendy as a coffee share.

Wendy Seltzer: I don't want to interrupt anyone's coffee so feel free to get up and leave the room. But anyone since our time a short anyone who wants to talk about registrants rights and putting together a real statement as opposed to the

completely bogus statement that currently exists feel free to join me. Thank you.

Bill Drake: And are we not also doing that in the NCSG Team meeting?

Wendy Seltzer: I have absolutely zero idea whether NCSG and NCUC are the same or different in their policy or whether there's any time on anyone's agenda to add this statement. And therefore I'm trying to take some time when I can get it.

We'll let me ask Robin as the NCSG chair is this policy issue on the agenda? It is not. Would we like to add it to the agenda or is that not possible?

Robin Gross: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: It'd be very difficult. We could also hold a meeting, an ad hoc meeting if you'd like Wendy for people who want to work on this?

Wendy Seltzer: I'm requesting an ad hoc meeting specifically starting during the coffee break.

Bill Drake: Okay those who want to work on the RAA statement with Wendy please find her and we'll set something up to get that moving and what about the video?

Man: We will play the video when everyone comes back in 15 minutes.

Bill Drake: In 15 minutes you will also see a short and spiffy video that has been produced with NCUC's vast (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay 15 minutes everyone.

Is the Web cast and everything back up and running? Rock 'n roll. Hello to everybody who may be out there somewhere. We are reconvening after coffee in the usual post coffee chaotic mode. But we're ramping up and getting ready to go.

We now have as you see there 10:50 on the agenda a visit from representatives of the nomination committee. And we thought we'd just invite them to say yes. That's helpful.

And we'd thought we'd invite them to tell us a little bit about what the noncom's up to and what it's looking for this year and how we in society can participate more and so on.

So I would like to turn it over to - who's going to start (Jario). So we turn it over to the chair of the NONCOMs Messrs (Jario).

(Jario): Thank you. Thank you for having us here. Good morning. I have to make sure it's morning not evening.

The - my name is (Jario) (unintelligible) the chair for NONCOM this year. And I want to give you basically three messages.

One and perhaps the most important is we need good candidates. Without a good candidate pool there's nothing we can do. And that's why I am appealing to you. Please apply and please tell those people you know could be good candidates to apply.

The second message that we need your help in selecting the people for GNSO. And as you know there are two positions, one in each house.

And all ideas of what kind of people would be good counselors would be very much welcome.

And the third message is about noncom itself. It's been said that noncom is a black box and always has been and always will be. And it is not true starting with this noncom, 2013 NONCOM things will be different.

Man: Yes.

(Jario): We decided in Toronto at our kickoff meeting that the - basically the process will be as open as possible the data that is to say, the names of the candidates will be confidential, strict...

Man: We know that Milton isn't in sharing mode. So then that's a good start for everything.

Man: Just to say the names of the candidates will be confidential. Strict confidentiality of the names is the absolute basis for our work because otherwise no one would apply. But it should not be used as an excuse for keeping everything secret like we would be a bunch of, you know, cardinals who elect the pope and then white smoke comes out and everyone goes uh-huh.

So we tried to change that and we're implementing that in two ways - maybe more later. But first of all we have a history report cards as to say report cards are sort of collectively drafted immediately after each meeting or phone conference or physical meeting. And then each - representatives of each constituency are relaying them to the constituencies of course with their own comments if they wish.

And this - I hope that this system works with you and that they are going to hear if you are satisfied with that. And the other way by which we have been implementing this principal of openness is that there are open meetings of the NomCom. First of all, our meetings are noted on the schedule of the ICANN meetings. Before they used to be like the meetings of the Soviet Homeland

Bureau. I mean they were not mentioned, not even in the pub. But now they are and two of them at this meeting at this time are open.

Yesterday we had the outreach of subcommittee meeting chaired by Cheryl and today at 5:00 in room 5BC we have the meeting of the full committee and you're all welcome to come and see what we do. In addition of course there will be this additional NomCom open workshop which is basically our last opportunity to recruit people and others.

Well of course, you know, there are going to be three vote electors we select this year - two for GNSO council, one for CCNSO council and three for ALAC. And the ALAC people - one will come from Africa, one from Asia, Australia, Pacific Islands and one from Latin America - (Gabriel Reyes).

So these three things are what I wanted to tell you. And as I said, I would be happy to have your feedback but perhaps I don't know if Cheryl would like to share a few things. She is the chair of the next NomCom.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langon for the record and I'm the current chair elect and we assume - as I said this morning in an earlier meeting - providing I survive this year, I'm assuming I will be the chair of the NomCom next year.

And this is a huge opportunity for us and I just wanted to remind you all and we will get into some details momentarily. I need to get this through to you right now and that is you don't have to send to us or encourage people to put in SOI's that are just thought up perhaps for the GNSO. If you think you've got someone you can tack that would be equivalent to an independent thinking and non-aligned and not the usual suspects.

I like to scout those three regions, you know. We need not just the people who are involved in those pretend sort of silo edges that we all try not to work in too much. But if you've got an idea for the CTNSO council - you've got

someone in the CPTLD community who is engaged as a civil society member, not somebody who's running their local registry because that's where the pathway would be through their CTNSO council. But someone who is in the civil society in a particular CPTLD, send them our way.

So don't only think your own place of space. Think right across all of those. And other than that, thank you for the opportunity of speaking.

Man: Thank you.

So just to review - three board member, three, two - alright, say it again slowly so that - I don't know if it resonated with everybody. Two GNSO, one CCNSO and three ALAC, okay.

Now for the GNSO, I think it's fair to say that some of us who have been on the council in the GNSO in the past have felt that the NomCom appointees often came more from a private sector orientation and that this has impacted the way the voting works because - as you know - we're divided up into these four stakeholder groups and basically the balance of power is held by that one person that's put in by the NomCom. And in recent experience, that balance of power then has been systematically held by the commercial stakeholder group.

And so from our standpoint I think one of our priorities would be to insure that the NomCom takes seriously some truly independent balanced non - maybe somebody from a non-business oriented background for this kind of slot. And we will certainly - the timeframe is May 1?

That's not a lot of time but we can try and identify somebody who might be a plausible candidate to fit in there. And beyond that particular - that's the local point. I take your general points there. We shouldn't only think just about that so society people can fit them into the board slot.

I wonder also, we have a representative on the NomCom from the NCDC - Juan. Perhaps he has a thought or two about the relations between the non-commercial world and the NomCom process and ways we can leverage it and so forth. That means you I think.

Juan Ojeda: Thank you Mr. Chair. I think how NCDC can help is to reach. I think we have also many new people coming today to reach all their networks and to encourage people to apply from the noncommercial work so we can have diversity - not just business (unintelligible) people with business backgrounds but more diverse background and also to warrant geographical and gender diversity.

So more we have bigger pool of confident boards, it will be easy for the NomCom to select council who can ensure the diversity. And you were talking about the open SO's and NomCom. I was sending several times every month report of the NomCom activities and I really hope that NCSC members if they have a question or they want to send the feedback so I can bring it to the NomCom.

So especially we discussed about the issue of this - the issue of the appointing and NCA in which house and it's quite a critical problem I think. So perhaps I just...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Juan Ojeda: Okay. So to explain the GNSO structure you mean?

Man: No but there's the substantial path over where and how the NCA's get placed through the GNSO and whether it's something the NomCom or whether the GNSO does it and the result of it thus far has not been GNSO society friendly. So I just wondered if you could say a word on it.

Juan Ojeda: Okay. So because I think the (unintelligible) GNSO, that's happened then before five years ago. So before - still the NomCom appointed three - three members to the GNSO council. But after the restructuring, we have two houses - the non-contracted where the GNSO is there and the contracted parties. So we have two voting NCA1 in the contracted and the other one in the non-contracted and one - what we can call home is NCA.

So the program with the restructuring, there is - how do you say - three showed for the voting. So in the case of the non-contracted party, we have the noncommercial stakeholder group and the commercial stakeholder and that NCA. And NCA can be a tie breaker in the voting. So it's really important to have an independent person, not someone that can be more close to one of the parties.

So we are not asking I think here in NCSC to have the noncommercial but someone to have the independence and the (unintelligible) to get all points of view and to vote and hold his own capacity, not really just equate it to one of the parties.

Man: Understood. Okay Wendy but first (Adam) is next before (Malcolm). Did you want to add something?

(Adam): Yes. (Adam). Just to be clear about this, the NomCom is limited by the ICANN bylaws. So we can't act beyond what is in the bylaws. So, you know, we do the best we can and that does mean reacting to the candidate pool. But the rules are there in the bylaws that we have to respond to and of course we can't bend those. Thanks.

Man: Fair enough. Wendy, are you ready?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes. Just very briefly - Wendy Seltzer.

I think we'd like to see on the council nominated committee appointees who couldn't have come through the stakeholder group and we've tended to instead get people who should have been through the groups and that's lead to by us and the voting because while we'd love for everything to happen through consensus, just about everything in council does happen through voting.

Man: (Carmen) do you want to add something? Just to underline, okay.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: Cheryl here. Just on that point, this is where we get to say that to you. Remember, we can only choose from the puddle of people we have. Therefore if we've got the material to work with, we hear what you say and we hear that from nearly everyone we speak to. But when push comes to shove at the end of the selecting process if there isn't anyone who has that particular criteria, we then have to make another choice. But providing good materials there, we will do our best with your request.

Man: Understood. (Julie)?

