

NCUC meeting- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 26th June 2012 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.

Coordinator: Excuse me; this is the operator. This call is now being recorded.

David Cake: We are ready to start; just a few little technical glitches and things there. For those on remote participation we have rearranged the room and reorganized the microphones and things. Please everyone try to use the microphone. There's a couple of hand mikes going around if you aren't near a desk mike. And let's get started.

First thing on the agenda, my name is David Cake. I am the Interim Chair, which is to say I am acting as Chair because Constantinos had to resign in order to take up a job and eventually we'll be - one of the things on the agenda for this meeting is organizing an election which I may or may not be replaced as Chair. We haven't thought about that yet.

Okay so first thing on the agenda I would just like people to introduce themselves and just a very brief, you know, one sentence description of why they're at an NCUC meeting because there a few faces in the room that I don't recognize.

And I'll start. My name is David Cake. Besides being the Chair previously I was the Executive Committee Member for the Asia Pacific Region and I represent Electronic Frontier Australia with the NCUC.

Should we start going round clockwise, starting with Mary. Okay, we'll go the other way starting with Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer, one of the GNSO Council Representatives and I teach MONNA and run the website chillingeffect.org.

Man: (Unintelligible). Thank you.

(Sam Su): (Sam Su). I run the website techone.geek.mz.

(Ed Morris): Hi, (Ed Morris). I'm a PHD student in Cyberlar at the University of Leeds. I used to be a congressional aid and a bunch of weird stuff like that.

(Fred Logner): I'm (Fred Logner). I am a member of the Board of the TGIDF, the Mexican Committee review and a professor of university for computer science.

(China Bulay): I'm (China Bulay). I work for the China Central State Interactual from the Office.

Roy Balleste: I'm Roy Balleste from St. Thomas University School of Law in Miami, Florida. And I'm also a librarian.

(Miyola Rapoy): My name is (Miyola Rapoy) and I'm a Nikon fellow lawyer and a PHD student at NLTT. Thank you.

Brian Peck: Brian Peck, ICANN Policy Staff.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I'm Wolfgang Kleinwachter and I'm a member of the council - NCSG council.

Bill Drake: Bill Drake, University of Zurich, also the NCSG Representative on the council.

Kim Heitman: My name's Kim Heitman. I'm a lawyer from Australia. I'm a founding member of the AUDA, regulated the dot AU and a long time interested participant in the Civil Society within ICANN. Many say Kim is my secretary now currently in Australia.

Adam Freeman: I'm Adam Freeman from Oxford University Politics Department studying Internet Government.

(Maggie Pazell): I'm (Maggie Pazell) from Brazil. I'm more in the fellowship program here and I'm a member of idoctorzoo too among the other organizations that we work on internet confidence at the global level.

Joy Liddycoat: Hi, I'm Joy Liddycoat with the Association for the Griffin Communication and the GNSO counselor.

Mary Wong: Hi, I'm Mary Wong. I'm on the GNSO Council for the NCSG. I'm also a law professor and the Director of the Franklin Pierce Center for intellectual property at the University of New Hampshire.

David Cake: Is there any - and anyone on remote participation could you introduce yourself?

Horatio Cadiz: This is Horatio Cadiz from the Philippines Network Foundation, PHNF, from the Educational Network in the Philippines.

David Cake: Thank you. I quite like the way we have the microphone situation in that we have to literally pass the talking stick. Okay if there is anyone new to NCUC has any questions and wants to introduce themselves and get a better clear idea of what's going on this is probably now a good point.

Mary Wong: But I wanted to welcome particularly some of the fellows who I had the pleasure of meeting this morning and I just wanted to say David and everybody that I think they are very interested in the work of NCUC and

particularly not just what we're about but about the kind of issues that we're working on so that they can find the place that they think they can contribute most from in ICANN.

David Cake: Absolutely. Okay, and it looks like this is the point I put up the draft agenda. I would just like to say that the agenda is open to change but this is roughly what we're going to discuss outreach and internal issues to NCUC before the coffee break. And I've set it to do mostly policy discussion after the coffee break.

I know that Bill had least suggested that we should probably concentrate more on the internal issues and keep below the policy discussions of the NCSG meeting this afternoon. And we'll see how we go basically on outreach. I'm certainly willing to keep discussing outreach after the break if we have - if the discussion is going well.

Bill Drake: Thank you. Actually, no - I mean what I was trying to say was that we had the policy meeting yesterday so.

David Cake: Yes - yes.

Bill Drake: Okay a lot of the policy stuff could be dealt with then and maybe we could spend more time talking as a group about where NCUC is and where we're trying to go and how we're organizing ourselves. It might be useful David if you did say a few words for people who we knew that if they don't have background on NCUC. I mean or I can do it.

David Cake: Yes.

Bill Drake: Or Joy could do it.

(Joy Liddicoat: I just wanted to say thing. I think hearing as we talked with some of the fellows this morning about that. But I just wanted to remind of the business of

NCSG and that is there's been an announcement that the April, 2015 meeting will be in Beijing.

