

Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting
Non Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) Meeting
Tuesday 16 July 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/#jul>

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

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

Bill Drake: This is the Constituency Day meeting of the Non Commercial Users Constituency, NCUC. We have a full agenda for the day. My name is Bill Drake, I'm the Chair of NCUC for 2013. I teach at the University of Zurich. And have been a member of NCUC now for five years.

(Unintelligible) sorry about that. Let's start by going around the table and saying who's here and then we'll see if anybody is joining us from home. Good morning. Let's start with the gentlemen over here. Could you identify yourself?

Satish Babu: Hi. My name is Satish Babu. I'm from India. I'm not yet a member of NCUC. I was there in Beijing as well. But I did try to apply but not sure what went wrong. Wasn't able to get any response. I would like to join NCUC and I'm here as an observer for this meeting. I hope it is not a closed meeting.

Bill Drake: Not at all. And we will get your membership sorted out forthwith. Rafik here is on the group that processes those. We'll get it taken care of.

Next.

Wilson Abigaba: I'm Wilson Abigaba from Uganda. I'm on the NCUC Executive Committee representing Africa.

Man: And Tapani Tarvainen from Finland also in the NCUC Executive Committee as the European Representative.

Bill Drake: Okay thank you. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Rafik Dammak, NCUC member and NomComm representative for the NCUC.

Bill Drake: David.

David Cake: David Cake. Currently one of the NCSG councilors and previously chair of NCUC briefly.

DeeDee Halleck: DeeDee Halleck with Deep Dish.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: My name is Wolfgang Kleinwachter. I'm from the University of Aarhus and one of the GNSO councilor from the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Mark Perkel: I'm Mark Perkel. Church of Reality. And I've been in the NCSG for a few years.

Joao Caribe: My name is Joao Caribe. I'm from Brazil. I'm an activist. I'm a member of our NCUC and NCSG.

Carlos Alfonso: Carlos Alfonso from Brazil as well and member of the NCUC Executive Committee.

Flavio Wagner: Flavio Wagner. I'm also an NCUC member and board member of the Brazil Internet Steering committee.

Bill Drake: And around the back we have.

Karel Douglas: Hi. My name is Karel Douglas, new time, first time (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Feel free to join us at the table if you'd like.

Karel Douglas: Thank you.

Tuchaise Robert: I'm Tuchaise Robert. I'm a fellow from Uganda.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Again, we have got plenty of seats if you'd like to join us at the table. There's no reason to hide in the back.

Karel Douglas: Yes, Trinidad and Tobago.

Bill Drake: Oh okay. Fantastic. Oh all right so the agenda - anybody else?

Man: There are more participants.

Bill Drake: Where? Where are we looking?

Man: Bill.

Bill Drake: Ah yes, of course. Can you introduce?

Patricia Senghor: Hello, I'm Patricia Senghor from Senegal. First time. My application has just been accepted for this here - for this group. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Happy to have you.

((Crosstalk))

Maritza Minano: Hello, my name is Maritza Minano, I'm from Peru. I'm first time ICANN fellow.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Great to have you. And the young lady here?

Sarah Kiden I hope you can hear me. Sarah Kiden from Uganda. First time participant.

Bill Drake: Okay, when we speak we have to use these because there are people remotely participating from around the world.

Sarah Kiden Sorry. Sarah Kiden from Uganda. First time participant and a fellow.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Thank you very much and welcome. And we have one more gentlemen about to sit down and he can introduce himself briefly if somebody hands him a microphone.

Man: You have to push the button.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Quesada Rodriguez: Hi, Adrian Quesada Rodriguez from Costa Rica. I'm a first time participant and a fellow as well.

Bill Drake: Thank you very much. It's great to have all of you first time folks here from the Fellows program. You're very welcome to...

Man: We also have remote participants.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Man: Mary Wong, Peter Green, (Brock Wilson)...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...and a guest.

Bill Drake: Okay. And Ed Morris who's also a member of our (unintelligible). Okay oh and one more person sitting down here. We'll let her sit down before we ask her to introduce herself.

Okay, the agenda is on the screen. Hi, do you want to just say who you are real quick so we know who all's in the room? We have people around the world participating remotely as well so it's nice for them to know who we've got here.

Gul-e Rana: Good morning. I'm Gul-e Rana from Pakistan. First time ICANN Fellow.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Well great to see you all. Okay so you see the agenda. We are of course running on socialist time so we're already late but we'll get caught up as time goes. We had a little delay with the usual transitional matters of getting people seated and into all the various electronic spaces, etcetera, but some of these points can be moved through relatively quickly so that's fine.

Okay so we've introduced everybody. Just to - then the second point in the overview summary of NCUC events at the African School of Internet Governance.

I just thought I would point out, as I just was explaining to the Fellows in the other room, that we had a very successful participation in the African School of Internet Governance that was held here in Durban on Tuesday through Friday that was organized by the Association for Progressive Communications, a large NGO network which is also a member of NCUC and by (NIPAD) which is an intergovernmental body in Africa.

We had I think about 40 participants or so, a very active debate, very vigorous. People seemed to enjoy it a great deal. We did a outreach event, a panel, about the role of NCUC and the experience of society in participating in the Generic Name space policy environment and what that's all about.

We also held a very nice reception which was appreciated by all. It was a very good time. So that was a very successful outreach event and I imagine we will be hearing from some of the participants who indicated their desire to join NCUC at some point so that I think was very good.

By the way it is hard for me to talk and also keep an eye on the Adobe so if somebody on the Adobe is looking to speak if, David, you could prompt me to shut up and call on them assuming that they're set up to participate via - is the voice enabled on the Adobe or do they have to use the phone bridge? Do we know?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: We have to use the phone bridge? Okay, we don't have voice enabled Adobe. Oh that's unfortunate. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: And they could also, yes, they can type and ask you to read out something. Okay so moving then to the next agenda, Organizational Matters, oh look, we're almost caught up, just to point out, Number 1, those who have not seen it I have here the new brochure on NCUC that some of us put together that's been distributed to the Fellows and at the African School and so on, which is geared towards reaching out to new people and explaining rather concisely exactly who we are and what our values are and what kinds of positions we take.

If anybody does not have one of these show me your hand and I'll pass them out to you. Or if anybody would like to take some and hand them out to people that they run into in the course of the next few days I've got a stack here so you're more than welcome to them. But this is - and our thanks to ICANN for printing those. They were very nice to do this off the regular budgetary line so that's good.

And we have two more - three more people wandering in here so we'll wait until they get seated and then introduce them as well. Oh and we have also joining us now online Amr. Good morning, Amr, who's up in Finland, I believe. No?

Man: Norway.

Bill Drake: Norway. Norway. I get all those places confused. Okay. So before I turn to the - I was just giving a quick overview. We introduced everybody. We have a number of folks here, Joy from the Fellows program, which I just spoke to and so we have a lot of first timers here which is great. And we have getting set up here now three folks so - a colleague who joined - who was at the African School of Internet Governance, could you introduce yourself? Do you have access to a mic?

(Nichol Bengalas): Yes, my name is (Nichol Bengalas). Good morning.

Bill Drake: And secondly we have...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Anriette Esterhuysen, Association for Progressive Communication based in Johannesburg.

Bill Drake: Okay. Thank you, (Andrea). And...

Joy Liddicoat: Joy Liddicoat from (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: And one of our GNSO councilors. So, okay, so and another new gentlemen over here who I missed. I'm sorry. Would you like to introduce yourself?

(Gabriel Lajorndau): (Gabriel Lajorndau) from the Gambia - Chair of the Gambia and also a Professor of Physics and Computer Science.

Bill Drake: Thank you. You're in the right place, this is where all the academics hang out. Okay. Oh and more people coming in as well. This is excellent. Oh, yes, would you like to introduce yourself please?

(Lydia Naroka): Good morning, everyone. I'm (Lydia Naroka) from Uganda.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. And sir, would you - just find a...

(Blessing Mabuto): Good morning. My name is (Blessing Mabuto). I'm from Zimbabwe but I'm based in Cape Town.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Welcome to you all again. Okay so the next item - what we're doing today is a relatively brief overview of some organizational matters. We talked about some of these at the NCUC Executive Committee the other day.

And some of these will be continuing work items for us going forward so we don't need to go into all the details but we do want to try to get members to be aware of and onboard the relevant processes so we'll overview those briefly until a little bit after 10:00, hopefully not much more than that.

Then we will have a - we will move toward the substantive parts of the agenda for today. We will have a discussion about African perspectives on ICANN and Internet governance that will be led by our friend, Anriette Esterhuysen from the APC who's just joined us. And there is a link there on the agenda to the background on Anriette.

And then there's a coffee break, the standard ICANN coffee break and you go out and schmooze with people in the hallway. And we reconvene then at 11:00. And - can I move that? No, but David can. David's in charge of the Adobe.

Okay. And scrolling down further so then after the coffee break we will have a visit - and this is important - from the Accountability and Transparency Review Team for half an hour. They've got some specific questions that they've posed to us about our views on accountability and transparency within ICANN. I've provided links there, background material. This was all circulated a number of times on the NCUC ListServe and so on.

They've actually revised their questions to simplify them just the other day and they'll be - they told me they're printing out copies that they'll bring along that will facilitate the discussion as well so I think that that should be fairly easy.

And then at 12:00 we are pleased to say that we will be having a visit from two vice chairs of the Government Advisory Committee. We have never actually had any kind of interaction directly between NCUC and the GAC before. And I would like us to try to see if we can't begin to rectify that.

So Thomas Schneider from Switzerland and Peter Nettlefold from Australia are going to come over and share with us some of the GAC's current thinking and priorities. And then we will share with them some of our concerns about the GAC's expanding role in the ICANN ecosphere. And we will close then at 12:30.

By the way, this meeting with the GAC vice chairs is in anticipation of possibly having a broader meeting with the full GAC and NCUC in Buenos Aires. I have discussed with them whether or not we might not have a large scale meeting so that the GAC can hear our views more directly because

quite often governments are not really all that aware of what civil society is thinking around some of these gTLD policy issues.

So that's our agenda for the day. Are there any quick additions? Things we can - we should add to it. Something I'm forgetting? If not okay, let us go back then to the organizational matters and we'll start with the new Website.

We are launching just today our new Website that's being constructed by Tapani and Wilson with help from the e-team. We've broken down into a number of groups with regular members and members of the Executive Committee collaborating on different functional issues and one of these groups works on our electronic infrastructure.

And they've done a whole lot of work to build a new Website for us, which - can we pull that up, David? Let's go to NCUC.org and have a look what they've got going on and then I turn it over to Wilson and Tapani to overview for a few minutes what the main features are and so on. Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Just waiting for it to show up here but for the remote folks just type in a browser window with NCUC.org which you'll see. They have really been doing the work from scratch. It's not a minor overhaul but a complete new design.

Have to name a few people besides those Bill just mentioned, that's (Sara Clayton) made most of the looks of the thing and Brenden Kuerbis has been also active in the (unintelligible). Wilson and I have been doing most of the bottom stuff and the background.

And the thing is now running on NCUC's own private server using free software, notably Ubuntu Linux which is, as you know, a South African design. And of course it's still a little work in progress and will keep on living as Websites tend to do.

Now if you take a look at the site - I hope everybody's got it up already - you'll see there's a slideshow that has nice pictures and a map that shows how many members we have in each country.

We have a bit about the history there. Try clicking on About and What is NCUC first to get some kind of notion of what we are. David, can you do that as well? Okay.

And there is also how to join. At the moment some people told us they had difficulty joining. I'm afraid our joining process is a bit complicated because we are part of the NCSG so you have to join NCSG to take part in NCUC.

I think it's not worth a while to spend the time going through everything on the Website. Do keep browsing. But I will give you one little secret at this point. Go Home and type on the address bar login as there are some features that can be only seen by logging and I'm going to give you a hint how to do that. This is (unintelligible) login, David, you can.

There is no clickable link for it yet. But type in the address bar login - yeah - this is not the ready feature, I'm just throwing the things we are about to do in the future so there will be some empty pages and things like that. Okay.

Login as Guest with capital G. Only one G please. Oh well and the password is noncom N-O-N-C-O-M as in Non Commercial. That will you give Website privileges except seeing the incomplete features we have in the thing.

Bill Drake: (Unintelligible). All right, well maybe we'll look at this feature...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay.

Bill Drake: ...later if we're having trouble getting...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: What was the password again, Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Noncomm it should be anyway, I'll check. I can reset this if it doesn't work.

Bill Drake: Noncomm as in Non Commercial?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Bill Drake: With one M?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Bill Drake: Okay. Lower case.

Man: Is that lowercase?

Bill Drake: Is that lowercase?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, all lower case.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Not working?

David Cake: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: It's working, okay. So at least somebody got in so it should be okay. What happens when you do that is you'll find number of many (unintelligible) were not present before which are basically empty.

And the hope here is that people will start putting them up. It's just to give you an idea of features we are - please don't change the password although the

guest has no privileges other than seeing a few pages so it's not - can't do anything much. But just hoping you don't mess it up.

So we are going to have much more things about different things we do. There is a small set of all policy statements. It's not complete. We are filling it up.

Bill Drake: This is not the best view from which to see things.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: Why don't we - can we just go back to the main?

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Click Home.

Bill Drake: Just to give people an idea.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. You didn't log in, okay.

Bill Drake: Like, for example, can we look at Events, just for an example of a link?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Bill Drake: Link that I know works.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Look at the past events. Events - the Website is not working on the screen here. But under Events you should...

Bill Drake: There we go, past conferences...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...and events, that's what we want to see.

Bill Drake: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...for some reason. Okay well.

Tapani Tarvainen: It seems we have a bit of a connectivity problem.

Bill Drake: So there we go. All right so...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay so then it could be...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: So that's kind of typical for ICANN meeting to have network problems I'm afraid.

Bill Drake: Anyway what you'll see there is we're going to start compiling links, the program is audio and video, from past conferences, workshops we've done. And then future ones we have coming forward as well as under policy we're in the process of bugging our members to dig out of their computers policy statements, comments and other things that we've submitted over the past decade and many other items. So there's a lot of good content that's going to go on here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. One of the main ideas of this was to collect all the history of NCUC, our institutional memory, so to speak, which has been spreading rather thin in the

various members' personal computers and Websites all over the place. So this is supposed to become our central repository of all things NCUC.

Bill Drake: Which is excellent and we've never really had that done. So this is real progress. These guys have done a lot of work to pull this together. Let me emphasize - Wilson do you want to say something? No? You're good for the moment?

Let me emphasize - so, yes, Carlos, please.

Carlos Alfonso: We are still on the Website, right?

Bill Drake: Yes.

Carlos Alfonso: The question is, will all members be able to access the dashboard?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, but not yet.

Carlos Alfonso: Okay but there is an idea that everybody who have a login and password and (unintelligible) the site will be able to...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that's the intent. Yes, but the member space is still something we are working on.

Carlos Alfonso: Okay.

Bill Drake: Okay? Any other quick questions on this? So one thing I want to emphasize, again they've done a great deal of work and it's been all just a few people doing a lot of pro bono effort to try to pull this together. And I think it looks really good.

There's a number of things that you're not seeing which - because they're just not visible - we hope to have pages added to this site as we go forward that will have a lot of content that is not there now. For example, on the history of NCUC, on the role of NCUC in the GNSO, links for operating procedures, the Executive Committee defined, stuff about participating in working teams.

Roy Balleste, one of our colleagues is a librarian, he's planning on building a database - a searchable database that will be linked off the doc - where we'll put all the documents and correspondence and so on.