(Julie): Thank you and I appreciate the repeated focus on the pool of candidates. Just a little feedback - I think it's also useful to reflect on and consider the performance of some of the NomCom representatives as a way to sort of tell them look, they're game. And particularly around the GNSO council, I think we're, you know, we've seen (Cindy) - due to the record - a lack of confidence I would say and active engagement and debate around the council.

And I'm worried that even with the quality of the council you've got there's, you know, a need to know the advocacy voice here. I fear that the NomCom representatives actually aren't clear necessarily on what we wanted. And I just simply see, you know, numerous meetings where the NomCom representatives actually make no input whatsoever.

So for whatever the reason is having got good candidates there. We want to make sure they contribute and so reflections on that and how to engage on that I think would be useful to get your thoughts on.

Man: I'll say my four years on council that when the NomCom people spoke , very often a lot of people - it was time to check their Facebook pages because some of them just took forever to say nothing and really we're not engaged in where the issues were. Or else we're just aligning themselves with another dominant party.

So we really need high quality people prepared to come in and think for themselves. And give me a second. One question I have about that is when you look at possibilities, do - when you look at the possibilities for the GNSO, do you think to yourself well it's got to be somebody who already understands the GNSO and is fully, fully in on the dirt of how that works or can they be somebody who's relatively newer because frankly a lot of the people who are already going to be deep into the process stuff are going to be people who are already aligned with one of the groups.

So I just wondered about that point. Thank you.

Man: Yes, just briefly. Of course it's preferable that people know about internet and the structure of ICANN and so on and so forth but they can come from totally outside if you feel otherwise.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, go ahead.

Man: Just to totally sort of change the subject here. So last year our - the NCUC rep on NomCom ended up resigning towards the end of the process. I don't - obviously I don't, you know, we don't want to part the veil that ties NomCom deliberations but - and obviously we don't know that much about the incident

because that privacy of NomCom operation has been respected. But we do know that our rep resigned and there was some, you know, it seems like fairly controversial insight in NomCom.

I'd like to know what NomCom has done in its procedures in order to prevent repetition of that problem which is difficult to do without really describing what the problem is but I would still like to basically answer that question. What procedural changes or how are you dealing with that issue?

Man: Well I don't know if we're supposed to comment what happened in the previous NomCom's but anyway, I was a member of that NomCom. And what I can say is that they were long and really deep discussions - after we had performed our actual job - on how to prevent any kind of conflict that would share with them and (unintelligible) NomCom from working in an optimal way - how to do that.

There were a series of recommendations from 2012 NomCom to this and they are in public domain. They are on NomCom site. And then in our kickoff meeting in Toronto we studied them and we adopted our present procedure. So that's what I can say and not really going back to the details of what happened last.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: I think - it's Cheryl for the record - it's important to recognize every NomCom is a fresh start and that is why they review their rules and procedure at their kickoff meeting. But do rest assured or as assured as you can, appropriate material which is in the public record provided by the previous NomCom for our consideration was looked at, was discussed and if you want to compare and contrast the rules and procedure from one year to another, you can do - you are free to do that.

Man: I'm confident that this NomCom understands the problem that happened and will guard against it happening again. I think we've run out of the time that we

have scheduled. Do you have something very pressing or - just two last real quick comments from Milton and (Adam).

Man: Just a question actually - is it still the case that the commercial constituency gets two representatives and the non-commercials only get one and if so, how can we change that?

Man: Yes, it is correct that the business constituency places two delegates. The nominating committee is a representative of large business and small business. It's also worth noting that the new part is a new constituency does not have a seat. And the only way to change that is to change the bylaws because the structure of the nominating committee is a bylaws requirement. So it means a discussion about the bylaws.

I have attempted one informally as myself - not a NomCom member but somebody interested in this process - and not got very far yet obviously because the bylaws haven't changed. But it would be something that you would continue to discuss with the board and specifically I believe with the SIC and so take it to the SIC.

May I carry on and just finish? Just we're talking about recruitment and we need your help and advice. There are two ways to do that. The nominating committee website follows the typical ICANN standard of the committee name icann.org. So if you go to NomCom - N-O-M-C-O-M - dot org, you'll find our webpage. And if you want to apply - if you do slash apply - you will take yourself to a statement of interest form which is our application form.

I will note that that application form is online. It does not save. So as you're going through it, make sure you've got all your information in a separate document. Do not think it's being saved please and if you wish to recommend somebody and this is particularly important. We have a process for taking recommendations. Nomcom.icann.org/suggest - you'll go to a form which allows you to suggest somebody's name and that can either be anonymous

or it can be with your recommendation going to that person saying I (Adam) recommend you person X.

And that will come to the NomCom. It's very helpful because it encourages somebody - oh somebody actually likes me enough to say you go do that job or it might be that they don't like you enough. But anyway, thank you very much.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much for visiting. We appreciate it. Best of luck with the rest of your meetings today.

Okay now we need to return to our schedule. I would like to talk about the workshop tomorrow. We were on the question of programs if you can go down - scroll down to the programming. So the Beijing event - the link is broken but can you go to the proper link which is for all councils in the NCUC webpage. It's called ncuc.org. Then click wherever opens up the link or you can do the link that's on council.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: No, I sent the links out to you. Would you like me to email it to you again?

Woman: Alright, just while you're doing that I've had a request to show - a reminder that you promised to show a video on that. Thank you Brenden.

Man: Do you want to show the video while he's trying to find the link? Show the video. This is a little video that was made for publicity purposes and I just emailed you the link again.

Brenden Kuerbis: This is Brenden Kuerbis for the record. So as (Bill) was mentioning, this is something that we developed mostly to kind of help explain what NCUC is

because a lot of people coming into the ICANN world really have no idea what - where noncommercial people go. So hopefully this moves us along the path of kind of explaining that.

And, you know, videos can be a very effective and cost efficient way of doing this. So this may be the first in maybe a long line of other videos we can use to do things like explain complex policy issues in a short amount of time. So here we go.

Man: This was produced for the Toronto meeting.

Brenden Kuerbis: Yes, in advance - this was produced in advance of the Toronto meeting and it actually was the result of a lot of contributions with a lot of people in NCUC. Maria Farrell and I helped develop the questions for the people that were interviewed. Numerous people were interviewed there at the Toronto meeting.

And then on the editing side both I and Milton contributed to the editing. We worked with a producer that's based out of Toronto and it was done on a shoestring budget. So here we go and tons of volunteers.

((VIDEO))

Man: (Unintelligible) years down the road, future historians would look back and go, you know, there was a time in the 1990's and 2000's when citizens of the earth built this open distributed network and everyone could communicate with each other freely and then it all shut down.

An organization like NCUC has a special obligation as do all of us who care deeply about protecting and preserving cyberspace.

Woman: Since the founding of the noncommercial users committee - NCUC - in (unintelligible) in 1999, we've been fighting for fair use, free speech, freedom of expression, privacy.

Man: ICANN plays a key role in determining how those human rights can really be enforceable in the internet.

Woman: When we talk about a multi-stakeholder community like ICANN, you have representatives from government, some law enforcement, some private industry each of which might bring their own agendas and interest, particularly the intellectual property interest people would say are overrepresented.

Man: What ICANN consists of now is a bunch of people running around the board screaming at it, trying to get its attention.

Woman: Decisions in ICANN are made by the people who show up and the people who scream most loudly. So it's really important for civil society to get involved because we need to balance that. We need to bring the kinds of human perspectives and human rights issues into these policies.

Woman: NCUC in many ways is the most diverse.

Man: We have over 200 organizational and individual members from more than 60 countries.

Man: NCUC is a good way to show how open, diverse and preparatory internet debates could be.

Man: Getting involved in NCUC is a great way to expose yourself to this environment of global government and to empower yourself.

Woman: You've got to get involved in this ICANN thing because it's important and if you don't get involved, you're going to find the internet becomes a more constrained space.

Woman: Organizations that are committed to noncommercial speech on the internet and are involved in using the internet for their own advocacy and outreach are definitely doing NCUC. And they should bring their energy and their ideas and we'll teach you how to participate in ICANN and you'll help us create good policies.

((END VIDEO))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Just one proposal. If you add a voice - it would be good to add a voice from Africa.

Man: (Unintelligible) leadership.

Brenden Kuerbis: Yes, we're taking onboard all of that feedback. Thank you very much, you know, we did what we could with the resources we had at the time and we'll do it more.

Man: And I'll put my Brazilian jersey from the national team next time I speak on the video just to make sure we are from the south.

Woman: Before we leave, Brenden said something really important that I wanted to add which is that this might be part of a series, not just about recruiting people to NCUC but about summarizing some of the very complicated things we do in a minute or two video that we can put out there. And I think that's great.

There's a lot - there's so many issues that we're working on and it's hard to do the outreach and to do the policy making at the same time. So this idea of videos that will help us gather comments and commenter's and some people from outside our process to work on some of these policy issues I think is a great idea.

Man: The budget requests are due in one week. The budget team is open to participation by anyone. You can follow the - you can reach the budget team from the ncuc.org website. If you think that this is something that we should ask for funding to do then please God get on there and make a proposal.

Woman: You're serious, the budget's due in a week?

Man: Yes. That's what I've been trying to tell people and were debating whether budgets are bad. The budget is due in a week, okay?

So we're turning now to where we are today. We have a reception tonight at 6:00 PM at the end of constituency day that will be held in the grand foyer - grand hall foyer B. We've discovered interestingly that ICANN is holding a reception next door at the very same time. So that's a little bit unfortunate but hopefully people will bleed back and forth between the two events.