So we're going to have a lot more content as we go forward. But for some of this we're going to need the cooperation of members to pull together the texts that would fit into these relevant spaces. So down the line after this meeting somewhere we will, I think, probably put out another call for participation to try to get some folks involved in collaboratively working out the last bits.

But we are at, I think, a good way down the road here in terms of having a new site so I just want to, again, thank the folks who worked on this. I know they did a lot over an extended period of time. It's no easy task to build a site from scratch and to transfer everything over from the other site so thanks again to both of you - to you guys and everybody else who worked on this.

Yes, DeeDee.

DeeDee Halleck: Yeah, I just - I didn't hear anybody say video. I really appreciate the videos that Joy and Wolfgang, I guess, did for the - there was somebody who recorded their presentations at the School, which was really excellent. And I feel that would be a really good contribution for the Website.

Bill Drake: Oh yes. Glen McKnight filmed our event at the conference and the workshop challenging (unintelligible) program you see videos, Wolfgang, Bill, and there are others that I'm sure will be added. Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes. We shall enter videos that Glen provided. And if you have any other contents that you want to contribute you may contact us through NCUC - @NCUC.org or will have contact us. I'll just put the email address in the Adobe Connect. And also (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay, thank you. Okay yes, sir.

Man: Just wanted to make a quick observation because as I'm a fellow also but as you go to the various Websites of the different organizations you notice that there's no uniformity. There is no following standard even though ICANN is a sort of the one promoting the standardization of many of these processes.

So it got kind of difficult - it's not intuitive in going from one site to the other expecting that you'll find some uniformity and information and so forth. So maybe that could be something that can take up with the other organizations.

Bill Drake: Yeah. I take your point but every constituency has its own little operation that's inherent in this opposition I think. The constituencies are fairly - in the GNSO are fairly self-organizing and not coordinated in any central way.

There are, of course, central - there's a central GNSO site, which has links to the official spaces that the GNSO and ICANN have for each of us. But then there's also links from there to our individual Websites which - and there's a great deal of variation across constituencies in how these things are done.

For example, our ListServes are publicly archived and transparent and anybody can go in and see what our discussions are. But if you go to the - for example, the Intellectual Property Constituency, their ListServes are not publicly accessible at all and you can't see who's been talking about what.

There's - you would expect that actually in terms of transparency and accountability standards that there would be uniformity of practices across

ICANN but in fact there's quite a lot of variation allowed. And this is, in some respects, unfortunate; in other respects kind of natural.

Joy, what did you...

Joy Liddicoat: Yes, thank you. And I just wanted to say thanks for the question. And it's a good one because I think as (unintelligible) there are some parts where it would be good to get standardization particularly in terms of the accessibility of access of community constituency groups information about each other and meetings.

And others where I think a blossoming of diverse approaches and so on is not only good but healthy and fun such as constituency groups having their own forms of Websites or things like that. So, yes, it might be a good thing to take back in terms of thinking about suggestions to ICANN - ICANN staff about the standardization around transparency in particular would be, I think, very useful.

Bill Drake: I should probably add there's some history here from before my time at NCUC there's, I think it has been the case in the past that many people in NCUC felt that they didn't want the staff to have too much control over our digital presence in any way. And so there was really a desire to have or own thing.

There are parts of - there are parts of ICANN where I understand the staff play a much more active and shaping role in everything that is put online. And some people in our group have not felt comfortable following a similar kind of approach so that's something else.

I should also point out just for those who don't know ICANN maintains a big wiki space called Confluence where documents - working documents and so on are located and where, for example, I've posted the agendas for these events and we put links to them, etcetera. And one of the challenges going

forward would also be to enhance the inter-working between our Website and the Confluence Website. That's just another thing for the future.

So okay anything else on the Website matter or shall I move on then? Okay, again, thank you very much, gentlemen, for everything you've done there.

The next item, Number 3, I'm sorry, David, has anybody been trying to get in on the Adobe? I should ask.

David Cake: No.

Bill Drake: Okay great. So Point Number 3, actually I can deal with quite quickly because when the agenda was put together it was anticipated that the ICANN Board would have passed the budget for fiscal year '14.

We have a number of budget requests that I've submitted, I think six asking for resources to hold a major policy conference next year, to hold - to bring people to the IGF meeting in Bali where we are organizing several workshops, and a number of other matters.

And unfortunately, the Board has not yet passed that - the budget so there's nothing to report other than that we are still waiting for it. I should say, however, that the - there was preliminary support given enough so that we can ensure that one workshop that I proposed, which is a joint workshop between NCUC, NPOC and NCSG about the representation of civil society in the GNSO is going forward.

We were funded to send one representative each to do that. We have other workshops that we've proposed and accepted in Bali. Whether we'll get support for further members to be able to attend is one of the things we're waiting on.

So that is waiting. We're hoping, though, as I say, that there will be support to do a policy conference probably in Singapore at the March meeting in 2014. We have, in the past, often done on the Friday's prior to ICANN full day policy conferences which have been very good events and we'd like to do one there.

Also there is - I mentioned, simply, the GNSO toolkit requests; I put in requests for support for communication facilities and a number of other things. Again, this was all circulated on the NCUC Lists and the GNSO is providing those so that's been taken care of as well.

So in terms of the financial points I think we can deal with those quickly. Any comments on that or shall I move to the next point? Okay, I see nobody in the Chat so we move to the next point.

Other projects for third quarter between Durban and Buenos Aires. Okay processing of membership applications, a concern was just raised by a colleague who said - when did you apply for...

Satish Babu: Beijing.

Bill Drake: You applied in Beijing? And you have not heard anything since? Okay. So one of the things that has to be explained here - it's a little complication for us. When - the way you join NCUC is that you join the stakeholder group of which we are a member, NCSG, and then you specify which constituency you'd like to affiliate with.

The NCSG Executive Committee meets periodically to review applications from organizations and individuals. And sometimes they don't get through all of the applications that they have in the queue. They have debates about different people or organizations, etcetera, and disagreements. And so part of the problem here then is that we're hostage to the timeframe of a larger group in which we're a member.

Rafik is our representative - or one of our representatives on the NCSG Executive Committee and he would probably know about the status of your application. But you meet how often, every two months or so?

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Turn on the mic.

Rafik Dammak: The discussion is mostly through the mailing list.

Bill Drake: Mailing - oh okay. So I don't know when you next plan to take up an intake of members. I know we just had a big intake of members a couple of weeks ago. But the procedure that we've put in place is that going forward when the NCSG EC approves people Rafik then notifies the Executive Committee of NCUC that these people have requested to join and we then basically, without much more complexity beyond that, we admit them and Wilson and Tapani add them to the ListServe and add their names to the Website.

So apparently you're in the queue. I'm sorry about that. And whenever the EC next meets we'll try to get it taken care of.

Satish Babu: Thank you for the explanation. I think this is fine. There is no complaint of any thought. Just that it would help if there is some degree of transparency as to where the application is stuck or delayed or that it is under process. This, as such, it seems like a black hole where you can send things into and nothing ever comes out.

Bill Drake: And that is not a good thing. And I'm sorry about that. One of the things we talked about in our Executive Committee the other - meeting the other day would be that we should have a standardized message that will go out to people when they do click Apply, saying within X, Y, Z timeframe we expect this to be taken up and to provide contact details if somebody wants to follow

up if it hasn't moved quickly enough. So this is something we're going to be trying to put in place after this meeting.

Yes, DeeDee.

DeeDee Halleck: You said that, in some of the discussions, there were debates about membership. What exactly are the qualifications and the - what is the protocol for joining?

Bill Drake: Okay. Basically what the biggest source of debates amongst the representative of NCUC and NPOC have been in the past - and this is - I say this from the standpoint of NCUC and perhaps folks from NPOC would spin it a little differently.

We have felt, at some times, that there were entities being proposed by NPOC to join the NCSG which were not, in fact, commercial - not noncommercial organizations that were in some manner business-related organizations.

And so there have been debates about, you know, the NCSG is supposed to be for noncommercial, full stop, not, you know, so a noncommercial - or nonprofit organizations that are peak associations of business groups, for example, or organizations that are involved in profit making activity even if in the name of some public good, would not normally be acceptable to us.

And so there have been disagreements about those organizational applications in some cases and the differences between the parties have led to some backlog. But I think we've made a lot of progress in resolving these issues. There's a much better working relationship, more amicable relationship now than there was a year ago. And I suspect that these things should start to unplug.

But when there are differences like that that can hold up everything including the processing of individuals where there really shouldn't be an issue as long as - if you look at the Website we explained very clearly what the criteria are for joining NCUC and, you know, it's being a civil society noncommercial nonprofit person who shares a certain set of values, etcetera, etcetera. I think it's laid out fairly clearly. Okay?

Yes, Wolfgang.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yeah, I can imagine that for newcomers sometimes this very arcane structure is confusing and in particular if they follow the definition of Internet governance from the World Summit, which speaks from there main stakeholder groups, government, private sector and civil society, then they are partly confused, you know, where is the place of civil society in ICANN.

Because they're (unintelligible) advisory committee and, you know, the ALAC also advertises that that's the right place for civil society persons. There is no basic contradiction between the various places, well, civil society people can become engaged in ICANN.

The difference between NCUC and ALAC is that ALAC is an advisory committee which, you know, has regional and national, local, structures and just gives advice to the Board in a more general way.

While the NCUC is a constituency within the GNSO supporting organization dealing with very concrete issues which has to be decide because within ICANN the supporting organizations are the policy making bodies.

So the policy for generic domain names is made in the GNSO and in the GNSO Council. And here the very important element is that the NCUC as a constituency has not only a voice, it has a vote. And I think this is really important. It means we are part of the decision making process. That's also difference to ALAC, which has just a voice and no vote.

And I think this is important. There is no contradiction. As a newcomer you can have an (unintelligible) At Large structure and join the At Large community or your regional At Large organization. At the same time you can join NCUC and become part of the activities here.

So I think I want to make this clear so and to reduce the confusion which, you know, newcomers sometimes have if they say okay where is my place in this arcane structure. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Thank you, Wolfgang. Actually I just explained all this at some length in the fellow's meeting just prior so the folks who are here from the fellow's meeting will have just heard this precise wrap in some more detail. But, yes, we live with the various silo structures that we've inherited from ICANN. And it is something of a constraint and it absorbs far more energy and time than it should for us to be working with those institutional aspects.

Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Another point about becoming members, on the previous Website there was a confusion on how to join NCUC. People - some people thought it just a matter of becoming - filling in our membership form on the Website and becoming part of the - was part of the Website on the users (unintelligible). But that was not the procedure.

The procedure is actually filling in the form on the NCSG Website and choosing NCUC as the preferred constituency.

Bill Drake: Right.

Wilson Abigaba: That has been corrected and now on the Website the resources are clear. So if you try to fill in the user form on the old Website that was (unintelligible) that information might have been lost. So, yeah, is that what you did?

Satish Babu: (Unintelligible).

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, sorry about that. Because we actually approved two sets of members in the - between Beijing and Durban and I'm surprised that you're not among so if you would please go to the new Website, follow the procedure there and your information (unintelligible).

Satish Babu: Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: Thank you.

Bill Drake: Thank you, Wilson. Okay so moving briefly then through some of the other items. Travel funding guidelines, this is simply to notify the Executive Committee has had a number of discussions about our desire to try to use what resources NCUC has, which are not substantial; we get contributions from PIR, the manager of DotOrg, Afilias and a few other organizations, each year to our budget.

And so we have a little bit in the bank but we're not rich. But we would like to be able to use a bit of our money for - to support more members coming to meetings like this.

And so we want to define a framework for this. And we've talked about in the way we've done things so far is when we did have a little bit of cash to spend we - we used certain criteria such as whether somebody was actively participating in a working group or drafting team that was going to be meeting at the next meeting and it was important for them to be there because they were representing us in an ongoing process.

And, of course, a preference for people who have been active in the group more generally rather than, you know, somebody who just writes in from out of the blue and says, hi, I'd like to go to a meeting.

But, anyway, what we hope to do - we talked about the possibility of maybe setting aside a fixed amount of money, maybe a couple thousand dollars, per meeting, to support - or at least partially support a couple of people so maybe we could get - if somebody can get their own hotel taken care of we can take care of their plane and we'll try and spread that a little bit around.

So we want to try and do what we can to make this easier for more of our people to participate. While we have a quite full room here, which is great, we have many people from the Fellows program who have come along. Actually we have probably about half of our normal team that is usually at all these meetings here. A lot of people just couldn't come to Durban this time. I think in Buenos Aires we're have a lot more.

But so this is always an issue because in order to get people really engaged in ICANN it's hard to say, well, the virtue, you know, there's a great virtual participation capabilities but if you've never actually been to the meeting you don't feel connected as much to the process.

So we think it's important to try to give as many people a chance to get to at least a meeting some time. So we're going to - we're continuing to work on that and I just wanted to flag that point for you.

Any comments on this? Okay then moving to the next one, now these are two big issues that we're going to be having to deal with over the next months. The meta issue is the bylaws.

The bylaws - Item D there - the bylaws of the NCUC are alas, quite out of date and don't really match very well with who we are and how they operate. We last revised them in 2009 when the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group was being established. And there's a lot of stuff in there that just really doesn't (unintelligible) reality is.

For example, if you look at our bylaws that we collect dues from certain members. It says that we have a policy committee; we don't. There are a number of things that are just not working. And so a number of colleagues have expressed - have concerns about this and said that we really need to revise these. And they're undoubtedly correct.

Of course one of the other challenges in revising the bylaws is that the bylaws have to mesh properly with the charter of the NCSG and the GNSO rules and the ICANN bylaws generally. So we don't do this alone; we have to work with the staff on getting this right. And we have a number of people who have taken a run at trying to get revisions of the bylaws started in recent years and there's different versions out there.

So what we need is, I think, to put together a team of folks who are closely engaged in this issue who will collaborate together to draft new bylaws and work with the staff.

We would need to have a draft, I suppose, by say October or November, to be able to circulate, get it - flesh out the details with the staff and then we will hold our next election in, what, late November, I think that's what our time cycle is? Right, our last election was in late November.

So when we have our next election for our open seats in the Executive Committee of NCUC as well as the GNSO election for the Council, we would also put up for a vote the new bylaws.

So this is going to be a bit piece of work. I hope that - I know that there are a number of veteran members who want to participate in this work. And we have a - we started a space for a team, if (unintelligible) people wanted to join and several people indicated an interest.

So hopefully we will get somebody, Tapani, others in the Executive Committee, who wants to take a lead on coordinating that process and we'll get the other members engaged in working on that.

And in particular I wanted to flag one - a big part of that bylaws revision has to be a decision about how we do policy work in NCUC. In the past it's actually NCUC has been quite seat of the pants and a little bit loose in its approach to policy to the extent that we often have just kind of done very rough consensus, checks with members on the list, hey, does this make sense with everybody? Okay? And then we've put out statements.

Some people feel that it should be more formalized than that. And of course since the bylaws say that we should have a policy committee one would think we should. Now there's also the NCSG, the stakeholder policy committee, and that policy committee is the principal interface for us to the GNSO process.

But one would think it possible to have an NCUC policy committee which can make statements that are purely on behalf of the constituency but which would then coordinate with the members of the NCSG policy committee on statements that would go forward into the Council process.

And presumably, if we were to do something like this, we would have the two people from - our representatives on the NCSG policy committee should also be on the NCUC policy committee. It's a little unfortunate to have redundant structures.

The only other way to do it is to define an alternative to a policy committee. And I'm not sure what that alternative might be if we want something that is not just kind of loose, what do you all think, which what we've done in the past.