We should have some flyers - other flyers for our workshop. Are they all gone?

Man: They've been distributed.

Man: They've been distributed. I don't know if we can find more. Hopefully we'll find more of the ideas that people need made aware about tomorrow.

So anyway, so we have the workshop tonight and if it's cool now (David) I'd like to just go through the program briefly. So tomorrow, the whole focus of the conference is the one world, one internet. New GTLD is a competition in

the changing global environment and this is operated with the support from our friends in CGI.br PIR the dot article - .org and Internet Society. Hi, and we have two panels they're going to have to move very quickly.

And we have not had an opportunity to really talk amongst ourselves about exactly how these should be calibrated and focused and I wondered if the chair - we don't have the chair of the second one but we have a chair of the first one, moderator Wolfgang Kleinwachter's here. Just to - it would be good to try and tune up as a group a few ideas about what we would like to get achieved with this panel, what concepts. You have one hour and six speakers here, you're only going to be able to ask a few questions and take a few rounds of reaction.

The first point is they need to know I hope that you've been in contact with them that do not all come with prepared speeches because it should be an interactive talk show kind of thing. I found out last night that somebody from one of the Chinese organizations was preparing a speech which was not what we wanted, so hopefully the rules of the game have been made clear and I just wondered can we talk a little bit about what this panel will talk about - Wolfgang.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes thank you very much, you know, this time of this one hour wants to raise the issue of the risk that the Internet becomes fragmented. I think the ICANN slogan One World, One Internet is now rephrased again and again and again but it's also a questioned by some other groups.

We had workshop and (wishes attend) class in Paris where one of the panelists from China said that's not right and we have different worlds and we have also different Internet, we are now behind the firewall. And so that's why we have the question between One World, One Internet and we - and this time, you know, I want to ask some questions to the attendant list, you know, how we can keep the Internet as one Internet and one world so we have no chance to escape to Mars or Venus.

So that means we live on this globe that we could recognize there are differences in cultures and languages also in jurisdictions and all of this, but this should not block our understanding from One World and One Internet. So that means the question mark could be removed at the end of the panel and we should say yes we have one world and one Internet. That's why I've invited people who are very close also to the government, Tarek Kamel who was a minister in Egypt.

And so I think there are uploads there are some plans to, you know, have a separated Internet for our uploads. I've invited former advisor to a Russian prime minister and (Lain Totterbolt) so there are in Cyrillic there are some plans, you know, how to get this world separated. We have a guy from the Ministry of Information Technology from China and we have Markus Kummer from ISOC which has a different slogan which says, you know, One World Internet for All, so and not one Internet.

So that means I want the collection date, you know, how ISOC sees this. And I hope we have a (limited day) which at the end of the day comes to the conclusion that we should witness that there are some tendencies to our expectation but we should encourage to do all what we can to keep the One World, One Internet slogan a reality.

Man: Thank you, Wolfgang how do we - in the time that we've got available, how do we avoid this just degenerating into the reputation of tired generalities about the glories of openness and avoiding fragmentation? What are the specific kinds of points about sources of fragmentation that you can draw out, in particular the local speakers on and where are the sort of points where we can put the pedal to the medal and get real on the issues here, that's what I want to know - if you have a thought.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I think it's...

Man: Or if anybody else has a thought.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I would be very happy to get some additional input, you know, how to talk with the first collection so I want certainly - I plan to ask (Chris), Terri Camille from ICANN to explain how ICANN feels. This with his background and how ICANN takes some data and risk here, you know, that the Internet becomes fragmented.

And then I want to go from this to our Chinese partner - by the way there will be only one representative from China in our (company) ministry because the Director from the Internet Society of China will miss. So it's a little bit easy also for the panel, we are less people so we have more time for interaction and I hope also that we get some questions from the audience. But please, you know, if you have any recommendations, you know, to - how to focus the debate - it's the right place to (need) this (feedback).

Man: My suggestion would be to as we look at the layout of the panel, we've got ICANN and ISOC people who are going to give us the kind of standard rah rah integration all one world, glory of the single (root other than that), that's fine.

And then we're going to have people from China and Russia, you know, we know the Russians in WCIT propose that there should be a recognition - international legal recognition of the national legal space for all cyberspace and that this should be subject to global regulations, etc. We have the Chinese approach and what they're doing, if we (attempt) to try to draw them out on the specific kinds of steps they're taking and how they're thinking about the question of integration versus fragmentation.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I think yesterday in the Chinese Summit which was after around lunch, the guy from Russia - the Russian Center (Anti Coleco) (commenced) the presentation of (Tiana Kontac) and the single root and that we have to talk about the logistics of the (yanna).

So I think this would be a very concrete point to say, you know, better there are plans to ask these questions. This is for the moment settled by contact which goes forth in the next five or six years. So - and I wanted to squeeze out was that there are some plans, you know, to challenge this.

Bill Drake: Uh-hum, does anybody else have any other thoughts that perhaps you could turn the table - (Joi)?

(Joi White): Just a couple of thoughts, I mean I think (CIGNI) and other foreign civil society groups discussing is the increasing risk around in fact the actual fragmentation of the Internet. You know, I mean the reality is here in China people who don't have access to the same Internet that people do in other countries.

And increasingly we're seeing, you know, large scale filtering, content blocking and other things which even affect here as seen in (issue pack of 56) does pose strict to the security instability of the (Denise) and - I'm sorry the (ropes). So I mean, you know, I think if we're going to try and get something beyond the present choice of how, you know, there is this one great model and all we need to do is secure and critique the multi-stakeholder, the bottom-up process and all will be fine. And I think we need to inject some strong reality check on that until civil society speakers.

And I know I've thought about it but, you know, Egypt did shut down the Internet and has never really had a equivalent and clear statement from Tarek, you know, on that and it's troublesome in terms of ICANN's role. And, you know, it's saying it has a technical mandate and yet, you know, the reality being what we're seeing in other forums, being really significant risk to that. So, you know, again know that, you know, there are sensitivities in this context, but I think amidst we have some kind of provocation around us, we're not going to get beyond some of those (platitudes).

Man: Well the point was to at least try, yes.

Man: Well I mean it's getting closer and closer to (unintelligible) cup and to my domain because it's - I can't actually access my own Web site here, so...

Man: Right.

Man: ...it's a really (interesting), you know, experience.

Man: It's a little frustrating.

Man: But I mean it's also good to ensure that we don't, you know, bring in the subject quite critically, it's a matter of approaching the subject with an understanding of circumstances in the country.

Because if your talking about the multi-stakeholder approach then we as - within this context we are in right now, there is the government and there is civil society supposedly and there is also the business community. So these need to be, you know, attracted to the subject but without having them attracted we'll only have one side. So I'm not sure we're going to go far if we talk about those subject (from here).

Man: Well of course we're not here to put the host country's feet to the fire and make things uncomfortable, but at the same time we should be able to have some open dialogue. And if you'd like to stand up and ask why you can't reach your own Web site, see if anybody has an answer I think that's entirely appropriate.

Man: Can we talk briefly about the - you all said something (unintelligible).

Man: Well yes if we don't put the host country's feet to the fire who in ICANN is going to do so?

Bill Drake: Yes that (exalted) relevance you see is recognized by all but at the same time it's not really appreciated by staff, leadership and others who have been in contact with me asking that we not misbehave.

So we have to walk a fine line here, they're trying to open an office here in China as part of their business model and so I'm not going to walk in and sort of misbehave to misbehave. You know, so anything we do has to be done with a certain amount of diplomatic finesse and balance I would suggest. And the idea was to have a balanced panel here, you know, we present different viewpoints and invite the Chinese colleagues to reflect on views being shared.

Man: Did anybody consider inviting the GAC representative from Taiwan?

Bill Drake: No we did not - all right so now - and you by the way are copied on - you're on the program clearly and you never suggested that. So now for the second panel Han is the moderator and she's not here but Milton is sort of the intellectual architect of this panel and so I'm going to ask him to perhaps do the same thing that Wolfgang did and give us a little taste of what other kind of organizing ideas that we're asking people to engage around here and see if people have any feedback.

Milton Mueller: Yes the organizing ideas are the regulation of the domain industry and particularly the issues of competition and privacy as they intersect with domain name regulation.

So in particular China has expressed at various points, sometimes not too efficiently but indirectly an interest in having some kinds of special authority over domains that are in Chinese script. On the other hand from a purely sort of business standpoint, you know, a domain is a domain and trading services are - services - domain name services or domain name services under the WTO Agreement probably would be classified in information service and

there would be no discrimination and treatment based on whether a domain name is in Chinese or Cyrillic or ASCII.

So we wanted to bring that issue out for explicit discussion, but we also want to sound out the attitudes of (Konac) and CNNIC towards competition with each other - will there be more competition in China because of this? Or will this be one of these sort of managed things where they get something and the other guys get another, kind of a carefully divided market.

And to what extent do the Chinese representatives believe that greater and more intense competition in this field will undermine their attempts to use domain name system as a way of controlling what they consider to be bad behavior on the Internet? So you may or may not be aware of the fact that there is...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: I thought I would raise some of these questions in my own (present)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: ...and I've already talked to Lee May about some of these issues, I haven't met the CNNIC guy, I should probably try to track him down in if (Hong) can - did you invite (Hong) to this discussion?

Man: (I did and she (unintelligible)).