So I wonder just briefly if anybody has any thoughts on this particular issue how we might organize ourselves. We also have a staff member back there who - Mary Wong who's a former NCUC member and councilor in the GNSO who was involved in our policy work a great deal. And, Mary, if you have any thoughts we'd certainly - the fact that you're now staff at ICANN doesn't mean that you can't offer thoughts as well.

I'm sorry?

Man: Speaking in her own capacity.

Db: Speaking in your own capacity, yes. Just because I know you - I've had this discussion with you a number of times and you've - Mary tends to be a fairly clear-thinker about these things where my mind is often very muddled so.

Mary Wong: That's too kind, Bill. Actually the influence of the (bar) more than anything else on everybody. So I'm Mary Wong and I'm going to be speaking now as ICANN staff.

But bearing in mind the background that Bill has just explained that I bring to the staff I think that it is very helpful to ICANN to have a lot of public comments especially on issues of interest to each community. So to the extent however it's done constituency or stakeholder group - constituency and stakeholder group individual comments that always tremendously helpful.

The more input that the staff gets the better report that we can do. So one thing that you might want to think about is that even if there is an SG comment, even if there is a constituency comment and an SG comment it doesn't mean that individuals can't contribute as well.

Bill Drake: Absolutely. Thank you very much, Mary. I see Amr making a comment in the Chat. He says, "A policy committee is important for practical reasons. Working groups sometimes require - the working groups of the GNSO -

sometime require statements endorsed by constituencies and not having a clear process to get this endorsement can sometimes be too slow." Which is definitely a factor.

David.

David Cake: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. Other thoughts or comments about this point? This is, again, something that some of us will have to go off and brainstorm together, members of the Executive Committee, members of the team working on the bylaws. And we will, of course, also share ideas with the broader membership via the NCUC discuss list. But if anybody wants to be part of this process of trying to think through how we handle these things we would totally encourage your engagement.

Ed Morris I see is agreeing with Amr in the Chat. Okay.

So I - we do need to do something to reboot this policy - community process and bring it in line with our actual practices. And that's - so again in the next month, August to November, some serious work will have to go into working out these details.

So - and once we get this institutional stuff sorted out then we are in a much better position to do what we're really here for which is to do activism and to actually put forward on an ongoing basis the views of civil society in the GNSO process in a more proactive manner.

Sometimes we've been very good at getting statements, public comments, and other things out and sometimes we've just missed the boat which is unfortunate.

Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Bill. Just a couple of thoughts. One is, I'm not a fan of extinct processes of redrafting bylaws and I think we need to have a bit more art than science in the work that we do.

And so unless there's something - even if we aren't operating clearly in the black and white of what our bylaws require if we're functional and we're otherwise able to act and this isn't causing any divisional conflict then I think this, you know, it's not the best use of our time or it shouldn't absorb too much of our time particularly given the review that we know is happening with the GNSO and the wider constituencies, it could just be wasted work, for example, if there are wider reviews.

So, I mean, it's just a request, really, a suggestion that if there are particular things that people feel strongly must be fixed because they're causing problem then it would be good to hear about those. But if it's just that look, you know, we could be a bit more well-oiled machine I'm not sure that it's the best use of the limited resources that we've got.

Bill Drake: Thank you. That has been sort of one of the polarities, a debate, among various members because there are some members who like the idea of having things quit specified, there are some members who are more content with a lower more flowing kind of process.

There are some members who think that they should be detailed. There are some members who say no they should be quite concise and limited. And then anything else that is more short term or malleable we could put into operating procedures, which are not necessarily, you know, the EC can just define them quickly.

So these are all issues we have to sort out. Nobody is looking to spend more time than we have to, obviously, on a big bureaucratic thing. But we do need to have just some fundamental things that are correct. I mean, it doesn't - it

doesn't make sense to have procedures for membership and so on to find in the bylaws that just don't comport with how we operate.

But I completely take your points and I know it's widely shared by a number of other people as well.

I just wanted to recognize a couple of other people who have joined us since the last round of welcomes. If they'd like to just quickly identify themselves that would be really great. Did you just come in a little while ago? Could you say who you are please? Could you say to the mic, please? We have remote participants around the world and they can't hear. We've got quite a full room. It's nice.

Unfortunately the logistics of getting people in front of a microphone are complex.

Kadian Davis: Hi. Morning. I'm Kadian Davis, a fellow from Jamaica and I'm also a member of the NCUC.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Great to have you here. Who else came in? Nuno?

Nuno Garcia: Hello, good morning to you all. I'm sorry - just a little late. My name is Nuno Garcia and I'm a member from NCUC from Portugal.

Bill Drake: (Jouden), you came in a little bit later too, right? I don't think you were introduced before. Were you introduced before?

Woman: Yes.

Bill Drake: Okay, I missed it, I'm sorry. I'm losing my mind. Magaly.

Magaly Pazello: Magaly Pazello from Brazil. And a member of NCUC and a GNSO councilor for NCSG.

Bill Drake: There are a number of people behind me that I don't see. Is there any new folks who have joined us and would like to step to a mic and just introduce themselves? There's one over here.

If you prefer to sit quietly and anonymously I won't bother you but you're most welcome to introduce yourself to everybody as well. Yes. Hi.

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: Hello. My name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje. I'm from Nigeria. And you guys invited me from the African School for Internet Governance.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: So I'm hoping to be an active member...

((Crosstalk))

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: Thank you very much.

Bill Drake: Great to have you here, Benjamin. Ellen, want to say hi?

Ellen Strickland: Hi, I'm Ellen Strickland from New Zealand. I'm a collaboration and community lead with Internet in (ZED). It's my first ICANN meeting and so interested in civil society and community engagement. Interested to see about NCUC.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Okay so I think - was there somebody else? Mary's pointing to somebody. No, they've been introduced before.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Yes. Okay behind me.

Oleg Demidov: Can you hear me? Is this working?

Bill Drake: Yes. No? Why don't you just step to this mic over here.

Oleg Demidov: Good morning, everyone. My name is Oleg Demidov. I'm a newcomer Fellow from Russia, Moscow, from a think tank which is dealing with Internet governance issues. I'm here because I was present at the morning session when Bill Drake was speaking so I got interested in the issues which the NCUC dealing with.

And I'm also very interested in tomorrow's session on closed domains which is the issue of particular interest for me. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. Anybody else? Please.

Eranga Samarathna: Good morning. I am Eranga from Sri Lanka and I'm a Fellow. So with the morning session I was invited about this working group so I thought that (unintelligible) for this. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Oh thank you. It's nice to have so many Fellows here. Okay so I think we have gone through our organizational stuff. It's all very exciting to have discussions like that but we just wanted to at least put those issues on the table or you. These are all things that, again, groups, members, will be working on going forward. And we welcome everybody's participation in that and we'll try to keep you abreast of it.

So let's turn now to the substantive part of our agenda. We want to have a discussion for - we can go a half hour, the coffee break is a half hour from 10:30 to 11:00 and so we can cut into that a little bit I think that's okay.

We wanted to take advantage of the fact that we're here in Durban and we have somebody here, Anriette Esterhuysen, from the Association for Progressive Communications who's a leading actor in the global civil society environment around human rights and ICTs and gender and many other

issues and has been very involved in the Africa scene around Internet governance and was, of course, a key driver in the School of Internet Governance that we just had.

So I just thought it made sense to have a conversation around this issue and to ask Anriette to share some thoughts to facilitate that and get us going. So let's do that for a half hour and then we'll take a coffee break. So, Anriette, turn it over to you.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Thank you, Bill. I have to say up front first this is my first ICANN meeting, possibly my last as well. But even though I've been involved in Internet governance and in telecommunications policy and regulation in Africa for decades, I know less about the ICANN process than many of you.

So take my facilitation and my input of that in mind and help me out if I make mistakes or get anything wrong. I just thought - and I thank very much to the NCUC and to Bill - I must say APC has been in the NCUC from the beginning so that's been good. Thanks to Bill for creating this space.

What I thought of us doing is just having a little bit of - of sharing some feedback about activity. We have quite a few people in the room who were at the African School on Internet Governance. But I thought if there are people here who were at the DNS School - there was a DNS school, so there was also a DNS School so maybe they could share something.

And then I know there's AFRALO, the African At Large Initiative. I don't see (Sati Mata) (unintelligible) here. But if there's anyone here who's part of AFRALO it might be useful to share a bit of that.

And then I thought it could also be useful if - and we have Mary here from staff - to get an update on the ICANN Africa strategy, which I know about. I've searched the ICANN Website for updated information. We did have Pierre

Dandjinou at the African School. But it would also just be good to get a bit of an update on that.

And then I just wondered if, in fact, maybe, so we can talk about some activities, look at some issues and challenges and possibly if there are any actions.

For example, I'm not sure if the NCUC has ever done a formal response to the ICANN Africa strategy. And that might be a useful thing to do because when I assessed that strategy a year ago, whenever it - yeah, it's about August last year that it was released, I felt there were gaps in that strategy and Tijani isn't here either, is he? He's also a member of the NCUC, Tijani from Tunisia, not?

Rafik Dammak: He's a member of the AFRALO.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay. So, you know, we've had some discussions about the African ICANN strategy. It might be useful to give an, you know, to give ICANN and Pierre, the Vice President who's responsible for implementing it, an NCUC take on what they would like to see ICANN do in Africa. Is that okay as a sort of format?

So just to launch straight into the African School Internet Governance, it took place last week. It's fantastic to see (Blessing) and Benjamin and (Lillian) here. Who else? And then some of our faculty and Carlos, Wolfgang, Joy, Nuno was there for a day. So there was a strong - David and Bill Drake organized this NCU session.

It was a short school. It was inspired by the European School on Internet Governance. I'm not sure if any of you have participated in that. You have. And so being inspired by the European School and then having Wolfgang with us and Bill and Avri, who isn't here, was really very special actually. I felt it was - the linkages and building on that and just being guided.

You know, when we developed the program we used the European School as a guide. Oh yes, and you were also there. And the goal was to identify Africans that are not necessarily yet involved in ICANN or any other Internet governance process but that have commitment and knowledge of the Internet in some capacity from a policy perspective.

It was a competitive process and we had more than 330 applicants of which we could select in the end about 35. So we had really excellent people in the room. And I think the discussion reflected that.

And it covered the basics of Internet governance, numbers, names, but located that in a broader policy questions. One of the useful exercises of the School was to identify what participants wanted to know and what they feel the pressing issues are.

And those ranged, you know, from how to deal with harmful content on the Internet to how to have more effective (ITT) for development policies. Names and numbers actually didn't feature that prominently in the issues that people were concerned about. And I think that always remains the challenge, you know, how do you link names and numbers to people's real lives everyday, Internet issues and challenges?

And the issue of domain names, speculator, or somebody who's got 200,000 in your back pocket that you want to put into a gTLD application. So I think that is a challenge for NCUC probably as well.

And I think that - and then we did a role play. We tried to get participants to feel what it's like to represent a constituency and have to go into an international negotiation process. And we used the UN as a model so we had governments, UN secretariat, chairs, very strict rules and square brackets and so on. So - but - so that's on the School.

I'm not sure if any of the participants or faculty who were at the School would like to share anything about the School? And then we will go on to some other activities. Or questions?

Adrian Quesada: Hi, I'm Adrian Quesada from Costa Rica speaking by myself. Well, I just wanted to let you know I couldn't attend to the African School but I attended the last (unintelligible) school on Internet Governance that was held by - well (unintelligible) Olga Cavalli.

And I really think that this kind of activities are really enriching and they do have a lot of affect on the community because they - although for people who have nothing to do with the Internet governance context to really get to know these issues and to make connections between them and their real lives.

So, yeah, really applaud your commitment and your efforts. And I hope that we can really continue these efforts.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Thanks. I agree.

Bill Drake: So turning from the School to African views in particular I just wanted to put on your agenda for when you - we have here sitting next to us somebody from Tunisia, Rafik, who's been very engaged for a long time in NCUC and has been pushing some issues of particular interest to Africa so it would be good to get him into the flow of...

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay. Okay no definitely. Any other activities that anybody wanted to report? Is there anybody who was at the DNS workshop?

Man: You mean the DNSSEC workshop, that's what you mean?

Anriette Esterhuysen: No, it was the African DNS workshop organized by (Uniform) and AFriNIC and ISOC.

Man: Okay, no.

Anriette Esterhuysen: So none of us were there but just to tell you that that was organized by ICANN plus AfriNIC, the African NIC, and some of the registries. And the idea was just to build the skills of African people involved in DNS administrator - DNS administrators. So participants were drawn from ISPs and from other network service providers. It's also part of the broader IPv6 transition and strategy of AfriNIC and ISOC.

So in fact we - what we did identify is that they had very different participants from our African School on Internet Governance. And I think they're complementary because they take people inside industry, build those skills whereas we are taking people from civil society, activists from the academe and from government and regulators who have a broader Internet public policy area of interest and don't know very much about, as you say, about the specifics of Internet governance.

And AFRALO, anybody can anyone tell us about AFRALO? I know, but there are some people that actually (unintelligible) so if don't think it's relevant it's fine, we can drop it.

Bill Drake: It's not that it's irrelevant it's just that they might be...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Just the issue with AFRALO that they don't accept individuals, that's why we don't have many people involved there.

Anriette Esterhuysen: They don't?

Rafik Dammak: Accept individuals, they don't (unintelligible) speaking here on my own capacity I have big issue with that because I cannot join the AFRALO to be involved there. So I try to follow what they are doing but that's big problem, we need more diversity there.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Is that something that NCUC should take up? I mean, sorry, I'm talking as an ICANN novice here. Is that something that NCUC, as a constituency, could write a letter to AFRALO about or not? It's completely hardwired into the ICANN DNS?

Bill Drake: It's their internal decision and...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...I think us going to a part of...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...the At Large community...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...and telling them how we think they ought to operate...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...wouldn't play really well and it's already been...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: ...it's been a big problem within other parts of At Large as well.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Bill Drake: In European At Large, which I'm in, individuals also can't participate.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Well I can share that AFRALO asked our help - APC's help in getting people to Durban and identifying people from civil society organizations to come to Durban which we did. So, you know, we have historical relationship with some of the people inside AFRALO so we did that in a fairly - just in our capacity as being connected with civil society groups in Africa.

Tuhaise Robert: Just wanted to - I was the DNS - the - I'm from an ISOC and was representing the Uganda chapter ISOC so I've been involved in that. But I'm really going back to the concern - the statement you made as far as the IG School is concerned and the fact that in fact the DNS and number addressing system was not really an issue that was really dealt with specifically or the interest level was not there.

And that's where my concern is because that is generally left to the techy guys, you know. And the others are touching on policy and regulatory but then do not really go into the DNS and so forth. But ICANN - that is the specialty of ICANN. So I think the school should focus more on developing curriculum around those.

I too (unintelligible) and so forth online, intensive ones and I'm well (unintelligible) with the IG environment - IGF issues. But this particular thing, you're right, that's where the disconnect is. The technical people are more into numbers and DNS but everybody else tries to shy away; we just gloss over it. And ICANN school should spend more time developing the right curriculum...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Well it was not an ICANN school. But it was an African School on Internet Governance and we dealt with it in great depths. So we had two very intensive sessions on numbering. We were very privileged, we had Adiel from AfriNIC, the CEO, with us two days. We dealt with ICANN in a lot of (decks)

as well and at different layers. So we had Pierre Dandjinou give us on ICANN staff take on ICANN. We had Bill Drake give us an NCUC take on ICANN and (Mactim) also dealt with numbers.

So we actually dealt with ICANN in great depth. What I said is that when we first asked participants what matters to you about Internet governance, names and numbers were not their priority. But we certainly tried to make those lengths and build those bridges.

Bill Drake: And...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Wolfgang.

Bill Drake: ...can I just ask a - I think this is perhaps a point to dwell on because the conversation you and I have often had around your views on ICANN has often - you've often said that in Africa the people you talk to concerns are much more about access and human rights and those dimensions and not so much these kind of critical Internet resources dimensions.

And that's, I think, a thing to really ponder and discuss is, are there - is there a unique African stance or view or set of views around these issues? Are there reasons why these issues do or don't connect more with people? How do we...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah, yeah.

Bill Drake: ...and engage people more?

Anriette Esterhuysen: No, I want to come to that. I just would like us to - I mean, we don't have to follow the agenda but, yeah, maybe we can just jump to that. I was going to ask ICANN to give us a report but we can jump to that.

CcTLDs, by the way, is something that did come up. And, Wolfgang, you wanted to say something?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I think the concept of the schools is based on the slogan, Learning in a Multistakeholder Environment. So the theory of ICANN is that you have the various stakeholders, which includes the technical community, the academic community, the private sector, government, civil society.

And in so far, you know, the - if you move forward with the first the conceptualization of the concept of the school you should find the right balance, so to include all aspects. And this goes with regard to the subjects of lectures.

In the European summer school we have more days, we have six days and we have one tech day where we discuss only technical days so this gives you more opportunity. You have to live with the reality, if you have only three days you cannot satisfy all needs.

But there are two more elements with regard to the fellows and the faculty. The selection of the fellows is a complicated process and Anriette knows about this.

But it means if you select fellows that means you have to - you are careful in the selection to get people from this community as fellows or from all the communities so that you have a balance, a mix of the fellows representing different stakeholder groups and the same with the faculty.

So this allows a lot of fellow to fellow and fellow to faculty and faculty to faculty communication not only in the lectures but only, you know, in the nice coffee breaks and in the evenings and things like that. So that means you have to look also beyond the lecture as such because this is a huge communication space which has a number of elements, one of them is lectures.

So and so far the - this concept, Learning in a Multistakeholder Environment, is important...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: ...and this has to be reflected in the program, in the selection of the fellows and in the selection of the faculty.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah. And Rafik and Carlos and DeeDee, Magaly, you all wanted to say something.

Rafik Dammak: So because you mentioned about what's happening with Africa it's just for example, for the strategic plan it was effort outside ICANN involving some members from the ICANN community from Africa where they didn't, for example, outreach to us.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: They just self-appointed themselves. There was a lot of hit about that last year in the African mailing list. The African mailing list is kind of an official mailing list for African members of ICANN.

And they did their work and they submitted their report so we don't have really the opportunity to submit comments. Even I try to - was kind of observer but it was not enough. I guess my hope. But that was problem with that.

And also we should be proud at NCUC that we push it for the support applicant. In that time it was not easy. We have a lot of - we faced a lot of resistance from contracted party. Nobody want - why you want to support applicant? They have to - if they want to run a registry they have to have enough money.

And we did a lot of - we struggled a lot. But it's not also enough because the Board decided too late they didn't do enough outreach to go to - how to say - to go to applicant from Africa. We need to do more for the next round. And so - and maybe other concern, for example, we have - it's related to the new gTLD program, like for example DotAfrica in (unintelligible).

There is no really civil society involved but it is supposed to be multistakeholder. And this is the issue - we are in the NCUC representing civil society. We want more people from Africa. But many times like they talk to ALAC, they support ALAC as the only space but ALAC they represent all user.

So we always have the issues to be represented in all those and incentive to bring our voice and to explain why it matters to civil society.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah. Sounds like there's some actually concrete actions in what Rafik was saying. And, Bill, you wanted to intervene before everyone else or you...

Bill Drake: Well just on the same point.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay.

Bill Drake: You may not be - in other words, (unintelligible) and I think it's good for people to know because it's an example sometimes - sometimes we say well can civil society make a difference? Is this an area where we made a difference.

In 2009 we were at the meeting in Mexico, the staff came to us, they were designing the Applicant Guidebook for the new gTLD program. They said, the price for anybody to apply for a new gTLD is going to be \$185,000. Mary, Rafik, myself, a couple other NCUC members...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...raised their hands and said, you got to be kidding? For a lot of developing countries this is not going to work, for NGOs, etcetera. And the staff said, well it would be too complicated to have a differentiated pricing structure.

Well we kept pressing the point and talked with ALAC colleagues who also pressed the point and some GAC colleagues and pretty soon we ended up with this joint...

Rafik Dammak: Joint Applicant...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Joint Applicant Support Group formed under the GNSO which Rafik was very centrally involved in as was Avri and some other members. And the output of that was a framework to provide different types of support to applicants that needed help in applying for gTLDs including the possibility of applying at a price of \$40,000, which is quite different from \$185,000.

Now in the end - this was quite a victory - and we - I think we can say this is something civil society contributed to putting this kind of equity concern into the process. In the implementation ICANN did not follow up properly, did not do enough outreach and in consequence we had only three applications from Africa for new gTLDs which is - and so they dropped the ball on that bit.

So this points to two lessons. One, we can, when we work together and find partners in other parts of the ICANN sphere, help to shape agendas, put items on the table and carry them forward.

But then the second part is always when you're dealing with ICANN it's not just the community; there's the staff. And the staff are very powerful. They

have a lot of influence. And there's other players, the private sector players, and getting things through to actual implementation often is very difficult.

DeeDee Halleck: We have such little time together and we have such a unique opportunity here with so many representatives from Africa. I was curious when you mentioned the - and I think it's a very good way to start what - to ask people what their concerns are about the Internet.

And I am - was surprised to hear that - I don't know, maybe - it was discussed but I'd like to hear from the people who are here what your concerns are, if you have concerns about security and the sort of surveillance that has been brought to the floor so much in the US and Europe and what is the voice from Africa on this issue?

Anriette Esterhuysen: So let's come back to that. Let's just quickly here - Carlos, you wanted to also say something?

Carlos Alfonso: Okay. Well, first of all is incredible that ICANN did not put this differential pricing structure in the first place in the proposal. And we had to pressure for that. And secondly that they still created difficulties for people to use differential pricing structure, it's incredible.

But shows that this - the dominant position is the business - business of (unintelligible) not provide service to the community regarding new gTLDs. And this is very serious, I think. When you ask about a strategy of ICANN why NCUC doesn't have so far position regarding the strategy they ask you what is that status? We don't know yet.

I talked yesterday to a few people of the ICANN Board and regional representatives, they don't know yet. They are asking for help from people in divisions to have an idea of what to do. You know? And why? Because the focus is selling gTLDs. This is the focus.

And it is very hard to disguise that into a very broad sophisticated under some - whatever (unintelligible) system of structures and strategies and whatever. This is very complicated. And finally, I - regarding the ccTLDs, which you asked, ccTLDs formally are within the ICANN structure as a supporting organization called ccNSO, completely different from GNSO, no?

Like GNSO now is discussing the new directory services structure, which would replace Whois. This is a discussion that GNSO does. CcNSO is not there. No? And nothing that GNSO - ccNSO determines is mandatory for the ccTLDs, is - are only recommendations.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Carlos Alfonso: And the ccTLDs joins the ccNSO (unintelligible) basis unlike the structure of GNSO. So the ccTLDs live by themselves.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Carlos Alfonso: No?

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Alfonso: Now, are they going to - are they going to have to accept this new structure? Are they going to continue with that Whois structure? We don't know. You know, this is completely dissociated one thing from the other. All these are very serious problems because ICANN is focused on only one thing because all the rest is already being done by other structures like the NRO, etcetera, gTLDs, how to make the business of gTLDs successful.

So what are we going to do regarding this? Regarding - which comments should we do regarding this strategy? What is it, no?

Anriette Esterhuysen: Just to respond to - and I'd like other people who were at the school and other Africans in the room to respond as well. But just to respond to DeeDee and Carlos quickly, and Rafik, as well, DeeDee, security was a big concern. And I think we had a mix, as Wolfgang was saying, we were learning in a multistakeholder context. So we had people from government and regulatory agencies.

For example, the Nigerian regulatory agency incredibly concerned about improving security and fighting spam because they feel Nigeria's national reputation is at stake. So - and then you had human rights people and media people - we had a substantial number of journalists who are incredibly concerned about protection of privacy and human rights and freedom from censorship.

So there was a real concern and quite a lot of discussion. I think that's the one area that our three-day or three and a half day structure did not allow us to spend enough time on was security.

And just, you know, before I open just on the ccTLD issue I think that's one of the challenges in a way because if you'd talked from a bottom up way for many people in Africa they experience the naming industry through having a ccTLD - well not having a ccTLD.

And if there's an active ccTLD that's part of the national stakeholder community that talks to civil society, that is a not for profit you often have a very different level of interaction and knowledge of what's happening in the naming industry than you do in a country where there isn't a functioning ccTLD or where the ccTLD is owned and managed by an entity outside of the border.

So in a way, I mean, this is - maybe that's not an NCUC issue but if you are a not for profit or a civil society (unintelligible) a country who wants to begin to

articulate and engage with names then that can make a really big difference to how you do that.

But let's talk about some of the issues. I think, you know - yes.

Carlos Alfonso: Regarding what I am trying to drive at...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yeah.

Carlos Alfonso: In 2007 the Government Advisory Committee it was - this was more an alert than a requirement which, by the way, the GAC cannot do. But an advice to the ICANN Board and staff on the geographical names. This was completely ignored by ICANN in deliberation of the application guides. No? And now the problem explodes because there are lots of demands and protests and, you know, actions against the use of certain geographic names.

And nothing of this was considered in the application guide. They ignored that advice and now they are suffering the consequences. Why? Because the (unintelligible), you know, we have to get the business going. Let's ignore all these demands. No? And this is terrible. And now we are confronted with well should we support ICANN now in this situation or should we say that, yes, there is an issue here that has to be solved, no, regarding geographical names.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Lillian wanted to say something.

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: You wanted to (unintelligible).

(Lillian): Okay (unintelligible). I think to me the issue that I'm picking here and something that's of - I picked from the - I think the Africa strategy meeting was how do we - the issue for us is not about having domain names but the

issue is will having domain names or having control in the management of the DNS increase access for the (DDT) to the Internet?

So what I'd like probably to hear or see in this community is how do we link this too? Because to an African all I need is Internet. And most of what we hear is when people - when you talk about the Internet (unintelligible) Internet to that some people is Facebook, to them it's Twitter, to them it's email. So it is kind of a little bit confusing. Thanks.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Any other of the African participants who want to add something?
Benjamin? (Blessing)?

(Blessing Mabuto): Okay, yeah my name is (Blessing). And I'm in the nonprofit sector. I lead an organization. And the essence of the African School on Internet Governance to me is that before I attended I actually had no idea about what ICANN is and what is its role in the whole Internet governance ecosystem.

So for me that represents an opportunity. Perhaps, I don't know, the exact mechanism, but for more to be invested towards ensuring that the people on the grass roots have a say in the whole Internet governance stuff because as it stands right now it's kind of a secret society and it's not really in touch with the people whom it is intended to save.

So I'm not very sure of the strategy and mechanism. But I think that is where more effort and investment should be directed towards.

((Crosstalk))

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: Hello. My name is Benjamin. For us where I come from it's about access truly. It's also about right now people just want to does this understanding that (ICTD) or Internet, whatever can just fix some of the things that (unintelligible) for a long time. And right now people are just jumping on board.

But a lot of us who wish we could be in (unintelligible) do things like (unintelligible) anyone in the world. But some questions come you keep increasing your bandwidth, doing different things and it seems like it never occurred to me that we could contribute to how this things are being decided.

So sometimes we need to talk to our own international organizations (unintelligible) in the US to do stuff for us that we couldn't do from (Abuja).

But getting to the African School it became clear how to relate with other stakeholders because there are places ICANN gets to. I mean, trusted in e-health but at some point in my pursuit of things I try to do I need to go to the ministry. I need to get some particular to some application and, I mean, get - that is the way it works.

But who decided that that you work that way? And, you know, (unintelligible) you could participate and who decide how things are shaped. And that's some of the things I've gotten from the African School which in essence is also pushing me towards thinking of investing more time to find out other things as I go back to tell other guys who switch one DNS to the other like oh you can get through with this one, try this one, use that one and all of that.

And for every other thing that (unintelligible) is about. Cyber security in terms of image, why do I get the kind of access I get when I'm (unintelligible) and I get another kind of access when I'm in Nigeria.

From my perspective or what can I do to improve my reputation irrespective of who I am - I don't have to be apologetic about that, that's who I am. But I need to also be respected that I'm legit. So it was helpful that I was in the African School. And it was also helpful that I spoke to the people, I interacted with and finding myself here. So do (unintelligible).

Anriette Esterhuysen: Thanks. Rafik.

Bill Drake: I'm sorry, can I just interrupt please? There's 14 minutes left of the coffee break. We have a half an hour open discussion space after the coffee break where we can continue this conversation. So can I suggest that we break now and let people get a coffee and use the restroom, get out of this dark and dreary room and we come back at 11:00...

Anriette Esterhuysen: I wouldn't mind actually on finishing the discussion because I also need to catch a plane and it would be - so let's - how long will the coffee break be?

Bill Drake: Well there's 14 minutes left of it.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay. Okay you did - the session did start late, you are aware of that?

Bill Drake: Yes I am.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay. So short coffee break and then come back, is that okay? All right just...

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: We've got the ATRT coming in.

Bill Drake: The ATRT comes at 11:30...

Anriette Esterhuysen: ...at 11:30 so...

Bill Drake: Right.

Anriette Esterhuysen: ...we have a brief discussion before they...

Bill Drake: Yes. So we - I would like us to, if we could come back and get some more African views and then try and wrap it up by 11:15 or so...

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay.

Bill Drake: ...and then we can move on to prepare for the ATRT. Okay? Just so - if somebody wants to use a restroom or get a drink we shouldn't preclude them. Okay? So let's come back at 11:00.

Should we start to move towards the reconvening? I mean, still some people are out on the coffee but I think we should - there are people online waiting too so. And we will begin in a slow evolution back to reality here. I know you never left it, right? Mark's grounded in reality.

All right, folks, can we reconvene please? There are people online listening to dead space and I think we should probably - and we also do have scheduling limits with the ATRT people coming in.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Boy, my ability to get anybody interested in sitting down is quite limited. All right, come, sit, reconvene, assemble, congregate, aggregate, agglomerate, concentrate. You guys - this is like herding cats.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: This is just a really herding cats experience.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I keep going - finding people coming back and...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Everybody wants coffee, of course. That's the thing, it's a coffee break, let's...

((Crosstalk))

Man: No I normally don't drink coffee at all but in these meetings I keep drinking coffee.

Bill Drake: Okay. Well because we do have people online I'm going to just go ahead without everybody until they come back. Let me just check in the - everyone still there?

Woman: Get a sense of how many people are online, Bill?

Bill Drake: Yes, there are - well there are seven people on the Adobe Connect and as I look I see five of them I think who are not here so that's five people who are somewhere on Earth listening in on us. And then on our Skype channel we have people who are - one or two more. So it would be good to get going.

So, all right, I just to point out by the way if you have not discovered one of the mysteries of ICANN meetings it's always the gala dinner and how to get into the gala dinner. Somehow there's this infinite ability to ration, to create scarcity and then create all kinds of interesting dynamics about how you manage that. So often it's hard to get tickets for the gala.

When we arrived to check in, to register, we were told that we did not need anything to go to the gala. Then it turned out that you had to go on the Website and get a little - go to the DotZA booth and pick up a little national flag thing to put on your lapel to get you into the gala.