Milton Mueller: Okay, so what - yes so the CNNIC domain had - was one of - becoming one of the largest domains in the entire world, it would pass .de. And then there was a crackdown in which they literally - I can't remember the exact number but it might be as much as like two thirds of their registrations were cancelled - a very large number of their registrations.

And this was because they were cracking down on what they saw as spammers, cyber crime and other bad actors, including like (Victor and sites) and those kinds of things. So there's two interesting issues there, one is the tradeoff between a growing industry and the highly regulated, you know, how much of the market are you sacrificing. And you can see the market share of .com going up as CNNIC cracks down - (which I think is interesting)...

Man: I don't mean to interrupt but I was just trying to get to like (Chris) was stating the kinds of question that we would ask, you're kind of giving your presentation which is interesting, but so just so we know how to - how we're driving the discussion.

Milton Mueller: The (Chris) statement is there, what is it you find inadequate about that?

Man: I want to know what when (Zu LuLu and Juan Tang Sum) looks at that, what they're going to think they're being prompted to say.

Woman: Perhaps we're done with the agenda items since we don't have the proper panelists.

Man: I wondered if anybody had any input on how we might (focus) this panel, if not then we'll move on. Okay I strongly encourage everyone to come along, I think they'll be interesting discussions and hopefully they'll be good coordination and preparation in advance. We talked with somebody last night who was preparing a speech and I hoped that they've since been told not to come with a prepared speech - okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Well it's a question of how it's being introduced and so the moderator will have to manage that.

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Bill Drake: Yes there is interpretation also - okay so that's the event tomorrow and I hope that everybody can come along. We've got ten minutes until the PIR people come so I thought why don't we hold the bylaws conversation until after that and before that finish up the other loose items on here?

We have a couple of other team (finished) efforts under - in launch, various stages of launch. We formed a team on (In Reach) and member engagement and other outreach of recruitment, these are obviously two sides of the same coin, perhaps they could be faulted together in a since relations but right now that's how they're specified and I'm the facilitator of that. We also want to start to do some communication stuff and I've talked with Mary about that, something to lead on that and I have a couple of points I want to share on that.

So first quickly why don't we go to (Evan) and see if you have a couple comments on (In Reach) and (Outreach), what you've been doing and what's your (hope).

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Bill Drake: Sure we've, you know, they're coming in ten minutes so...

Man: (Both) the slides will be (doing some speed talking).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Edward): Okay, we've held off a lot in these committees because we had to do some revitalization within the infrastructure of (EMTUC).

When we took over we really had no way of admitting members, members who have come to the NCSG and we wouldn't even know they existed, we didn't know what members we had. When you apply to join our family, you

would go to the NCSG and come to our Web site and we'd ask you to join a Web site not a constituency and I know I wasn't brought onboard to be a Web master. So in terms of outreach and (David) we're going to have to just go real quick if you could - next stage

David Cake: Okay.

(Edward): What we're waiting on are some resources, so Web site's going to be up, (Bill)'s going to be talking about (funds) requested to produce a brochure and I'm working with Mary in creating a fact sheet that is key to international invasion of our community.

We want to use the fact sheet and translate into as many languages as possible with the (date) who we are, what we do, how to get involved and the benefits of getting involved. And my idea is that inside the brochure we'll be able to put the fact sheet in the native language of a country we're going to, say for an ICANN meeting when we have an event in Buenos Aires for example. We'll have the brochures, but we'll have the fact sheet in Spanish and we'll be able to reproduce that in as many languages as possible.

Next, okay different types of outreach and sometimes we don't clarify what we mean by the term, we have the public outreach to increase our membership but we also do an IG outreach and ICANN-specific outreach. And one of the proposals we'll be making is we need to involve more public outreach when we do events at ICANN Event. When we have Milton three days before the event asking, where are the flyers?

And I'm going to an English-speaking event on Sunday morning with 250 English-speaking diplomat civil society folks and I have no flyers it's really hard to say we're doing outreach at this event. We're doing outreach but to a limited degree, we're going to fix that, all right. Different types of outreach - we have the general outreach which everyone's been doing, we also have

targeted outreach. As we've been waiting for the other stuff to come up that's what I've been focusing on and we've got a few private projects, you know.

We had a great private project in Russia, unfortunately the nature of volunteerism is that volunteers leave. But we have about 40 individuals in the organization we've identified that are potential candidates for membership of NCUC. This whole project we're going to try to reproduce in different countries and it came from a Brazilian brand (Amocile) who told me, (Edward) you send stuff in English to us, you're in America - or in my case the United Kingdom, no one's going to respond.

So what I'm trying to do is get people on the ground, we had somebody in Russia translate our stuff in Russian and then we do the cold calls via email to those organizations to see if it works. The second pilot project - (David) next one, professionals - it's called affinity marketing. We're going to start with some IP folks, we'll give them some feedback, say hey we have too many IP members - my argument is we don't, we have too many American IP members.

I don't know if we have any civil society IP (voyeurs) they're more civil society countries in the world than there are common law nations. So we get a list of about 40 - I've asked Mary to help out with the joint letter saying, hey IP folks we're NCUC this is what we do, please join us. So we'll send these things out with that attachment and we'll see what happens. If you can go on we're doing the same thing, we're going to be trying to follow-up in the same price in Italy with (Nuno Garcia) leading the effort if you can keep going - okay (David).

Private Project 1B librarians and the access to knowledge movement and (Ray) has a few extra letters to his name - (Roy) basically in Miami at St. Thomas University, he's leading that effort and has already been making calls. Next please - and (Sam) - (Kappi Sun Sam) is leading the youth effort. The youth's have adults talking for them and (Sam) made me realize in

Prague maybe we need to have a youth talking for themselves. Some of us have met some of the kids from Hong Kong here, really bright.

I have the card and (Kathy), (Sam)'s going to get the contacts to follow-up and (Sam)'s really upset, he's not here and he doesn't think he should have to go to school this week as you well know. And I do agree with (Sam), we needed him here and tell him that - feel free. Okay this is big because as I said waking up on Sunday morning with Milton yelling, where are the flyers? And it wasn't the first time he yelled that and then it was Brenden get me the flyers because we all know when things go wrong, we always yell for Brenden.

This is what we'd like to do in Buenos Aires where we think we're having an event, first of all we can't rely upon ICANN for a room - there is - that's going to be a discussion elsewhere, I've briefly talked to Robin about it. We got to get it set up a month or two in advance, we can't be saying, are we going to have an event two weeks out and expect we can do public outreach in the city the meeting's taking place. Then the timetable's out, six weeks out we contacted (Cognis), one month out we contact civil society media and then two weeks out we start bombing them with email and reminders.

That's a way to do public outreach at ICANN meeting instead of just having outreach to ourselves, which is tend to be what we do ourselves in every constituencies, (Bill). Okay as (Bill)'s brought up the IGF, there's been some talk that we need to put a little bit of pressure on the nice folks in Brussels and Washington. We may at some point and this is far down the road, try to do a standalone event in DC, introduce folks to ourselves, let them know we exist. That's something - again that's in the future but something that we have out there, (go for it).

The one thing we can't forget, we talk about people - (Bill)'s real proud as am I what 75.8% I believe of our membership is non-America but we sometimes forget they're people. So let me personalize this a bit with one of our newest

applicant's (go for it). That's (Maria) and I use the photo with her permission, she's a (Nickel Sea at Cypress) - go. She produces under her own domain name this Cyrillic human rights blog - go. She also has an English language newsletter that she comes out with every week, that's how I get to know her.

I found the newsletter, it's fantastic, I made contact with her. We have been emailing back and forth for a few weeks, then was it Sunday night - Monday morning - one of these nights here (Ching) I was up for three hours with her, went back and forth, she finally applied - not a deal, there's two billion - there are two billion non-commercial Internet users out there. If I could spend six hours with each and every one of them, my life - I would love to have that life expectancy. So quickly if you could give me one more, we're going to have referral blocks on the member's Web pages.

We're basically - let's say you're sitting at home and watching a TV news show and you're thinking they should be with us, I want you to go to that box and put down try to find these people. You know, this organization, this individual - send it to us, we'll do the recruiting and we now have a email address nquc@ncuc.org where if you have anybody out there that you think we should be targeting, any ideas of how we can do outreach.

And please if you'd like to join our committee, contact us through that address, we'll get back to you and we'll try to bring more people in, so we truly become the voice of individuals in civil society in ICANN whether ICANN wants us here or not, thank you.

Bill Drake: And I see Brian has already showed up, so we'll leave this relatively short then and then turn to the PIR welcome discussion.

But just so as you can (Han)'s bringing to the game, I'll have energy and interest in trying to stimulate outreach to new people and we can all help by trying to target particular groups. There are a lot of folks that we could sit down and map out and identify as potential and members and like

customized spin of why they should be want to be involved. But then once you bring them in, you've got to like show them how they can actually do stuff and why it matters. And so that means also the (In Reach) part...

(Edward): But we have a presentation which we don't have time for, but we are doing (In Reach) and we're doing a serious study led by Amer and Norway to try to find out for example why 90% of our membership is inactive. That's not something we can do quickly, but it's going to take time but we are putting together a study plan to do that.

Bill Drake: Okay just when you use terms like inactive, its worth bearing in mind that, you know, in civil society coalitions like this they're - you've got different types kinds (dynamics), you've got people who joined and they're willing to vote for and support representatives who engage in processes but they don't necessarily have the time to go work in those processes themselves.