Now it turns out you also have to go to DotZA and pick up a paper invitation and a rubber bracelet. So we're now on the third iteration of what to do to get into the gala.

So anybody who intends to go to the gala on Wednesday night - this also has a nice program, apparently we'll watch dolphins swim although not you, because you'll be in the Council meeting at the same time as the gala. Sorry. That's the plan.

Joy Liddicoat: Watching the sharks from...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: So, yeah, exactly, you're with the sharks instead of the dolphins. So ci comme ca. Anyway so, look, again it's...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...the ticket so I don't know whether it will be...

((Crosstalk))

Man: In Beijing less than half the attendees managed to get tickets.

Bill Drake: Yeah, Beijing was completely crazy although that was a host country issue. So, look, it's 10 after. Let's have 10 minutes more discussion about views from African colleagues on what they think the priorities are and in particular anything that NCUC can do to help facilitate their participation and engagement and so on would be really great.

And then I think really at 20 after, so we should prepare briefly for the ATRT team because they're going to come in with questions and we should know what we're going to talk to them about.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay so we had some comments from the floor. I just want to summarize. Some of the possible actions or issues that have come up so far is the applicant support and how that can be made more effective, how - what

ICANN does can be more linked to issues of Internet access because that is such a priority, whether the NCUC could in any way raise concerns with the DotAfrica gTLD around its insufficient inclusion of noncommercial civil society interests.

Then some NCUC form of advisory or commentary on the ICANN Africa strategy. And then I think the other issue that really did come up was that it's incredibly important to continue to build capacity in Africa at both the technical level and the broader policy level when it comes to Internet policy governance, technical governance and public policy governance.

Okay we had Rafik and then we had you, sorry, I don't know your name, and Nuno.

Rafik Dammak: So, yeah, I heard the question about why we need to be concerned about naming and addresses. For, you know, when we talk about business here it's not big business, in fact, the domain name, but in Africa we need it because even when we talk about access we need to think about the whole infrastructure.

We need the Internet, not physical access but we need to think about DNS and to have registry in Africa, to have registrar. We have really few registrar in Africa. So it's not easy even to buy a domain name if you want. So we need all those provider to be in the region so we can create this digital economy.

So to have the full picture it's not just about domain name, it's to create how infrastructure, the whole environment to enable it for the development. And so that's why in the JAS - the Applicant Support Working Group we think one of the purposes to have a regional registry provider - we don't need to have, for a TLD in Africa a provider from United States or Europe but to have our own infrastructure in the region.

Man: Just to make another comment. In addition to what my brother from Tunisia said, which I fully endorse, my name is (Gabrielle), again, just so you remember me.

There is the issue of human rights also that I thought I heard the Chair mention that NCUC is also involved in that as opposed to the consumer protection issues.

In Africa human rights and democracy and multistakeholder they're all interrelated. And in the African context you're going to find there is a lot of violations of human rights issues on the African continent. And it has permitted also on the Internet space.

There's a lot of IP blocking of Websites and anything that the government views as against the government or whatever in their interpretations. And this, of course, goes to the stability issue of the Internet infrastructure.

So how can the NCUC try to get involved in that in terms of the human rights aspect of, you know, of a democratic space in terms of multistakeholder but also the IP blocking because that's one of the DNS is affected and that's - in that case.

Anriette Esterhuysen: I think that's a very good point. And I don't think that that was at all mentioned in the initial Africa - ICANN African strategy document whatsoever.

Nuno, you wanted to say something?

Nuno Garcia: Yes, thank you. Regarding the experience of African engagement I just wanted to let you know that after - actually two years of inviting my students from the University of Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, to join NCUC and to join Internet related activities.

I finally managed to make my point through and I was extremely, extremely happy - I cannot tell you how happy I was - to find that (Milauku) was coming over and was actually attending the African Internet Governance call.

So this meaning that my experience with Africa is very diverse. And when we say Africa we are generalizing a concept that maybe has no generalization possible because the experience you are having here in Durban it's not at all the experience I had in Addis Ababa as many of you know.

In fact Internet access in Africa is extremely important not only because of the questions that (Gabrielle) mentioned earlier that are known to all of us but also because Internet access, as sort of a prerequisite, a number of things that we take for granted such as electricity or communication channels, which in Addis Ababa are not as common as one may think.

I remember distinctively last year I had to redo one of my classes because the power was out. And we just had power the next day. So having said this, it is extremely important to be aware of the challenges that face our African colleagues when we call them to discuss these issues bearing in mind that what these issues mean to us are not exactly the same thing as to them. And with this thought I just conclude here.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Anything else or shall we wrap up? You go first and then (Nicolo).

Man: Yeah, I was just listening to some of the other comments regarding censorship in Africa. And I'm wondering, especially in developing nations, if ICANN can sort of put some pressure on the, you know, African governments though censorship in that we can say things like, you know, we're not going to, you know, give TLD support to countries that don't allow free access to the people?

In other words if they block the people off then the government gets blocked off too. And that we can maybe say, you know, it's either everybody or nobody and help with eliminating censorship issues from that perspective.

Anriette Esterhuysen: I think it's a good thing for us to decide. I just think on the issue of censorship and human rights, I mean, as you've said that the level of Internet infrastructure and broadband infrastructure is very different in different parts of Africa.

But when it comes to the challenge of human rights and freedom of expression and free flow of information that challenge exists everywhere in Africa including on the Internet, including in this country so it does actually create a common area.

(Nicolo), I'm going to get to you just now. But, you know, NCUC should decide that but has NCUC given ICANN any comment on the fact that ICANN is internationalizing by establishing offices in countries which are pro-Internet censorship such as Singapore. Have you actually raised concern with ICANN around that?

And so I think, you know, I think that NCUC should consider that type of strategy in Africa but not just in Africa. I think there's work to be done around that with ICANN in the world at large.

(Nicolo), you wanted to say something?

(Nicolo): Yes, thank you. I was also a participant at the African Summer School in Internet Governance and I wanted to say that first of all it was not only a matter to learn all the structures and the dynamics of Internet governance that I was not fully aware of but it was also a celebration of multistakeholdism as you already emphasized.

But in that respect I was thinking that on issues like security and censorship it would be very nice to hear different perspective from different governments and in this respect we had some participation of governments but I was wondering whether in the future outreach activities one should not also focus on enhancing governmental participation because those were indeed the - government (unintelligible) are those that are less keen on opening up to multistakeholder in the first place.

And, second, with respect to new gTLDs, I was wondering if it's too far fetched to think about opening up a new round just for developing countries given the unsatisfactory results that we had on the application from Africa. Yeah, that's my comment.

Anriette Esterhuysen: I think that's also an interesting suggestion. And maybe we should hand this back to Bill Drake for summary. And I'm just - I think what (Nicolo) was saying is also - reminds me that maybe there's an opportunity here for NCUC to address GAC and particularly African members of the GAC on the issue of freedom of expression and freedom of information and an unfragmented Internet.

So I think there's lots of potential follow up actions that have emerged from this. And I think I should hand back to Bill because we need to end now. And maybe you can then consolidate what NCUC members want to follow up with?

Bill Drake: Thank you, Anriette. First I'll just quickly say on the question you asked about whether NCUC has raised concerns about the places that ICANN is establishing new offices, no, we have not.

One of the debating points, of course, is always whether it is better to engage and try to support local actors by being present or better to withhold. And quite frankly, the places that ICANN has got new centers opening up are not like begging for ICANN to come.

So if ICANN were to - one suspects if ICANN were to say well you aren't quite meeting our conception of standards of freedom of expression they'd say well good, you know, don't come. They don't need ICANN to be there.

So, you know, how much you could get the Board to want to engage in that fight I don't know.

Anriette Esterhuysen: But why does the Board choose Turkey? And why does the Board choose Istanbul in the first place if ICANN is actually willing to express a commitment to human rights?

Bill Drake: Because I suppose Turkey is a booming Internet environment that is seen as crucial to the future evolution. Well, I'm not the Board, I'm just telling you. So but anyway how we would engage these issues I think is a fair point.

And certainly one of the things I'm hoping we'll do - and this is why I've invited the Vice Chairs of the GAC to this meeting to establish a connection - is, as I say, if it goes well and we can muster enough participation to really prepare properly and make a good showing if we can organize a session with the GAC - the full GAC - in Buenos Aires this would be precisely the kind of place where we could raise the kind of - the human rights concerns that the GAC often does not have raised with it in other ICANN settings. So I think that's an opportunity and we should look in that direction.

I don't know that I really want to try to synthesize beyond that. But there are a number of points that people have raised about things that we could do that we aren't doing. Everything of course, is dependent on member engagement, the first step is to get people involved and then secondly to try to create teams or spaces where they would start to take certain issues forward.

If there was - we are certainly welcome - welcoming to any and all who want to get engaged. If there are people who would like, for example, to work on

crafting a response to the Africa strategy of ICANN, if there are people who would like to work on a statement about the location of new offices, any of these kinds of things NCUC of course would welcome the participation of civil society activists who want to get engaged and do these kinds of work.

So all I can say is, you know, please if - if this appeals to you, you know where we are, please join, please be in touch with people. Rafik in particular is the chair of our membership committee and is an African himself. And so we have many people you can approach directly to try to push this along.

I want to thank Anriette for taking the time to cover over during our first ICANN meeting to facilitate this discussion. I think it was really very interesting.

One of the things that always depresses me is we fly around the world and we don't meet enough with civil society activists from the different countries and regions that we're in. And it's something I would like to change; going forward I would like NCUC's Constituency Day to always have a chunk devoted to meeting with local folks.

And so this was a great first step and I really enjoyed and got a lot out of the conversation from hearing from African colleagues. So I want to thank Anriette for doing this and all of you for participating.

In a couple of minutes we will hopefully be seeing the doors open and the ATRT team walking in. The ATRT team, again, is charged under the Affirmation of Commitments, with reviewing the accountability and transparency of ICANN. They are undertaking a very comprehensive review. They're talking to all relevant actors in the ecosystem about this and they're asking some quite pressing issues.

David, are you able to post the questions on the....

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: ...easily here...

Bill Drake: But they're not on Adobe?

David Cake: Yeah, Adobe seems to be dying due to network congestion.

Bill Drake: Upload in progress. I see. Upload in progress. Okay but - well, my apologies to the people who are dialing in from abroad. We do have them on the screen. They were sent to the NCSG discuss list by Avri I think yesterday or the day before, revised questions from the ATRT.

There are 15 questions that they want to talk to us about. And I'll just highlight a few quick points by way of getting us into the mindset for this discussion. There's a few that I think are really directly relevant to us.

The first one, of course, is about the GNSO PDP process and whether it's working, which is of course the long-running debate that we've had in the GNSO Council and other places and the criticisms that we've received from the GAC and others that it's all too slow, that it doesn't work well, etcetera. That's broader than NCUC particularly.

The second question has to do with the multistakeholder model. It presumes substantive involvement from all stakeholders including those who do not have financial interests at stake. Is that being achieved effectively? That is very direct to us.

How do we engage the stakeholders who - because quite obviously the Registries, Registrars, all those folks, they don't have a lot of trouble to get people to come to ICANN meetings, to put time into ICANN processes and so on.

But to get people from advocacy groups and so on and individuals to participate who are not - who don't have financial skin in the game, as they say, is more of a challenge. And so I think this is something in particular where we might be able to offer some thoughts to the ATRT as to what are the barriers particularly from civil society's standpoint in getting involved here.

The third question has to do with the PDP working groups and whether - and public comment, sorry, and whether the public comment period process works effectively, whether people feel that the comments that are made are being brought - taken into account sufficiently within ultimate decisions. Again, this is broader than us; it goes to the whole ICANN community.

The fourth question has to do with ICANN's organization into advisory committees and support organizations and whether or not these are effective - whether the system of organization is effective, again a meta issue for the whole community.

And some of us wonder indeed as with the growth of all the new registries and so on whether or not the existing structure for organizing the GNSO, in particular, is going to remain sensible. But there's other questions implied there as well, for example, the role of the GAC as an advisory committee whether that - how that fits into the model, how effective...

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Sorry, Bill I'm just wondering - can you point to the - I'm trying to find Avri's on the list. Has there been any discussion on the list about the...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: No, nobody - she sent it just - when did she send it? Let me look, it's an NCSG members list and she sent it - oh, you know, I just had it and now...

David Cake: She sent it on the 13th.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay, I'm just wondering if there's been any discussion already...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: No, nobody responded. So it was - unfortunately in the run up to the meetings. Are we getting ATRT people? Hi.

Woman: Hi.

Bill Drake: How are you? I'm Bill.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: So, okay, we've got folks. Can - if - I'm sorry, if some folks could make space at the table for ATRT folks that join us that would be really great. And they have handy printouts of their new questions, as well, which also up on the wall, as you see.

So we were just going through those quickly and trying to identify the ones that we thought were particularly germane to us here in the NCUC. So let's get everybody seated. How many people from the ATRT do we have coming over?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Quite a few? Okay for people who are on line just give us a second for the chaos. Oh, Amr, says on the list that I sent it, not Avri. I thought Avri sent it. Maybe Avri sent it to me and I sent it to the list, I don't remember. Okay. Are you with ATRT? Are you with ATRT? No? Okay. Okay fine.

ATRT folks should all be at the table. We don't want anybody sitting in the back. There's more spaces here. Do we have others from the team here or...

Woman: They're on their way.

Bill Drake: They're on their way, okay. So while they're on their way - because I assume - know that the chair is not here so we won't start until he comes in. So I'll just continue - I was doing a quick scan on what these questions are again. So, again, I left off with the fourth.

The fifth one had to do with if we had any comments about the implementation and recommendations from the previous AOC review teams, the ATRT1, the Whois Security, Stability and Resilience. Again, this is broader one than our local concerns.

Number 6, "Do you have concerns about ICANN's overall transparency and accountability that are related specifically to your group? Again, that is of course quite direct to us. Does NCUC - does civil society experience particular issues with regard to transparency and accountability?"

The seventh is on public comment again so there are several on public comments. This one says, "Public comments appear to indicate a concern that there's not been substantive improvements in accountability and transparency since the ATRT1 report; what is our impression? Have we seen any improvement there?"

The eighth is, "Has the community had any specific issues or concerns about - with other aspects of security, stability and resilience outside of the DNS specific issue?" I'm going to guess we don't have a lot to say there but we'll see.

The ninth, "In regard to public comments how do commenters and staff/Board deal with the practice of orchestrated high volume," - I think that should be

form letters - commenting - not from letter commenting - astro-turfing, in other words. Again a broader issue about the public comment period.

The tenth, "Does the community embrace decisions made in regard to IP addresses and AS numbers?" That's an interesting question. And then we have a few more that, again, some of which I think are pretty direct to us. "How can we share ICANN's decisions are embraced or accepted? How do you - do you review the decisions? If not, why not? If you don't embrace and accept ICANN's decisions do you feel your opinion was properly understood and considered?"

The twelfth, "Is transparency sacrificed for expedience when the Board has difficult decisions to make?" I would think NCUC has some views on that particular issue given our recent experiences.

The thirteenth, "Is it clear to you that the Board has a dual role as a governance component inside the organization and as the last stop policy organ, how do you deal with that dual role?" That's an interesting existential question.

The fourteenth, "Do you believe the current Board reconsideration process is sufficient?" Again, very direct to us I would say.

And finally, the fifteenth, "Are the working methods of your group fully accountable and transparent?" I'm happy for us to address that. "If not, how can they be enhanced or improved?"