And then you've got people who actually want to transition towards getting more engaged. Then of course it's difficult, it's difficult for non-commercial players who don't have any financial skin in the game and don't have staff and all the other goodies to want to put a lot of time into deep diving into ICANN work processes, etc. We can do more though to try to facilitate that process, show how it works, show what the benefits are, show that if you get real engaged in a working group and start to play an important role that we might be able to allocate some of our travel funds to support you to get you to the next meeting, these kinds of things.

But all that has to be sort of laid out, we never really had that specified, so it's a matter of just architecting that and recognizing that different people are going to want to participate in different ways. Some other things that we want to try to scale up - are you raising your hand?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay I just because I know Brian is here and I don't want to go on too long on this point, just some other things that we want to start to scale up that we haven't had a lot of time yet to work on is a new communications effort and I think Mary can help with that and certainly anybody else as well.

I put in the Fast Track proposal that's being considered now, I won't find out until a couple days for just \$2000 for print materials. We have not print materials - we have no brochures or any kind of newsletter or anything that you can lay around - a nice shiny thing that says, this is what NCUC is. And I thought we could do maybe like a brochure or even some concise issue briefs that would be presented before the quarterly meetings - or the (three time a year) meetings that would maybe perhaps identify a few key positions that we're taking and some contact information and things like that.

When I look around this table, we got a room full of people who write for a living, you know, I've looked at by side by ex- can you click on that example (this will freak you out). I would actually show this to probably like - that link doesn't work? Well I don't know why - what's going on with these links?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: But anyway it's the brochure from - it's a newsletter from - with the (VC) and you've seen those floating around. And they have a lot of like smiley, cherry, Lottie Lottie stuff and we don't necessarily want to do something like that.

But we could do something more substantial with a little bit more of a critical bite that says who we are, what positions we're taking and what we think are the key issues for this meeting that's coming up that we're pushing, it would not be that hard to do this.

So anyway I put in a Fast Track request, if we get resources we could try one as a pilot for Durban and if we decide that we want to do more in the way of communicating our message, who we are, on standing event. Who we are,

what we're about and so on through different medians we could build that into a budget process which again is due next week - Milton.

Milton Mueller: The newsletter - the bottleneck is not resources, it's somebody's time and somebody having the time to read that. You know, and nobody is going to get more time if ICANN gives us money.

I'm sorry you can't hire some flunky to write up - have a full graph of what's happening in the Durban meeting and write up an analysis of it and understand where we want to - that would have to be you Bill. And resources I don't think, you know, it's a question of whether you have time to write something like that and in terms of duplication that's trivial - that's trivial.

You want to send me a PDF and I'll bring 100 - 200 copies and they won't be late this time. You know, it's not about resources, the time that you spend preparing a proposal to ICANN for something like that would probably exceed the time you would save from whatever resources they gave you.

Bill Drake: Your opposition to resources is noted, in any event so the point is I think we can do more in the way of printing materials that reflect who we are and that's one of the items that we want to consider going forward. So that then - those three items very quickly and now we have - we're very happy to have (Kathy) has something and then Brian - okay than (Kathy) I see your hand, sorry.

Kathy Kleinman: (Unintelligible) we definitely (unintelligible) ICANN (unintelligible) an awful lot of resources. I'd love to say as a society we (unintelligible) just to think about what (is left is valuable).

Bill Drake: Okay your (appearance) leader has been pushing this on ICANN staff and leadership for four years, they showed no interest in it, I'm going to respond and in Los Angeles we raised it with her and she - it's been turned over and turned entirely into a staff process with the community locked out.

So I'm willing to try to do that again but the problem is that they have not shown interest in engaging us that would be worth trying again. If we keep doing it then there has to be a group that works with (Ed) who's the head of the outreach group to try to put - to keep this going with (Sally) because so far what she's told us is they've defined theoretical models and constructs for outreach with 16 x 75 tables with little boxes with little dimensions and payoffs and deliverables and this, that and the other and all this kind of stuff.

And we're like going, you know, we just need help to reach out to civil society for these regions, so it's an issue. So I would certainly suggest trying to engage with them, I'm in the group - the outreach group that (Sally)'s running.

Kathy Kleinman: Great.

Bill Drake: So with that said thank you Brian for coming, thank you for waiting for five minutes, we just wanted to knock out a couple of agenda items and we'd love to hear from PIR and what's up. And first of all we have already acknowledged our grateful support to you for over the years for (MTs and work). And so we continue to thank you for that and just wonder what your thoughts are for today.

Brian Cute: Thanks (Bill) and very happy to continue to provide support in public interest registry. My name is Brian Cute, I'm the CEO of Public Interest Registry, thank you very much for inviting me, I will try to be succinct and give you an update of what's up with us.

PIR is of course the operate of the .org domain on the Internet which has been serving the non-commercial community to a large degree for over ten years. We are continuing to promote .org on a global basis and in the last couple years have put some focus program in developing countries in the southern hemisphere markets to make sure that org is being made available to the broadest set of users. Their most important new project for us which

some of you I haven't heard of is the applications we made for the .ngo.org top level domains that is designed to serve non-governmental organizations.

Both NGO and LNG the romance language equivalent is going to be offered as a community base top level domain uniquely designed to serve the NGO community globally. And they will also be offered as closed domains so that only NGOs will be able to register in those domains. We came to the conclusion that this was a good idea after doing about 18 plus months of outreach to NGOs around the world. Holding a number of workshops and presenting this concept to the NGO community, both grassroots and larger and mid-size and asking them whether there was a benefit here to be had.

We heard a resounding yes and in large part because the NGO community told us that damage done by briefcase NGOs, (propsters) who set themselves up as NGOs is real in their community. It has done damage to their reputation and that if an online resource that in some way could be verified could be offered. And address space where the donor or the user had a high sense that this was a bonafide NGO that they were (in tracking) with, this would offer distinct benefit to their community. So after doing a lot of outreach and getting strong, affirmative response, we applied as a community-based TLD.

We had over 700 letters of support from NGOs from around the world and a very good geographic distribution too - both northern hemisphere, southern hemisphere - a good representations of the NGOs saying yes we think this is a good thing for Public Interest Registry to do. So where we are in that process is the early good news is that there was nobody else who applied, so we don't have a contention set. We are going to the ICANN evaluation process, we - if ICANN stays on its current calendar and track anticipate launching those new addresses probably late first quarter or early second quarter of next year.

And so in addition to continuing to continue to promote robust and healthy .org we are very busy in the halls of Public Interest Registry trying to get ready to launch what we think are going to be very important new top level domains. We did also apply for four IBM versions of .org, one in Hindi, one in Cyrillic, two in Chinese. We do have an objection against our Cyrillic application, we'll work through that process but we also anticipate the launch of IDN versions of org as it's important - equally important to us to promote the growth of a multi-lingual Internet around the globe.

So that's really what's new with us and I'm happy to take any questions or discuss anything of interest.

Man: Thank you Brian, the Cyrillic case - what's the nature of the objections with that?

Brian Cute: It's an organization that's asserting a trademark right in the Cyrillic strain that we've put forward and so as it's a intellectual property, legal based objection our lawyers are looking at it, assessing it, we're moving forward in the challenge process so we hope that we'll prevail there but we're in the middle of that process.

Man: Do you express support from the Kremlin for identifying true NGOs?

Brian Cute: I haven't spoken to Vladimir yet - oh the other thing that I should point out too is we - in addition to doing a lot more outreach to NGOs in the coming months, we'll try to again raise the awareness as we lead toward launch.

We have opened up an expression of interest list for NGOs who may want to get that name and it's simply a matter of them indicating an interest and we will provide them with updates on the program as we move closer and closer to launch. But we've gotten good responses there from some very notable NGOs around the world and that's encouraging as well.

Man: Fantastic.

Man: In Brazil to win the support for some second level domains we offer sometimes a period for free. When you are looking for the market in Latin America and Africa do you see that you need to use a special grace period reducing the prices or make some advertising to win more members that will join the process? Is there any differentiation? Sometimes the price is for some countries some NGOs (let's say) not a high amount but can be a barrier, can be a difficulty.

Man: Thank you for the question.

Man: Just to add...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...to the - what Vladimir said, sometimes it's not even the pricelist, how pay for Africa and so on.

Brian Cute: So two aspects there, first in terms of the price where we're keenly aware that the community we're serving is a community of NGOs and that there will be a price and cost sensitivity there.

We're also aware that it's not just the domain name that gives them some value and visibility but also a basic Web site at a minimum and some other services that get them online visible and interacting with their supporters. We're talking to the registrars that we work with so that we can provide as cost effective an online package for NGOs and certainly we have the ability to offer discount and rebate programs through the channel to try to make sure that it's getting to the entire community at the right cost level.

With respect to payment issues, that is also a issue. One of our challenges in addition to building a mechanism that allows us to provide some basic level of

verification that an organization is an NGO and that is a unique challenge. Distribution and making sure it's available on a global basis in the southern hemisphere is something we're looking at. We're talking to the registrars again who we work with about language support, multilingual, different payment mechanisms. So it is a problem that is on our radar screen that we're trying to solve.

Bill Drake: Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks (Brent). About your last point about distribution I think several strategy either from Latin America or Africa or in the (England) one in Middle East and North Africa is about having more registrar and we think more stronger (unintelligible) I think that you have space to have that. And if not long time ago we had that talk about that separate applicant that's more than the NGO. But you can think on the next round if you can really help for kind of pro bono support for those applicants for initiative if there is next round.

(Brent): Thank you. And in terms of distribution you're right, in some regions of the world there's very little distribution infrastructure in terms of registrars.

We're looking at that. We're looking at resellers and reseller channels. We're thinking about could perhaps NGO associations become distributors of NGO and NLG and trying to find the best way for the broadest possible distribution.

Bill Drake: Can I just ask, I'm sure you've thought this all through. I just never talk to you about it. A large part of civil society is not formal legal NGOs at all. It's the advocacy networks that have varying or no legal form in many case.

So how - what's their access like? What - are there any special provisions that need to be made vis-à-vis -- whatever? How do you deal with it?

(Brent): So let me start at the high-level on this. One thing public interest registry is very aware of and in terms - learnings from our engagement with the

community is that what we are is what we should be as a neutral third-party steward of the TLD. And that it is not our job to determine who is or who is not an NGO -- very aware with that in approaching the work from that perspective.

In putting together definition of an NGO we did a lot of research and looked across all of the sources as you might imagine -- United Nations, governmental, community-based, regional and established what we felt what was a broad, as broad as possible definition of that term knowing that when we get to verification we're going to be doing that working with community organizations who maintain the data working with different list be that governmental or from the community and that the defining of that will come through the building and the verification process in a more clear sense.

We do have an entity element in the definition, clear recognition that there can be voluntary networks that don't have some formal entity around them.

But there is an entity element in the definitions. So that is one aspect that bounds it a bit.

And again, we have to work with the lists that are available, the associations who are members -- any other community resource.

It's going to be a combination of those types of lesser data points and then building a manual verification part of the mechanism. So if someone isn't on a list that's verifiable can they present a document, some other piece of evidence? Can they get a referral from another NGO who is in good standing?

So we are looking through all of those. It's a challenge. There's a - and we're open to suggestions as to how to solve this the best possible way because we have to deal with the community.

Man: In Brazil we have not all but we are but (all the) second level and we apply only from not-for-profit entities.

But for sure if you go to the academia your scientific associations not-for-profit. But they apply under .edu because they are academia. Or we will use let's say an industry configurations also not-for-profit. But behind them are big industries. But they cannot apply for .org.

So it's very easy for us to know if there's an entity that is non-for-profit they need to prove by the bylaws that they're non-a-profit entity and are not in other activities that can be in competition with social projects and this kind of relationship. And it's very easy.

(Carlos Francois) is one of the seats in our board for the not-for-profit entities and knows all the history.

(Brent): Thank you. And that's - so that's for that.org.br rules?

Man: Yes.

(Brent): And so for us as many of you probably know .org itself is an open domain.

So yes and it's, you know, most, a large percentage of registrants and .org are noncommercial nonprofits. And that's where the brand value and the trust elements of work come from. And that's a good thing. But it is open.

So going with a closed domain on .ngo is where we're getting into the realm that you're describing and so again if you have any suggestions on wide-open off-line to think how we can best do this. Thank you.

Bill Drake: And we'll be doing a workshop on close domains at the IGF so you should pop along to that.

We have Wendy. Did you have a question?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes I'm just wondering whether there's another possible synergy here in that we and NCSG and NCUC are always looking for ways to get new folks to know about the possibilities to participate in ICANN, are there ways that we might work with a .ngo or .org to help promote the possibility of involvement as constituencies and stakeholder groups?

(Brent): Certainly. We're going to do effectively to waves of outreach. We've done the first which was to validate that this is something that would give benefit to the community roughly around midyear this year.

Because we're assuming an early Q2 launch will be when we want start to launch the second wave of outreach. And that's about building interest and getting the word out there.

So there may be indeed some opportunities in our activities to work together to not only sensitize NGOs to the fact that this is coming but also what are the opportunities that opens up for them? So that's a good suggestion.

Glen Reichart: (Brent) I have a question. Have you ever taken a look at the distribution globally maybe by country or a region of .org addresses to see if there's a more equitable distribution in this present in a number of other TLDs?

(Brent): Well we've done the first which is look at .org distribution but not necessarily comparing to other TLDs.

And generally speaking there's still a higher concentration in North America and Europe for .org. And hence the programs that we been running in the last year and a half to promote adoption of org in developing regions of the world is something that's a critical focus to us.

So we're starting to see material shifts in that balance and we're going to keep driving in that direction vis-à-vis the other TLDs don't have any data on that (Glen).

Glen Reichart: Great. Well I am glad to hear that the shifts are happening.

Bill Drake: All right are there any last questions for (Brent)? Wilson? Wilson and then somebody in the middle.

Wilson Abigaba: Hi what (unintelligible) organizations that are not necessarily NGOs but they are (unintelligible) NGOs or are (unintelligible) organizations like NCC or NGO?

(Brent): The question again was in with respect to organizations...

Wilson Abigaba: Organizations that are not necessarily NGOs emerging (unintelligible) respect to government but there are non-(unintelligible) organizations in that country.

But NCUC is not like this but any government. That's the question. And ICANN, within ICANN and (unintelligible). So can it apply for an NGO for an (unintelligible) NGO?

(Brent): Yes the definition would be broad enough. Again we try to build a composite definition. We're not the authority. We went out and went to a number of different sources but we built a very broad definition, you know, noncommercial, nongovernmental, non-criminal. That's important.

And then - sorry guys. And also the definition speaks to the mission orientation. And there's a lot of good language there but it is a broad definition.

And in fact you could qualify. But there's the verification element too. And that's something we have to have in place today. Because again the promise

and the benefit is that this is going to be an address on the Internet where the donor, the user the participant, the volunteer had that higher sense of trust that they're interacting with a genuine NGO.

Man: Yes okay. I just heard that non-criminal (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Could you say a name?

Man: (unintelligible) from Bangkok. I do the (unintelligible) work for noncriminal. I'm not sure a lot of NGOs do things do like we call - what we call (unintelligible). So that (unintelligible).

But my question is I'm not sure whether this is contribution relevant to (unintelligible) that part for the .ngo or not.

But would this mean we are going to extend to the support for those SSLs certificates or I'm not sure or just promote security whatever or it would be like either way in the next two years when, you know, (DNSAC) whatever, in place?

But just to keep in mind that whether there's going to be like extend to that SSL certificate and requirement of (unintelligible) or not to support an NGO? Thanks.

(Brent): Well in terms of requirements new TLD registries it's required that they be (DNSAC) compliant. So .ngo, .dlnq will be (DNSAC) compliant.

With respect to certs or other things again what we're focused on is making sure that the NGOs have a at least a good basic package of Web hosting services. And working with our partners to put that together that of course could include SSL and would in many cases.

So the answer is yes (DNSAC) is required. That's a good thing and we will be (DNSAC) compliant.

Bill Drake: Okay because we do need to wrap up this.

Man: And my big concern is all the new gTLDs (unintelligible) is that a lot of probably the domain names will be protected. It will be you need to register your company to avoid some other use it.

If we already have.org and now you have two other new options how do you see that all the.org clients so they will react and they request again to go to the new top level domains to protect their names?

Is there any special provision that you will help them to avoid to spend money only for protect domain?

(Brent): Well we have heard this question often, you know, if I have a .org what do I do? And the way we are presenting it to them is this is really a choice.

We are not looking like perhaps some other actors to perhaps force defensive registrations and .ngo, .ong That's not what we're trying to do here.

And frankly if you've got it.org Web site and you've got a good Web presence and it doesn't make sense for you even if you could qualify for .ngo then we're just as happy for you to stay in your .org and not make the shift.

Man: But I don't like to see my name used. I have a (closet).org.

(Brent): Yes.

Man: Now someone who used (closet).ngo. I'm not happy with this. ow do you protect me?

(Brent): Yes well we are going to use a trademark clearinghouse as all of us will with the new TLDs that there's no getting around that. But that's something we have to explore in terms of providing additional protections to .org registrants.

Bill Drake: Okay we have one more. We have 15 minutes left of this. Kathy yes last question?

Kathy Kleinman: We just heard the new issue raised, the trademark clearinghouse and the use of that during sunrise which registries have some discretion over. How do use the trademark clearinghouse and whether a trademark for shoes would apply for preregistration and .ngo.

Have you thought through this level of registration policy and is there something you can share with us?

(Brent): We are working on those policies right now with the legal team. And again for.org registrants because it's an open domain there are some individuals in there whoever registered.org and lots of companies and lots of not for profits.

So we don't have a clean parsing of the .org zone either. That's something that we need to do as we've been through this. But we do not have a final policy, happy to take suggestions Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: (Unintelligible).

(Brent): Thank you. You know where to find (David).

Kathy Kleinman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: I believe we've reached a meeting of the minds on that last point. Thank you very much for coming by. We really appreciate it and appreciate your support of the leaders.

(Brent): Thanks very much Bill. Thank you all.

Bill Drake: Okay it's getting late in the day and everybody's thinking about lunch but we do have one last item that's worth talking about. We knew we had a full agenda to go through and this was saved to the end. And it was either going to be depending on how the day went a long ontological discussion or brief (prologominon). So I guess it's going to be a (prologominon). It's going to be a introductory.

We need to review the bylaws for NCUC. They are significantly out of date. If you were to look up the Web site they are several years old and they describe an organization that does not exist.

They describe an organization that takes dues that has a policy committee that just in a lot of ways doesn't support terribly well with who we are and how we're actually operating.

So one of the things that we clearly need to do in the last quarter I would think by the summer would be to try to redraft the bylaws.

And I had a little conversation on the side here with Rob Hoggarth who was telling me that there's a big push coming from the board not to make sure that all the bylaws of all the constituencies and other entities are going to be completely consistent across ICANN.