So those are the 15 revised questions that were sent the other day. And we now have sitting next to me the Chair of the ATRT, Brian Cute, who - are you all set up?

So I'm happy then to welcome the members of the ATRT2 to this meeting. And we've just been reviewing your questions briefly in advance of your

arrival. Could you introduce yourselves just real briefly, the members of the ATRT, starting at that end, Avri?

We have people abroad dialing in on the...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It's okay. I'm Avri Doria. I'm a member of the NCUC but I'm also a member of ATRT2.

Bill Drake: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond, I'm the Chair of the ALAC but I'm a member of the ATRT2.

David Conrad: I'm David Conrad with SSAC and ATRT2.

Carlos Gutierrez: Carlos Gutierrez, GAC representative from Costa Rica and ATRT2.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg with the ALAC.

Brian Cute: Brian Cute with the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Stephen Conroy: Stephen Conroy from Australia and Larry Strickland from the US.

Woman: Perhaps you can come to the table, Larry, there's...

((Crosstalk))

Man: There is a free seat here.

Woman: There is a free seat up at the table.

Brian Cute: That's a nice Australian accent, Larry.

Bill Drake: Larry believes in leading from behind so he's hiding in the back row. Okay so Brian, I turn it over to you.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks very much, Bill, and thank you for your time today. Do we have a full hour or just under?

Bill Drake: We have a half hour.

Brian Cute: Half hour - we have a half an hour. Okay so let me be quick here. The questions are here. They're in front of you. They are here to trigger discussion but don't be constrained by them. If there are other issues on your mind that we need to hear about our work that's the reason we're here is to listen.

Briefly we're going to issue draft final recommendations in the mid-October timeframe. If NCUC wants to provide some formal responses on these questions or other issues we have an email list on our Website. You're welcome to do so. Please do so by the mid-September timeframe so we can factor them in to that draft that goes out mid-October.

That draft of recommendations in mid-October will be open for public comment. There'll be another opportunity for you to provide inputs. We will provide our report to the Board by December 31 of this year.

That's the framing. We're here to listen. The floor is yours.

Bill Drake: Thank you very much, Brian. Just to point out we did provide one statement to you that was drafted by the - or the NCSG provided a statement to you of which NCUC was a participant that was drafted by Mary Wong before she became a staffer, which raised a couple of concerns specifically around the role - the growing role of the GAC.

I don't know if you have that document? Okay. And also about the reconsideration process and the recent controversy that NCUC - NCSG has had with the Board over the management of that.

So there are - I went through the list and I identified a couple questions I thought were of particular salience to us but I don't want to presume if members see some other questions that they think are a priority? Otherwise I would suggest - does anybody have any?

All right so just - I think the second one is an interesting one perhaps to raise with you, the fact that the model presumes substantive involvement from all stakeholders including those without financial interests at stake. And is that being achieved effectively?

I think it's worth putting on the table for your consideration that the difficulties that civil society has in maintaining really effective ongoing engagement in these processes.

You know, folks who have financial skin in the game have all kinds of reasons, let alone resources and energy to tracking ICANN issues. We just had a meeting before with a number of African participants who joined us from the African School of Internet Governance and also the Fellows program this morning.

And we went around and people were saying, you know, for us issues of access and other kind of big Internet issues are more priority in some ways than names and numbers.

So then convincing people that names and numbers are big issues, that they should invest a whole lot of time and energy into if they don't have the resources to actually ever come to a meeting, for example, physically, make

connections and feel the ICANN process it becomes quite difficult, I think, for us to keep people engaged.

And just saying, well we've got wonderful remote participation tools doesn't quite cut it. And so often I think NCUC and NCSG has had trouble, for example, getting people into GNSO working groups and other kinds of processes. It's hard - it's just - and this is a structural asymmetry among the players that is just, I think, configurative.

We don't have the financial support and staff support that some other parts of the ecosystem have. And so everything is very much bottom up and this presents a lot of challenges.

And I think one could argue in consequence - this is my own view - that the kinds of views that NCUC in particular tends to emphasize, freedom of expression, human rights, privacy, so on, often then don't get as much play in the process as they might otherwise simply because we are challenged.

Brian Cute: Thank you for that. And this is an area that is becoming into focus for us in a number of different ways so let me frame some of the things we've heard and get reactions.

With respect to access ICANN offers open meetings. ICANN offers remote participation. One example of things we hear. With respect to an area we're focusing on the policy development process and participation in working groups, hearing today in fact that those processes are open, that GNSO does put out calls to stakeholders and in some instances impacted parties, that that process is there.

That it's open and while not perfect and there are issues with respect to GAC participation, a process that it's there, it's open. So we need to get to the effectiveness of these processes and the effectiveness of participation.

So with that framing of the comments we're hearing can you dive a little deeper into the substance of what are the barriers of either participation in ICANN itself or in the specific processes that we're focused on?

Bill Drake: I could but I'd rather hear from some other people. Can others speak to this point? Wolfgang?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: It's been already outlined, you know, as a Non Commercial User Constituency and part of the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group we represent a special group of special interests within the multistakeholder model.

And so this is the modus in the broader sense if you start with the definition of Internet governance to civil society. Well, there are also groups representing also civil society in the (unintelligible). We feel this is a home here for representing civil society interests within the ICANN stakeholder model.

As we have discussed also in the - on Saturday and Sunday in the GNSO, we have the feeling - and it's not only the NCUC - that there's a lot of lip service to the multistakeholder model within ICANN. But if it comes to concrete policies and in particular decisions and implementation then a lot of things are disappearing.

So that means we see a gap between input and impact. So that means we give a lot of input into various policy processes. And according to main interests which are defended by these constituencies here - and this is particular issues mentioned already by Bill like freedom of expression, like privacy, like reasonable costs and excess and all this.

So while all this if we say this that say, yeah, it's wonderful, we have to take this into consideration. But if it come down to certain decisions then it disappears. We know (unintelligible) is complex. I think just to take one example, certainly the NCUC has a big concern with regard to privacy.

And we gave a lot of input into the recommendations for the Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreements. And say, you know, please be very careful how to draft the various articles.

So we know that's also an issue between the Board and the GAC. But the - our feeling was that at the end of the day a lot of the concerns which were expressed by NCUC member with regard to data protection and privacy were ignored.

So certainly we supported the Article 29 Working Party letter and said, okay, look, this is the guideline and you have to take this into consideration. We understand that this has consequences for competition amongst the various registrars so it means there was no consensus in the GNSO.

But at the end of the day we feel (was) frustrated that, you know, a number of these issues with regard to privacy and this very concrete case was watered down.

And you can go along the line, you know, with freedom of expression in new gTLD program if it comes to the exception rules and the trademark clearinghouse and so then yes we have sometimes the impression, yeah, freedom of expression is important but if it gets concrete in the freedom to select domain names then we are confronted with a lot of restrictions which finally ignore the impact that the input we give.

And I think this is a problem that means how we can advance the multistakeholder bottom up transparent process further and how to make sure that in an adequate way concerns expressed also by this group, which has no powerful corporations behind them, are incorporated in a reasonable way.

We understand that, you know, this is a complex thing and a lot of interests have to be balanced. So but sometimes we have the feeling that we are totally ignored.

Bill Drake: You know, in fact, this process started, you know, we wrote the Article 29 group soliciting their views and so on. And, you know, we thought, wow, we've got this great ally from the European Union involved with this process. And then it comes back, well, they don't really count.

You know, this is the kind of example of - in a way you're shading into the broader question of whether or not our overall concerns about accountability and transparency of decisions more than the specific challenges facing civil society and getting organized. But that's fine.

Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: A follow question for Wolfgang. You clearly said that you don't feel that - and Bill just said that you don't feel that your issues were properly addressed in these - in the negotiations and the outcomes.

My question is, is this because in the balance they simply did not win in the equation? Would that have changed, you know, if you had been better funded to attend meetings or things like that?

Is it really an issue of, you know, you lost, that's too bad. Not everyone wins in every discussion. Or is it an imbalance in the power of the organizations compared to others?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: It's not a question of funding so funding is a problem but not in this regard. It's a question of the political will. And this is related to the other issue which is a little bit strange that we - since one or two years we have the discussion on policy and implementation.

Because I think this discussion on policy and implementation would not have popped up if we have the impression that implementation follows, you know, what policy is. But we have the impression that we say, okay, policy, you know, is okay but then if it comes to issue then it's implementation. And then we disappear or, you know, from, you know, the policies which has been adopted.

And we discovered a gap, and I think it was the NCUC which started to raise this issue and say, you know, you cannot just say this implementation and then it's dis-linked from the policy so that means - and we raised the issue, you know, what is policy, what is implementation.

Probably it's a little bit of a strange question because as we also discussed it on Sunday there is a unit so - and then it's, you know, things are moving, you know, from policy directly to implementation. But because we have certain concerns that this doesn't work well so we have raised this issue. And then we have discovered that a lot of people in the ICANN community, and not only NCUC, have similar concerns.

So it's more, I think, a broad stuff question and then the concrete negotiations, you know, with the partners then the question of funding the NCUC so that they can speak louder. So that means we do not need more money for a bigger loudspeaker; so we need some more money for other things but not, you know, to be louder.

Bill Drake: I actually disagree with Wolfgang sharply on this. I think if we had more resources we could engage privacy groups on a more ongoing basis and play a more effective role in advancing these things. We're operating on shoestrings and very hard to keep people engaged and so on. But that's just a difference of view.

There are several other people here who have views. Yes, Brian.

Brian Cute: Just want - yeah, if you don't mind I just want to follow this a little bit more and come around. What I'd like to understand is so on the one hand I heard Wolfgang saying that some of the positions put forward by NCUC are ignored in the outcome.

And, Bill, you used the example of having gotten the attention of the Article 29 Working Group that at the end their position or inputs didn't matter. An outcome of ATRT1 that I think was positive was the Board in drafting its resolutions providing broader and clearer rationale as to why it made its decisions.

The arguments that influenced its outcome, those that it identified or disagreed with for a particular reason. Those examples that you use, inputs ignored, Article 29 Working Group's view doesn't count. In the Board decisions that you're thinking about did the Board articulate the reasons why the positions that were put forward were considered and dispatched at the end of their process?

That's what's helpful to us. I mean, we need to deal on facts. We need to be able to point to something that shows that the Board is not showing that it's deliberating and considering those opinions on some level. So do you have any concrete input on that?

Bill Drake: I'd like to turn the Joy. But while I look for the email that I just received on this very precise point. Joy, what did you...

Joy Liddicoat: Sure, I mean, I just wanted to pick up a couple of - a couple of threads. I mean, I think from a civil society perspective there are some structural issues, I think, with how the effectiveness of input can run.

And partly that's because of civil society's relationship with its governments in its own countries so that, you know, for example, in relation to this particular issue national civil society groups, you know, talking to their GAC

representatives about inputs into the Registrar Accreditation Agreement saying, you know, we are concerned about data privacy protections and how this aligns with our own national law attempting to generate that interest understanding that the RAA negotiations are actually happening in private.

And then seeing those negotiations bubble up into public spaces such as the, you know, the discussions that happened during the ICANN meetings. And the desire to then raise those issues with civil society to registrars saying, actually, you know, we like what you're doing in terms of resisting requests from law enforcement that are coming from our governments but we're not quite sure how to give support or input or strengthen those negotiations.

And I think that's partly a structural issue; I think it's partly the nature of both processes. But it's also difficult for civil society groups when governments are saying, well, you know, we're elected governments, our role is to speak for civil society as well.

So some of it has to do with our own processes and we want to raise some of those issues with GAC who may come to join us later this morning. But I do think it's - so beyond the issue of just did we win, a certain policy discussion or a negotiation, it's also structurally what are the effective levers for our input across the span of processes and inputs. And I think that it is an open issue. Thanks.

Bill Drake: I was just looking at this article that came from Kevin Murphy on this very point. And the response was actually (unintelligible) ICANN President Cyrus Namazi said, "We expect that the Article 29 letter is from an authority but it's not a legal authority." That's our interpretation. Boom. So you get a response from a staff person that says we don't accept it. And then what do you do?

So some of our members are saying well, look, how do we raise this in a legal or other manner with ICANN then because we don't agree with that

interpretation of the status of Article 29. But, I mean, the dialogue doesn't go in very effective manner when you get a result back in that.

You wanted to say something before, I'm sorry.

Carlos Gutierrez: No, I was not aware that we have only 30 minutes so I'd rather here from you. I have another question for Wolfgang but I will put it afterwards.

David Cake: Could I just please ask for people on the remote access can everyone introduce - everyone who hasn't spoken at least introduce themselves when they do. Say your name.

Mark Perkel: Yeah, my name is Mark Perkel. One of the things that occurred to me that maybe one of the problems is - has to do with traditional, cultural structures that are changing in the evolution of the Internet.

We're used to thinking of the players at the world table as being governments and that the people are a subset of the government that they're a member of. And the Internet has created a new world community that never existed before the Internet because of the Internet technology.

And that that world community is unstructured. You know, as compared to governments that send an official representative, you know, we're not the elected official representatives of the world community.

So there's a new paradigm that's happening and we're the new paradigm. And I think that culturally organizations don't know how to listen to us and that we need to have some type of essentially affirmative action of some sort to encourage, you know, the voice of the people, which is a new voice to be heard directly by organizations at the same level as governments.

Because I think the governmental paradigm over the next 100 years may be going away in favor of a world paradigm and that since ICANN is an Internet

organization that it should, you know, look to the future and see that as a new paradigm and restructure itself to hear us.

Bill Drake: Thanks, Mark. Thank you, Mark. I just wanted to draw your attention consistent with the line of questioning you were asking before to the letter - the NCSG letter that Mary had sent or that Mary crafted for us and that we sent.

So there was the discussion of the trademark clearinghouse plus 50 and the way that was handled. And so if you want to ask about how we feel about how the responses to us are and whether or not we get a clear explanation and justification of a decision that was made this would give you a pretty good indication that the responses we get don't quite satisfy.

And I think this was recognized by many people who were involved in the GNSO Council and the broader community.

Okay and David has something to add.

David Cake: Yeah. Just that the whole trademark plus 50 issue, I mean, it really sort of gone well beyond, you know, the specifics of the original issue, which was just one particular relatively minor policy point originally.

But we've progressed this as far as we've got and we've just got nothing. You know, this was a - GNSO advice was clearly ignored. They're trying to remedy that with a GNSO motion. We put forward a request for reconsideration.

And the request for reconsideration, I mean, I think everyone, given that the original rationale for that request has not been withdrawn because it was just - went so far and was so extreme that, you know, and not just us that were unhappy about it but a lot of people that originally had no interest in the

original issue that felt the rationale in the request for reconsideration was so extreme that it - in word sort of threatened the entire multistakeholder model.

And we're very (unintelligible) the fact that that rationale went through, which shows how the request for reconsideration works, which is that it - we didn't get any sense there was a genuine sort of attempt to assess the issue. In fact, instead we got the request for reconsideration clearly had been - it looked as if, you know, outside counsel had been told please write a very strong legal letter telling them why they're wrong.

And that rationale went so far as to say, among other things, that the - there's no reason any - that the Board had to - or ICANN had to listen to the GNSO Council unless it was the result of a formal PDP, which has now been sort of backed away from.

They also said there was no reason that we had to - that the comments of the, you know, ICANN CEO even when he was testifying to Congress did not constitute something that we had to pay attention - it was just mere off the cuff remarks that (unintelligible) actually indicated, you know, what ICANN policy was.

And there are many other quite outrageous things. And it really came through that this request for reconsideration had just been said, look, could you just write as many reasons why we don't need to listen to them as possible.