So that will add to another level then. We have to make sure that everything we do is completely consistent with the NCSG charter and also consistent with whatever it is the ICANN board is now thinking about how the bylaw should look.

So these are factors that are going to require a lot of collective work going forward. Ideally though, if we were to be able to revise the bylaws by the

summer we could have a vote on them to adopt them prior to the next election of people to fill slots.

If we can't get it together that we would have to do it at the same time that we do the election for the slots in the fall.

And the main issue there I would think is the following. One of the points that I've raised -- and I know there are different views on this -- has to do with the composition of the executive committee.

Right now we have an executive committee that's defined by regional representation. One of the interesting things about that of course is that nobody really represents their regions and that the regional representatives historically have not done much of anything.

And so what we've been trying to do with this current push to rejuvenate the executive committee was to create functional roles associated with task communities that'll actually do stuff. That instead of standing for I will represent all of Asia which of course you're not really going to do, you would stand for I want to direct the outreach efforts.

I want to be the facilitator area of the budgetary committee to ask people to vote to stand for particular functional roles that are associated with open teams that would work on getting these things done so that all of the kinds of functions that have not been performed on a consistent basis on which we're trying now to post catch up and refresh could on an ongoing basis be done collaboratively with people who have stood up and said yes I am willing to serve as the leader of African (unintelligible).

Now some people agree with me on doing on some people don't.

If we were to decide that that was the way we wanted to do it then we're redefining the positions people are standing for election involved. That would

mean you need to adopt a change in the summer you see so that people could stand for different positions in the fall.

Another way of course we could do this is of course would be to stick with the regional thing but simply operate on the expectation that everybody was elected to a regional slot, we'll take one of these functional slots and we'll take command and lead something -- a lot of different ways to talk dealing with this.

Now we've got to enough of a team, four or five people who've expressed interest in joining. If there are other people would like to join that team again it's accessible through the Web page. But it ties in to the general point of, you know, how do we want to build the organization going forward?

And we have to have, you know, we have to have bylaws that support with who we are.

The other point that's really a big one is outstanding is the policy committee. The NCUC charter or bylaws says we have a policy committee. We don't.

Right now policy work has been done on a very ad hoc basis over the years. People have said at various points on the members list hey I'll draft something. What do people think? And then something would be drafted, nobody objected to it and it would get posted as an NCUC statement in a public comment period or into a working group or something like that or else those things have been fed into the policy committee of the NCSG to be considered by ad hoc as well for adoption at the stakeholder group level.

Either way we've been operating in a very loosey-goosey way.

Now we can either say we shouldn't have a policy committee and we just do all the policy work through the Stakeholder Group which to me would be at

odds with the whole history going back to 1999 of NCUC having a particular identity and so on.

Or we could try to create some sort of a more principle-based way of doing policy whether it's a standing committee with members or it's a defined process led by somebody of reaching out to posting things and then waiting for supplies whatever. It has to be specified in the bylaws what we're going to do.

So it can be kind of a virtual thing drawing on all the members. It could be a small group of people who opt in join. There a lot of different ways of thinking about it.

But right now we've got a bylaw that says this is how we do things and we don't. And so that is something that we clearly want to take a board in the next two months.

So I would strongly encourage anybody who has an interest in thinking about how does NCUC want to position itself in relationship to the Stakeholder Group, in relationship to the workflow, all those kind of the visibility does it want to have, identity does it want to have, et cetera, and how in particular should we structure our processes to join the group that's going to be trying to revise the bylaws and help us do it in a proper way.

And with that I should up and we've got a few minutes for discussion. Any thoughts on any of the issues that are raised? I see (David) and (Stefanie) and Milton just a go - (unintelligible) and then Robin.

David Cake: Okay. Certainly the fact that we don't have a formal policy committee that was pulling - that provision was put into the charter before there was the NCSG, with the NCSG policy committee so that might be that it simply is redundant for historical reasons.

But we do have a formal process at the NCSG level and that may be all we need. It's certainly however a less formal focused policy group that might come in.

I also just want to say I'm wary of going too far down the putting functional role into the charter part.

The charter is a very difficult to change document. It's extraordinarily, you know, it is quite a lot of organization to change it.

It may in fact actually fail not because of - I mean if there's any actual opposition to it that would be another thing. But even just if everybody's in favor of charter changes it could still quite easily fail to achieve the voting minimums to happen.

So I'm very wary of putting things like functional roles into the charter because the - if our operating procedures and so on change over time we're then stuck with it.

I mean to some extent the roles absolutely aren't going to change like finance and so on are one thing. But roles that might very well change is another story.

I mean and we can certainly create functional roles without having to put them in the charter. We can just decide okay you - we've just, you know, the executive committee has decided we now have a whatever. And that's all we need.

We don't need to have a charter we can make. We can create whatever we want to call them bylaws and/or regulations or any - and the rules are outside the charter that documenting our operating procedure.

And I think that idea of having a list lightweight set, a much more lightweight set of rules that we can flexibly change that cover really, you know, and it's really our own internal organization, what does it matter to the rest of ICANN? So if it doesn't matter to the rest of ICANN why do we need to put in a formal charter? Why can't we just have it as our ongoing rules?

(Stefanie): Okay just first a quick practical point for joining the teams here at the moment is simply such great (unintelligible) the mailing lists. So look at lists .ncuc org which you can see up there now and subscribe that there.

Otherwise for the functional teams I pretty much want to echo (David). I'm quite worried that your elected and somebody's elected to do certain job and then this person disappears and then we'll have to figure out how to sort that out.

But a bit more flexible way that you can change roles and during the year would be useful.

Bill Drake: We have Rafik and then (Carlos) and then Robin. Sorry Milton not Robin.

Man: Robin, Rafiq and (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Everybody raised their hand at once. Okay sorry. Robin - no Milton Robin, Rafik, (Carlos).

Milton Mueller: (Unintelligible) former chair duties showing up there. So a lot of the crust that you see in the bylaws is a consequence of the fact that the stakeholder Group thing was kind of imposed on us from the top.

And we had a big discussion battle about what we - we didn't want to have constituencies. We kind of we're assuming we just throw out the constituency stuff when we had the Stakeholder Group and the staff didn't want us to do

that ultimately but they compromised with us. There was a lot of confusion there.

I think I want addressed a specific issue after saying that I think (David)'s attitude is the correct principle the way to approach this is, you know, unless it really has operational consequences don't mess with it. We don't have to formalize everything to actually have it functional.

But I think Bill had some good ideas about in particular the nature of the executive committee.

When the executive committee was first created it was an early days of ICANN and there's a lot of concern among non-US entities not just in our constituency but elsewhere that, you know, the whole thing was too US dominated.

And we were making a point at that time but having our executive committee be graphically representational that every, you know, part of the world would be represented in our executive committee.

It may be the case that with the broader representation that we've achieved in NCUC that's no longer necessary and that we simply want, we will get diversity anyway and the people should be coming in and volunteering for specific function.

I actually like the idea that the executive committee are people who are, you know, this is our communications person, this is our finance person not - I like that idea.

And we can just trust ourselves and our members to vote and that the volunteers would be the person - voting population will put the right person in there regardless of where they're from.

Bill Drake: And you can have a distribution of a (pilot).

Milton Mueller: You could. That was the other thing is that you made this point yourself that you could just say well keep the committee as it is but when you're running members saying what are you going to do on the executive committee, you know, what part, what function are you running for?

And in that regard again recall with (David) said about getting too specific with the charter or the bylaws, you know, given how hard it is to change them.

And again, the GNSO is going to go through another review in a couple of years though right? So good luck with that suckers. I'll be gone.

Bill Drake: This may have to be a standing committee.

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: Or a sitting committee for...

Bill Drake: Yes.

Milton Mueller: ...depending on how tired their legs get. But so there's another point I want to make. I'm trying to recall what it is. I'll give up the microphone.

Bill Drake: Okay Robin?

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes I just wanted to answer your question or at least provide my input in your question about policy and where policy should be done.

I think it needs to be done at both levels. We know that the broader Stakeholder Group has a lot of policy obligations in our charter, and our counselors are elected from the - at the Stakeholder Group level and have policy obligations there.

However I think it's also very important that constituencies also work on policies and in some ways can have an opportunity to be more effective because, you know, oftentimes at the stakeholder Group level we're really focused on what we're doing on council that week or, you know, and not everyone cares about the RTP whatever, whatever, whatever and people don't engage in that.

But I think that the constituency has an opportunity to say okay what's the issue or some issues that are - that we really care about and we really want to focus on and drill down into.

So for example the NCUC could have a Webinar on WHOIS privacy. And I think that would be fabulous and I think that could then feed into the SG.

So, you know, that's my view. I think that the constituency must be doing policy, should be doing policy and in some ways have the opportunity to be doing the more interesting and the more - to work on policies that are of greater impact to the interest of our constituents. That's all I'm going to say.

Bill Drake: And so should we think in terms of a fixed community with fixed people or a more open structure is what I'm struggling with?

Robin Gross: Well I think there should be a fixed committee because there has to be some way of people giving a approval that something is an NCUC statement. So there has to be some kind process by which that happens and a committee could manage that.

But at the same time I think it also we have to have an opportunity for a sort of an open opportunity for anyone to participate and anyone to just work on a policy issue and work with the committee on these issues. So that would be my (view).

Bill Drake: (Floating) there.

Robin Gross: Yes.