And the - it also - we've looked into it and found that, you know, people have looked into it since and found that requests for reconsideration pretty much always fail. It's the only mechanism we have for sort of demanding a reconsideration of a lot of ICANN decisions. Any ICANN decision that sort of doesn't come through isn't acknowledged to be part of a formal process, you know, really the request for reconsideration is all you've got.

And before you start the mechanisms after that you very quickly start getting into the point where, you know, you need to get lawyers and it becomes potentially quite expensive. So this one mechanism we have and it's terrible. It just doesn't work at the moment.

And our experience this time around was it actually was so bad that it got the entire GNSO community - well most of it - the majority of the GNSO community kind of up in arms against it and demanding that they withdraw it, which is being done. But, I mean, the fact that was even allowed to happen, that it got to that stage indicates there is a terrible problem there with that mechanism.

So we are objecting at the strongest sort of possible terms to how that request for reconsideration went and think that it shows that that mechanism is fatally flawed and, you know, it's all we really have and it's fatally flawed. So that's pretty much it.

I mean, we will be proceeding with the process as far as - for a little bit further, I think, but we're not really very hopeful of changing the original decision at this point. But we certainly are - think that this has highlighted a very big issue that needs to be remedied. And the ATRT is definitely - I think, you know, it's very appropriate place to deal with the request for reconsideration mechanism itself.

We'll also, I mean, we're trying to do deal with that other ways by - other aspects of that advice by a counsel. But, yeah.

Bill Drake: Yes. We have some other guests who have just arrived but probably the consensus is for a couple of minutes, the vice chairs of the GAC. So we could - (unintelligible) but also if there's anything you really wondered from our side, if you have a priority question or two, Brian, that we can hit quickly?

Alan Greenberg: David, the - when the issue of changing the reconsideration to not just reviewing whether policy was followed but substantive review was brought up with the Board their concern is that if you create such a mechanism then you're opening the flood gates to anyone who doesn't get their way in any answer goes to the Board.

And that puts the Board in a position of judging substance, which they may or may not be experts on, how do you do this in such a way that we do have a way to reconsider bad decisions and occasionally there will be decisions that are just wrong but without causing the flood gates and without causing a problem of an unending stream of these things.

If you have any suggestions as to how one could word this to make it useable in the kind of case you're talking about but not cause a huge problem as a result we would welcome any input.

Brian Cute: Thank you. And, lastly for me, as I said, if you have documentation with respect to this reconsideration request, with respect to inputs in rationales, that's what's useful to us. We have to make fact-based assessments here.

Again, our process is, as I said, if you can get inputs to us by mid September so that we can factor those into our initial final recommendations or drafts that go out mid-October that would be great and there'll be one more opportunity for public comment there.

We're running an open process. We'll welcome your inputs at any time.

Bill Drake: Okay. And may I ask you - if I could just ask one closing question to you? Your Question 15 about are the working methodologies of your group fully accountable and transparent? We've, I think, made a lot of progress ourselves recently in moving further in this direction.

I think we are quite transparent. We're using publicly archived ListServes for our discussion and so on and so forth, our Website is - we've just launched a new Website that members have built and we're going to be putting all of our policy statements and other kinds of stuff there. So we're trying to really get our information out there.

One concern I have - and I don't know whether it's something you guys look at - is whether there's a consistent level of transparency across stakeholder group, constituencies, parts of the ecosystem. Because I know that there are - and whether there shouldn't be.

Because I know that there are some constituencies that, for example, they don't - you can't read their ListServes. You can't find, on their Website, any documentation of how they arrived at their positions.

And I, you know, we don't want to get too far, maybe, into micromanaging all the parts of the ecosystem. But one would think that there ought to be some base level of standards that the community adheres to, I would think. And I don't know if that's something you guys are really trying to push on or not.

Brian Cate: A couple of thoughts. We are - we're operating our process as default open unless there's a need to go Chatham House Rule. That's how we're operating. We are asking this question of every group and looking for feedback.

We met with the SSAC, for example, and part of their response was because of the nature of the some of their discussions, which could, if misinterpreted in the public, raise real serious questions about the stability of the Internet unnecessarily so they have reasons why they've operated the way they have.

But we are asking this question of everybody. We're operating as default open unless a need. You know, we have a view on that. And thank you for the inputs and that'll be reflected in our report as well.

Bill Drake: I'm sorry that we had such a rushed time but when we were trying to organize this with staff it got complicated with your schedule and ours and half hour was what we were able to do. But we will follow up in writing with you as much as we can. And we really appreciate your time in coming over to meet with us.

Brian Cute: Thanks.

Bill Drake: Okay? Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Right, understood.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: All right, everybody. We have a half hour left. If we could - if we could reconvene and stop chatting fairly soon (unintelligible) sitting right next to me, that's - be welcome. Yabba dabba do.

Okay, seriously, could you be helpful? Okay so, folks, if we could reconvene. We have finally two visitors who I'm very pleased to welcome because we have actually never had any kind of structured discussion between NCUC and the GAC or any members of the GAC, which I think is a bit unfortunate and something that would be worth changing.

And to that end I bugged a couple of GAC vice chairs, illustrious GAC vice chairs, to come over and spend at least a half hour with us as a starting point to establish a relationship which hopefully we can build on going forward. And so I should have spread rose petals in front of their seats in order to welcome them properly but I failed.

But anyway nevertheless we have with us Thomas Schneider from the government of Switzerland and Peter Nettlefold from the government of Australia, both vice chairs.

And of the thought here was that we could take a few moments to share some concerns that we have about the current trends and developments with regard to the GAC and its role in the ICANN ecosystem with respect to the kind of issues we care about.

And conversely to hear from them what their take is on the current state of play on particular - people are very concerned about some of the stuff that's come out of the Beijing communiqué and your involvement.

And unfortunately we have not been able to track what's been going on with you in this meeting because we're all locked in our silos. So we've been in the GNSO field box for the past few days and I, at least, am not up to speed on the current thrust of your discussions.

So I thought - would you care to start with a little bit of a where we are right now in terms of the big ticket issues?

Thomas Schneider: First of all, thank you for asking for this opportunity to meet. As you know, we also have the silo problems that our tasks normally - and especially last time in Beijing was so big that we worked two days more and nights and so on and so forth so that we didn't really have the time to meet as much as necessary with others. So we're very happy to have this exchange.

With regard to what happens to the GAC advice (system), with regard to this list, this very famous and very much loved list of - indicative list of strings that we consider sensitive.

We have about tripled the list now in the GAC meetings of Saturday and Sunday so there will be a new list coming up which is about three times as long. No, this is a joke, of course.

No we have been having an internal discussion about how to proceed and the discussion with the gTLD program committee on how to help them make this advice better understood because we didn't really have the time - it came out very late in Beijing.

We didn't really have the time to explain in detail what brought us to this advice and there is a need for explanation because not everybody apparently seems to understand why and what we meant with this and also - it's also true for the Board committee.

And we are looking for ways now in how to cooperate with the Board in finding solutions for this noting, however, that the responsibility in implementing this doesn't lie with the GAC because we are advisory committee but with the Board but we will do our best to help this.

And we are currently discussing the 14 stings that were kind of postponed to this meeting because there was no time to - not enough time in Beijing. And there's a number of other issues that we are still discussing. But the main goal is basically to understand what the problems and the misunderstandings -potentially misunderstandings are and to help engage with others to solve these problems in a way that is satisfactory for all.

Peter Nettlefold: Bill, just quickly to say hello to everyone and thank you for inviting us. It's a very welcome development. And I expect long overdue so thank you for initiating it and sorry we didn't.

But I think hopefully coming out of the Beijing meeting and this meeting we will hopefully have a little bit more time free in our agendas so I think it would be a useful initiative to discuss.

And, I mean, I'm very mindful of the - and we were just talking on the way here of the whole silo issue which we face and that we often meet amongst ourselves and then certainly from the GAC's point of view we will find an hour on the agenda when there are issues to discuss with other constituencies.

But, I mean, to be honest it's not really enough. And I think we should try to work on some ways where we can find more time particularly on issues where we have shared interests. I think it's - and there are plenty of those around. So, yeah.

Bill Drake:

Peter, I just wonder - I'm going to see if any colleagues have questions. My sense from talking with Thomas, who I know quite well from being in Geneva, and others, is I have the sense that in the GAC there is not a really high level of awareness even of the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group and its component constituencies and what their interests and positions are.

When I do manage to get to GAC meetings and I hear any GAC members refer to civil society they always refer to ALAC and At Large. And I sometimes wonder if they even know that we're here when we have 300 members, including 90 organizations and 210 individual members, and we have a much stronger civil liberties, orientation, human rights privacy, freedom of expression, etcetera, than some of the other parts of the ecosystem.

And I just had this general sense that like we're not on the radar. And so that also translates into whether or not our issues are properly being taken on board. And when we look at something like what's happened with the RAA and so on we really wonder about this. And we see through the GAC much more engagement around LEA issues and so on.

And so this is general kind of configurative concern. And then there's specific kinds of points.

((Crosstalk))

Peter Nettlefold: Okay, yeah, yeah. Okay, we'll keep fighting about it at the mic. Yeah, that's a good question and I obviously can't answer for everyone because the GAC is made up of many countries just like the NCUC. All the constituencies are going to be made up of different people but certainly many GAC members are aware of the various constituencies within the GNSO and so forth and so on.

I still occasionally grapple with exactly how the GNSO works. But I'm certainly aware that it's broken up into houses and constituencies and so on. And I'm certainly aware of your existence.

And but that said others may not be and particularly newer members. And, you know, to mention the ALAC I'm probably still unaware, to be perfectly honest, about how the - I mean, there's an obvious distinction in that the ALAC is an advisory committee and yourselves part of the GNSO structure and so on.

But I don't know whether that means that you share members, so that you're a member of both or that there are different representational structures and the issues in each group are entirely different or are shared and whether you coordinate extremely closely with the ALAC, those sorts of things I guess I know far less about.

You know, periodically it does appear that the ALAC - there are different voices coming out from the two groups. So, you know, how that works, to be honest, I'm not sure. I know the two groups are there. I do see comments and I understand, you know, that there are different viewpoints and so on. But how it works in practice I can say I really don't know. So perhaps it would be useful to discuss.

Bill Drake: Sure. Many of us would give you a take on that one. Thomas, before we do?

Thomas Schneider: Thank you. Just a quick point to add to that. First of all government members are normally one, maximum two persons. They come from one ministry. They do not necessarily have the overview and the competence of the whole range of government activities. They try to consult in areas where they are not - so there are no consumer protection representatives in the GAC, for instance.

Most of them come from telecom ministries or foreign ministries or regulatory bodies and so on and so forth so this is one issue. And of course, as human beings as they are, many of them take those issues from the national level and board of those who have the strongest lobbies and that shout most.

So if some industries or some interest groups have more weight at the national level they have more pressure to represent these interests compared to others. This is how politics works.

So you have an interest in making and getting contact to your national GAC representative to make sure that noncommercial interests are aware - in the awareness range of the representative of your GAC representative because that's his job. But you have to also work on him to raise that awareness, that's one thing.

And the other thing is what Peter said, as we spent most of the time in our GAC room working, doing our job, we don't have the time to often to go to ALAC meetings or to - I've never been into a GNSO meeting. But what we hear from the outside, from different spaces, to put it like that there are some tensions between at least that's the way here was probably even more people might think that I am.

I would dare to say there are some tensions between ALAC and the NCUC. And it would, of course, be of the benefit of the whole system if the cooperation was more intense between these two and more reinforcing and if

structural and other differences would have less weight than they, at least, sometimes for an outsider seem to have.

So we can only encourage you to organize yourselves together and be stronger. Thank you.

Bill Drake: We do have (unintelligible) members and there are a lot of people reactive on both sides including me. And they do play different roles, AC, SO, etcetera, etcetera. We have individual members, ALAC doesn't, etcetera.

But in terms of just the policy orientation, I mean, I think it's not unreasonable to say that ALAC has tended towards more a consumer protection - as they see it a consumer protection orientation. We have tended towards more of a (unintelligible).

So where, for example, you take something like Whois, we're much stronger on privacy aspect where they're closer the position of the LEAs and the intellectual property interests, that's just one example.

So - but we interact with them extensively. We try to find common ground. We meet with them at every meeting. We - where we're able to adopt common positions and things we do. There are just certain areas where we're - we have a bit different orientation. Things like that.

But let's go to - see if we have some comments from other colleagues. Everybody's tired, we've been here since 9:00 in the morning and we had - before a very robust discussion with a large group of African colleagues who are mostly now gone. But despite burnout let's - Wolfgang, please.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Okay let me just make first a comment to the issue which was just discussed and then to raise another issue. The first thing is I think we are aware in the NCUC that for the outside world also for the outside ICANN world, there is a confusion about representation of civil society within ICANN.

And, you know, this has historical reasons. We discussed it several times. And I personally think it's - time is right to intensify the communication among the two groups and to find a way that we can speak better to the outside world.

And so far, you know, from the internal world of the constituency and ICANN GAC is a little bit the outside world. That we can speak better with one voice. So I just want to let you know that we have, on Wednesday, a joint round table with NCUC and At Large.

And where we want to discuss in the (earlier) the idea to have on top of the various civil society groups in ICANN because probably we will see more constituencies coming which are - have a relevance to civil society like new gTLD groups which are just community-based and also claim that they represent civil societies.

So - and so that we can build something like a civil society sector within ICANN, a coordination committee, which then could, you know, I would not say harmonize because as Bill has outlined we have different priorities and sometimes of different stakeholders - but would at least for strategic issues create a mechanism so that we can speak with one voice. This would be a big achievement.

The challenge is - or the timeline is that we have this At Large summit in London in June next year which is a summit, let's say of the Internet users, civil society's Internet summit or it's called At Large because it gets its history from the At Large movement. But it should go far beyond the At Large Advisory Committee.

Probably this could be one of the key issues discussed in London so that means just to give you the signal that we understand this so it's not easy because different interests, different historical packages are also in the two

groups but there is an understanding and we understand that it's in the interest of ourselves and also in the communication with other stakeholders and the implementation of the multistakeholder model.

You know, time is right to do something in this direction. And the implementation of the multistakeholder model, this brings me to my second point, which goes directly to the GAC.

What I have seen is, in the last couple of years is that again and again and again GAC members argue in joint meetings with the Board and other constituencies, governments work different. So that means we have a different mechanism and methodology. We have to call to capital if it's - gets complicated or have to talk with my minister or something like that.

And personally I think this is partly a barrier for full implementation of the multistakeholder model. And this leads to the question of early engagement. But it means the issue which was discussed over in the joint GNSO Council GAC meeting is how we can really move forward with the early engagement.

You made us promises in the Toronto communiqué. So, but I understand it's difficult, you know, because there are so many governments and not one government can speak on behalf of all. If they join the working groups - so it's complicated.

But the whole multistakeholder model is complicated. And we have to be innovative to find ways to guarantee this. I think the reality is that if a policy is developed over various stages and comes then to a decision and then comes the GAC advice it's really too late. Then we have a confrontational situation which is very distractive for all sides.

It's not good for the government, it's not good for the nongovernmental constituencies at ICANN. The only way to avoid this is early engagement. I

think the question with Red Cross and Olympic Committee is a very good example.

You gave the advice before a policy was developed and now we have the dilemma that we have two or three parallel processes which could lead to another set of conflicts. So I think the US government is very clear in saying the advice and you have to do this.

So, but, you know, there are still open issues. And in so far, you know, the question is - or my appeal to the governments is really to consider early engagement and to come with creative solutions so the partners are there, you just have to jump into the boat.