Bill Drake: Okay trying to remember the order of you and I'm sorry it's been a long day.
Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes so this is Rafik speaking. Coming after all these thoughts maybe I'm - I will overlap in what I'm going to say.

But so I think maybe I'm in agreement with Milton that we need more to justify about the (mission) what kind of role we can define and details but not really giving a specific position, not elected or appointed - appoint someone.

And I think that if you have the role to manage the process of joining a role in that. So it will help to manage the process it can be someone from the (unintelligible) taking the role but also to open that to the whole membership so we can engage more members so we have an ad hoc and a constitution and also the process in place that can help us to make a decision at the end. Otherwise it will be endless.

And then at the same time do we need to make to have a stronger NCUC and making more statement to be involved in the policy and so on? And so sometimes we need to hurry up to not wait for our counterpart to make a decision.

And the third point about the GNSO in fact it's coming soon. And I think we will have a discussion with the Thick and so they will ask us about our open-end transparency and accountability and so on.

So that's another process we have to care about kind of take a look (unintelligible). But so we need to see if we - so I think we need to work with

(Robert) how we can maybe to both the changing by those (otherwise). It's not easy to engage our membership on that issue.

Bill Drake: All right. Okay. Was Wendy in (unintelligible)?

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks Wendy Seltzer. I'm now totally confused about where we actually get to do policy discussion. But it seems that we went from the overlap of redundant discussions of policy in both NCUC and NCSG to no discussion of policy in either NCUC and NCS on constituency day a brief policy meeting yesterday where we covered the council items but not the additional items on the agenda.

I think there is a loss that we need to do to put a positive policy agenda forward so that we don't keep on getting swept up in last minute response to public comments about how we're being ignored but having to put our concerns on the table beforehand.

So where shall we do these things for Durban? Because - and where shall we do them online between now and Durban because I'm finding it difficult to see in the proliferation of lists?

It's great to have an NCUC specific list but where do we focus our attention so that we get policy positions developed and then forward them through the most effective channel possible?

How so you the NCSC policy community or what's your chair?

There's - I mean there's a committee. That's the only place that exists right now - in the structure. And we're debating whether within the constituency we can do something that would support and feed into that. But right now that's what we have.

Wendy Seltzer: Excellent. I call a policy committee meeting parallel to every other meeting and meet me in the back.

Bill Drake: Fantastic.

Man: Very briefly I think that there is consensus and here the charter needs to be changed. And it's a good thing that you are starting this process.

One thing that I think it's a recurring theme from everybody who is speaking today about this issue is that first of all I would recommend don't rush it.

I mean I started at some point. But because there are elections coming up do not try to have the charter before the election so you do, you know, the new counselors are on the new charter.

Just by the time, you know, try to set a reasonable deadline, that is even if it's a year because the charter needs to be relevant right. We need to try to make the charter relevant the next ten years.

Again I hadn't realized that the GNSO would be structured so soon. I thought that, you know, this would take more time. So God only knows what ICANN has (in the cuts) for everybody especially for constituencies.

They see I prefer the idea of having and I see that you have already kick started the process of outreach communications people rather than, you know, we definitely need to have someone from Europe or Latin America because then again it was becoming difficult getting people from these regions.

I think that it, you know, people have interest in areas like communications and outreach to other (unintelligible). It would be easier to find those people.

And for the PC I also think that it needs to be done at the level of the constituency because the constituencies might get bigger and bigger. You might have NCSG with plenty of constituencies.

Right now NCSG has counselors from NCUC so it works. At some point NCUC might not have counselors from NCUC. So what will be the voice of NCUC if you don't have a policy committee only (this)?

And in order to attract them you might actually want to start, you know, and this is of course putting pressure on ICANN to give funding for these people to come.

And the people who are working on policy they need to be able to be funded to come to these meetings and stick. Because those will be the people who - you know, and if you promise them attendance then you would see them engaging and possibly even submitting their comments.

Bill Drake: Thank you. Thank you. Okay we're - (shall must go) eat but Kathy yes?

Kathy Kleinman: Oh I'm holding everybody up?

Bill Drake: Well no, no. There may be one or two others but...

Kathy Kleinman: I just had a strange thought I wanted to throw out there about the policies being policies just generally which is that we may want to organize in a slightly different way.

There are some constituencies that want to cover every issue all the time. The registries and registrars will do that for example to make sure that they're, you know, that the industry is represented and everything.

We tend to be - we tend to come in slightly differently. We care about certain principles, certain core values. And when those are threatened that's when we galvanize.

So isn't there something on the policy committee can - should we be thinking about having people who can help us identify what issues in ICANN threaten or can help improve our core values and help identify which proceedings we need to pay attention to and which ones we don't need to monitor in the first place, identify those and then try to tap them?

You know, can the Policy Community be kind of thinking about something a little more broadly and more rather than assigning certain people who always have to respond everything regardless of whether they're interested or not find certain people who are really, really concerned about free speech and freedom of expression, certain people really concerned about privacy and data protection, not just concern but expert, and then reach out to them if - and then if certain people monitoring like our counselors know exactly what's going through because they're approving charters.

So how do we set up our own early warning system and then figure out who has time and some expertise to work on issues?

It's a slightly different approach rather than just systematically assigning people who are always responsible for certain things.

Bill Drake: And you sort of raised an issue like that in LA as well when we are talking about whether it would be if we wanted to have any kind of funded assistance should it only be administrative or should they have some role in sort of like the front end of policy stuff too?

And there was a lot of different feelings about that if you remember. So this is a difficult issue but...

Kathy Kleinman: Right give feelings about whether our working group people should be assigned...

Bill Drake: You know, whether there staff could play the kind of roles you're talking about whether that was involved...

Kathy Kleinman: No, no, don't with respect very, very different issue whether we have staff writing up minutes as a draft is a totally different issue than organizing the policy committee based on certain types of values and principles to help do early warnings as new ICANN working groups are formed right...

Bill Drake: Okay.

Kathy Kleinman: ...sorry, apples and oranges?

Bill Drake: I didn't know they were chopped together and (unintelligible).

Man: If I understand the point of Kathy I think she's talking about going to management if we know whether our members and their interest they can engage them into the specific issue more easily.

Bill Drake: Well we don't have the committee now to do that. But the question if we should then we certainly can go that way yes.

And Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Thanks. We have a tremendous opportunity. We are the bottom of the bottom-up model. We're the lowest form of life in this hotel. We can probably ask Fadi about that.

But what we have the opportunity to do is have a really open policy committee. Yes we have a leadership that may have to vote and have official positions.

But we can welcome and new members and engage them immediately and policy. We began IP (unintelligible). We can put them on a policy committee looking at an IP issue. We can generate our own proposals. We so often here we're just reacting to other's fires.

And I actually thought I'd say we can be the arsonists. But then Wendy came up with a great idea last night that we can actually propose some positive change.

And if we have a very open expansive policy committee not in competition with the Stakeholder Group but in addition as a complement I think we'd be some pretty neat stuff.

Bill Drake: Thank you.

(Carlos Francois): Very quickly this is (Carlos François). Just to second Kathy's and (Ed)'s comments on that definitely if we could have a sort of an open policy team on that we could (clutter) around some issues it would be interesting especially because there is a sort of a branding or marketing thing that we are not quite using that much which is the fact that we have a bunch of professors here on the very prestigious academic institutions represented in this room for instance.

And we have people who have this awesome experiences on issues like privacy, free speech and IP. And we could definitely use that.

And when I thought about IP I was thinking about you volunteering. But we definitely could use our this let's say open or extended policy team as a sort of a showcase of the people with the expertise that we have in this room. And on the counterpart of that which has the - which are the GNSO counselors like probably the greatest challenge that I'd say when I was a GNSO counselor presenting in CC is that you were needed to be a generalist of

some sort that you had to be on the table and discussed with some degree of expertise on some issues that probably you wouldn't have like took the time during your life to study or to research that much.

So that's truly a task for the GNSO counselors and it's good that they are aware of that.

But on the policy counselors level it will be definitely important for us to try to use this amount of experience and expertise that we have on the team on the constituency as well.

Bill Drake: Yes Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Just about to note to feedback to what (Ed) said and (Carlos) said this ability to focus on the issues I like the three you identified, free, privacy, free speech, intellectual property. And all add fair use to intellectual property. Intellectual property/fair use, this ability to profile both our experts and bringing new people in this is resume people builders for people coming in.

There - these are areas people are excited about. These are areas that are big to let them - to invite them to come into the ground floor of a Working Group working on these issues for the Internet may actually become a positive, not a negative if we can work with the new senior people to help mentor and spend time and talk about not just the substance of how you work within the working group but there's all sorts of ways now to channel with this energy to our engagements and outreach. I think this is a great direction.

Bill Drake: Okay fair enough. That will require people in capacity but it's certainly doable and it's certainly a model that would help us be more engaged and effective (unintelligible).

Man: Our Web address...

Bill Drake: Yes?

Man: ...again for anybody that would join us is...

Bill Drake: NCUC.org I would think?

Man: Yes well NCUC - our email address is ncuc@ncuc.org. If you have ideas, if you want to join us, if you have friends that want to join us we need help please. Thank you.

Bill Drake: So I need help with lunch. There's cheap food readily available right downstairs actually which is quick. What time does (SGSC) start?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: One-thirty, so we a 40 minutes. So you can either run through the hallway to the shopping mall across the way and eat Chinese or just grab a sandwich downstairs.

Thank you everybody for participating.

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Bill Drake: Yes.

END