Peter Nettlefold: Thank you. I agree, it is complicated. And it is something we've been turning our minds to but likewise ideas would be welcome. It's interesting that you use, as your example for the GAC getting involved early, an example where we did get involved early, which has caused problems apparently.

So an interesting tension there. And I think one of the things that we've started to work out with the BGRO Working Group and we were talking is that potentially the question of the GAC getting involved earlier, it's getting involved effectively.

You know, if we get involved early and we make principles or give advice it may not be entirely welcome all the time. So one of the things we've started talking about is input, something that doesn't trigger bylaws or (unintelligible) or something. And then we've, I guess, got to figure out if the GAC starts giving input what does that mean.

It is complicated. You know, we had a little experiment a while back with the ccNSO where we were developing some principles and they said, "Please don't do that." It's going to be, you know, be a, you know, a big rock in the middle of the stream kind of thing so we called them interim principles, I

believe, was the solution we came up with while the protest was going on. I actually can't remember what they ended up turning into but...

((Crosstalk))

Peter Nettlefold: Yeah, something. But it is difficult. I mean, and I genuinely think early, you know, early is good obviously but it's not the complete solution. You know, you probably want to be wary about us getting involved too early as the GAC in a very formal (chance), if you don't want to like invite us, you know, we need to start talking about input and if that's possible and how we can do it, what it means.

And if we give you input what do you do with it? And we probably need to start having a really sort of, I think, open discussion about how this could work. I mean, one thing we were just talking about is, you know, potentially having thematic meetings to give us all little filios we all agree that each ICANN meeting is one issue that across everyone and we all have a big meeting together.

That was virtually just five minutes ago but...

Bill Drake: It's not something that broke the silos down and have led to focused discussions on some topics I think would be actually really good. And we have a couple of people who have questions but, Thomas.

Thomas Schneider: I'll be very short. Just to agree with Peter and just to tell you that for quite some time there is the need, also, there is the agreement that GAC structure also needs to reform because it's growing and there's some deficiencies that have been growing with the growing of the GAC.

But in the past two, three years with all the new gTLD business especially there was just simply no time to work on the operating principles and other things despite a little bit of work with the ATRT recommendations. But we

know that also we should reform the GAC the same - in much bigger ways for the GNSO but also the GAC as it's growing, as the tasks are growing and everything is growing and we don't have more time because we already have - use a lot of government times three times a week a year is a lot for our governments to afford.

So there is room for improvement. And we hope that now things get into a little bit calmer water so that we have more time internally to discuss our working methods. Thanks.

Bill Drake: Thanks. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria. I wanted to sort of address the issue again of early participation. First of all I was almost amused - and, for give me, I may not be being as polite as I should be - by the notion of we gave you early advice and you weren't happy on the IGO.

The early advice - and GAC advice is generally a mere veto. It's the expectation of the Board doing what the GAC has said. Certainly from our perspective it goes way over our head and it's a veto that we essentially have no part in.

And what came with that advice is, what? We gave you advice and now you're doing a PDP? Why? And let me continue. And then I'm sure you'll have a rebuff for it.

I wanted to actually - you say offer a practical. I think when we say GAC and governments should be more involved and should be involved earlier I think we mean as contributors.

Most of the work gets done by these working groups in biweekly phone calls. Now it doesn't even have to necessarily be the GAC members that participate in terms of working groups, it isn't only the GNSO Council that participates, it

isn't only the chairs of the various constituencies and stakeholder groups, it's all sorts of people.

I am sure that in all of your governments you have people that are competent at particular subjects, at particular topics that are of interest to ICANN, that are of interest to those - to your governments and to the GAC in general.

And to basically have them participating like the rest of us in the week to week discussions of the various issues coming to understand each other's perspectives, coming to the point of making consensus is a place to start.

But that requires more sort of investment from your governments in the ICANN process and sort of saying more than just my time as a GAC member I'm also going to give you two, three hours of person x from my staff to participate in a working group and etcetera.

So I think there are ways of sort of saying, you know, we don't need GAC as a monolith to exist to participate early in everything but we need the government perspectives, the government knowledgeable, the government experts to participate with the rest of the experts to get to a point where we've got something to do consensus with. Thanks.

Bill Drake: Do you - should we take another question and then you can - you want to be real specific?

Thomas Schneider: You're running open doors. The problem is for - in our case we had a regulator and like the Foreign Ministry on Telecom and Information Society and just for us to have the competent people we have been making phone calls, emails, for months and almost years to the Data Protection Office, to the IP people in the government, to the consumer protection offices, trying to tell them hey, there's something like new gTLDs coming up. Ah, what is new gTLDs?

So, I mean, we would also need you to (unintelligible) again in your country via political pressure or whatever the respective competent people because the law enforcement agencies they come but the data protection agencies they don't come which also creates a kind of imbalance sometimes.

We need backup because all the - with all the saving grounds that all governments have they're all under-staffed and overworked; I don't say that they're always efficient but that's another part of the reality. So we need public awareness that is brought to the data protection people that they should start caring about TLDs and Whois things and so on and so forth.

Because even for us to get expertise and support is sometimes extremely difficult and sometimes just not possible because they say, sorry, no time. Next one, that's it.

Bill Drake: So that certainly pricks the balloon in any belief of all powerful governments. Maybe not, I don't know. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: So just I'm going to start from experience that we have for the support of (unintelligible). So it's good that we had support of the GAC at the end to support the recommendation of the report and so on. But as the co chair of that working group at that time it was really hard to contact some GAC member to involve them in the working group.

So I think that may overlap with Avri's comment about to be involved within the working group. We understand it's hard to attend conference call and so on but at least even to be on the mailing list, to see what discussion is ongoing there and to participate somehow.

So also when you say that I should contact my GAC representative the funny thing the GAC representative for Tunisia is at the same university - out of the same university and the same for (unintelligible).

But I'm not sure how to contact so it's, you know, every time it's like in the IGO, you should talk to your representatives, not that easy. I have more contact with the representative of the - from Japan than the representative from Tunisia.

So it's - so how you create - I'm not sure how the GAC as a group you can facilitate it's not just asking us to go to our representative in - via country basis.

Bill Drake: Are there - I think we're - I was going to say probably reaching - oh okay good. Joy or David, okay, David. And then you have one too? Okay.

David Cake: I mean, I just wanted to - I just wanted to take the opportunity while I've got sort of - the whole Red Cross whatever, you know, saga, has demonstrated I think a lot of the - almost all of the different frustrations we have with the GAC have sort of come up in that long messy process.

And to be, I mean, to be - and the first one, rather, I mean, to be really, really sort of candid and blunt I think the GAC has to some - has to admit that sometimes its advice is actually not very good advice and that we don't follow it because it's not correct.

And that - and I was thinking in particular, I mean, we sort of got this initial advice on the whole thing, you have to do this because of the Geneva Convention and the Treaty of Nairobi and we sort of read the treaty of Nairobi and went, that's not what it says at all.

And, you know, there was a straight out just disconnect why the advice we got from the GAC doesn't appear accurate. And that is very frustrating. But we also - there are other, I mean, we've also had the issue where I've had GAC members sort of telling me about oh, I can't believe that the - then we had the issue of the GNSO is instituting a PDP, how - why are they doing that when we've already got, you know, got advice.

And part of the issue and frustration there is just the simple lack of understanding that what the GNSO does when it creates policy is a lot more - is a lot more than what the GAC does. I mean, it's differing roles, right? We don't - there is a absolutely a case where the GNSO could go this GAC advice is fantastic, everything in it is correct.

Now we need to initiate a PDP to turn that into what we think of as policy, which is, you know, nitty-gritty detailed stuff, operational stuff. So that sort of incident where we sort of, you know, the GAC sort of strongly told the Council why are you doing this it just seemed to be there was a real disconnect and the GAC understanding of what policy - a GAC and the GNSO respective ideas of what policy was and what that process was.

And then we got another frustration where I've sort of - I've had, you know, GAC members not officially but unofficially sort of expressing their frustration about why are they having this PDP, you know, why - I don't want to have a GNSO working group telling me what my treaty obligations are.

And it's like what the GNSO working group - which I'm not, I stress so I'm maybe putting words in their mouth, but I'm pretty sure that what they would absolutely love for the GAC to come and tell that here are our treaty obligations, this is a hard discussion, you know, to - so that's sort of early information wouldn't be exactly what they wanted.

So the fact that there was no mechanism to provide it was very frustrating and that both sides seemed to be angry at the lack of that - or frustrated by the lack of that mechanism just indicates that there is, I mean, there's a working - that is a working issue but it's genuine real frustration in dealing with the GAC it's like please, provide us a way to tell us this stuff in the process so we are really clear.

We don't want you to make policy decisions, we want - necessarily I understand the limitations of the GAC cannot, you know, have to go back and get a government position and can't participate in a working group in the similar way.

But things like please tell us what your, you know, your treaty obligations are so we can absolutely not step on those would be fantastic thing to hear. And (unintelligible) mechanism for that. So sorry to have just unloaded a bunch of stuff on you but I just thought it was illustrative.

I mean, I thought these are the real experience of the GAC from sort of outside is often there are frustrations with its process that are not - that are very real and that don't in any way indicate a desire not to agree with what the GAC says or implement GAC policy. Yes.

Bill Drake: We're going to lose the remote participation probably because it's - we've reached 12:30. But we'll just take one or two more and then we'll let everybody go eat their lunch. The last one now or - okay, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Peter Nettlefold: Thank you. And it's actually good to hear. You know, as we've already said this is the first time we've chatted as groups and it's not even really the whole GAC. But it is useful to hear.

We hear from other groups when they don't like things that we do. And it's good feedback. I mean, we've - just at this meeting we've heard from the ATRT2, we've heard from - they've passed on some criticisms, they didn't like the closed door meetings in Beijing. We've heard that loud and clear.

And other things as well, there's been questions don't the GAC have a code of conduct? Why not? We're taking that sort of stuff on board. So I think, you know, we need more of this. It's - the fact that there is clearly a frustration

which has reached a relatively high level means that we need to be talking more often so that we - it doesn't occur like this.

And I hope that we can continue this dialogue and get to know each better and avoid these sorts of situations.

Bill Drake: I really appreciate the spirit of that, Peter. Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks. Just a few points. Firstly I think as a former - as a former government official in a previous life I do understand that governments do talk in code. And I think that, you know, not in any way to denigrate the - or disagree with the views that have been expressed by people about aspects of GAC communiqués I also was quite happy with aspects of what I didn't see in GAC communiqués occasionally particularly the one out of Beijing. I think there was some conspicuous absences indicating support for some of the positions that NCUC's taken.

So I just wanted to sort of make that clear in terms of understand the code and understanding how you reflect your decisions as governments amongst each other. It's different from how other groups and other stakeholders will.

So the other thing - or just to pick on your point, Thomas, about this thing about how we engage with GAC members, this is something that I've - and APC members have struggled with a bit in terms of our work around human rights and the Internet and (unintelligible) being in Geneva and talking with Geneva (unintelligible) about online freedom of expression, resolutions, by the Council and then raising that with GAC members here some of whom, perhaps, Thomas being the exception, would be aware of it and others who are going my government has taken a position, I didn't know that.

And, you know, not wanting to put government members here on the spot but thinking, okay, what is the mechanism then for those of who work across the ecosystem to support those anchor points.

One of them, as a practical suggestion, are the national IGFs, you know, and I think having specific sessions in national IGFs that focus on the GAC members' participation, civil society groups who are present and fostering that, you know, is one way.

Apart from that, you know, it's difficult as civil society groups know, who do we contact in government. So I think that would be interesting - or maybe we could actually talk about that more and share experiences about that more because I imagine also sometimes occasionally there's a bit of GAC frustration if they do want the civil society input - nationally who do they talk to. And we should open a door to that with GAC members here particularly from developing - and developing country perspectives.

The other thing I had was just a very specific question on the working group and enhanced cooperation. The (CSTD) working group that's going on and there are GAC members on it and there are a number of NCUC members - I think there's four NCUC members to - three of whom are actually here in this room at the moment.

And I'm just wondering is there any GAC discussion going on about that process? I don't want to put you on the spot in terms of detail but I'm thinking is there any space in the round of these meetings that would be useful to open up in terms of discussion about that work?

Thomas Schneider: With regard to the (CSTD), I don't know, normally there's an IGF - used to be an IGF outreach session sometime during an ICANN meeting but that was usually on a Monday. I don't know at this time but I don't know whether something is planned here.

But people like (Mark Over) from the UK and me and those who are also participating in these environments we normally try to also raise the

awareness of the Board and of the whole community that there is the UN that is also discussing this in several fora so we try to do our best.

If you give me one more minute I will just - I think I hear that the IGO thing is still an issue from all over. Just to maybe use one minute for an understanding of our situation. I think there's reasonable and legitimate frustration on both sides because we have the problem that my country, Switzerland, we are not the poorest country in the world but we are a rather small country. We are - I don't know what the percentage of the population of the world - our country is probably zero point something percent.

We pay 5% of the budget of the UN. We are a large country due to the ITU, to UNESCO to all these institutions whether you like one better or less. The contracts - there are legal contracts that make us members of them.

And our taxpayers who pay these hundreds of millions of money to these institutions expect of us that we, within these institutions, try and force them to be - use the money effectively but also to protect them that they don't have to engage in cost effective exercises that basically have nothing to do with their work.

So this is why we are obliged as governments to defend the IGOs in a way that they don't incur costs that could be avoided; that is basically the political and whether it's now the Article (6) of Convention A or B, that is - I'm not a lawyer, as a person we don't really care.

But then in terms of common sense we have our role is to help enforce these institutions to be efficient and use the money that taxpayers all around the world give them to actually do what they're supposed to do.

And with regard to involvement in the process I think there's already quite early - I don't know whether it's the GAC principles of 2007, whether it was,

say, something like IGOs should be protected, that was in a very general level of course.

And the problem of misunderstanding for us is now that we finally, after long debates, have - see the light here at the end of the tunnel in terms of a process with these list of IGO names and acronyms with the discussions with the Board that we might create something like a copy of the clearinghouse to notify IGOs and they are willing to renounce on having a veto.

But having a notification and then maybe dispute resolution procedure process, now that this is basically in front of us we don't really understand why something from a completely - but it's not - we didn't really understand the Board's position to induce a PDP although I have to say I'm not too familiar with how this processes work because I didn't.

But we are thinking that at least in terms of strategy we are about to resolve that problem and would just like to implement this. If this PDP is the implementation of these discussions that we've been having then that's great. If this PDP leads to something completely different then we wouldn't really understand why we did - had the discussions in the past two years.

So just to make you understand our - or at least my personal and national view of this. Thanks.

Bill Drake: I think it's fair to say, looking around the room, that views on this particular point are variable. But I don't know if we want to take more time to go around now. I think we're 15 minutes over. And we need to be back here as NCSG in 45 minutes, right? Don't we start at 1:30?

Woman: Yes.

Bill Drake: Yes. So I think we should thank you two friends from the GAC for coming over and meeting with us and establishing a bridge and, you know, maybe

what we'll try to do - I think at the Buenos Aires we'll be much more well represented. We didn't have as many of our members come to Durban as normally but we - if we can get our act together and maybe come up with a concise set of really bounded and useful questions maybe we could have some sort of a larger discussion in Buenos Aires, the larger engagement.

I just simply think it would be good for the GAC to be more aware of the civil society part of GNSO and our distinctive approaches. So if we can pursue something like that that would be really good. But we'll see how that goes.

In any event thanks very much for coming, okay? And thank you all for participating.

Thomas Schneider: Thank you all. Hope to see you in Buenos Aires.

END