And I think that we should think about whether the NCUC wants to make a statement about that strictly in terms of any key message we might want to send to ICANN about the organization of that and specifically around secure online communication will be a good example of welcoming, you know, the organizing events and the toasting by the Chinese government and so on. I just wanted to signal that it would be useful I think for us to discuss that at some point today.

David Cake: Yes - yes. I think that's a good item for general business. Okay, just a few words then to. So what is NCUC? You know, ICANN structure, it operates within the GNSO which is the generic name for this organization so it discusses the main name issues that are not country codes. That is they are sort of formal really but less formal.

It's probably important to say that NCUC is one of two constituencies within the non-commercial stakeholders group. We probably think of ourselves as much the bigger brother of those two - older sibling in that we're considerably larger and we've been around a lot longer than NPOC, which an old relative newcomer.

And we would - I think NCUC would really describe ourselves as the main home within ICANN for civil society. That's sort of how we think of ourselves.

In practice the non-commercial user constituency is defined a little bit by what it isn't rather than what it is in that we're not commercial so we end up with people from a wide range of areas. We end up with people who represent civil society organizations and that's probably our main call but we also have some academics - another big strength of the NCUC. We also have some just interested activists.

We allow people to participate within NCUC as individual members. So we do have some individual activists who are just really interested and people from a wide range of other organizations.

So that's pretty much it. Is there anything anyone else wants to - Bill, do you want to add a little bit more about the nature of NCUC?

Bill Drake: I would just add that essentially it's been the organization within the GNSO environment that is not representing any particular commercial sector's interests but rather is trying to promote a conception of the public interest. On a global basis that we focus historically and strongly on freedom of expression issues, privacy issues, having intellectual property rules that are not overly restrictive of speech and so on, and that over time the focus is brought in to include other kinds of issues as well; development and other concerns from a public interest standpoint. So that's essentially where we're at.

David Cake: Yes, that's true in terms that we are not - we do not represent our commercial interest. We do not represent our interests in particular. We represent - the NCUC tries to represent the public interest. This is probably a point of distinction with the NPOC which while it's for non-commercial organizations in theory it's supposed to represent the operational concerns of those individual organizations who have specifically the global public interests of course. Non-profits generally have some public interest goal.

Okay with that's probably a good introduction to NCUC for the new people. Let's see we've just got one person who has just joined the meeting. I think Alejandro Pisanty is hiding behind the pillar.

And currently the first item on the agenda is outreach and membership. So one of the goals here is to - ICANN is an organization that affects pretty much all in some ways - pretty much all internet users. How can we outreach to make sure that more people with concerns about the main name and number

used in other ICANN activities are involved in ICANN and specifically non-commercial organizations are involved in NCUC? Would anyone like to speak first to this topic? Yes, yes; I know the brain is going off.

Bill Drake: Maybe it would be interesting to hear from some of the new folks how they see - what they know about us or how they see the possibility of participating with us or what the challenges are as they look at that ICANN space and trying to decide where to seat themselves, etcetera, etcetera. You know, don't make me - I'm looking at (Ed) in particular.

(Ed): Yes, and I could also address the outreach because I just went through the process. And one of the problems is you go to the website. The website is a little bit outdated looking.

You send your name in and you receive nothing. And you wait; eventually I wind up writing to Robin. Robin wrote back to me, "Oh, we have to have an executive meeting. We're going to do this." So you wait; you wait; you don't know what's going on. You don't know if you're being considered you don't really know the process and then eventually you get a meeting note you've been approved; you're now a member of NCSG - no mention of NCUC.

And so it sort of a process that is welcoming but when you go through it you really don't know - it's like something is going on behind closed doors; you don't really know what's going on. I think one of the things you may want to look at is redesigning the webpage and clearly explaining that for each individual member it is open for membership. This is what we are looking for and this is what's going to happen and what the process is.

Bill Drake: It should be pointed out actually I think we - now one joins NCSG first; that's the process and then you can be an NCSG member without being in either of the constituencies - either NCUC or HENPOC or you can choose.

(Ed): On the application itself when you apply currently it tells you to check both boxes and that the application is good for both. So if that's not correct, that's actually the information we're being given.

Bill Drake: No, that would be correct if you say I want to be - I want to join NCSG and I also want to join NCUC.

(Ed): Right.

Bill Drake: And that's fine.

(Ed): Okay.

Bill Drake: But I guess it doesn't make it clear that you can join NCSG when you want to join NCUC.

(Ed): No, it's actually the other way around. It's almost as if you can join NCUC and then we suggest - strongly suggest you join both.

Bill Drake: Yes.

(Ed): I believe there's words to that effect.

Bill Drake: Well, then we need to fix that don't we? The problem, of course, here is unlike ALAC which has four or five staff members helping them unlike the commercial stakeholder groups and so on where they have paid people representing them. We're all volunteers. We all have day jobs. This is just something that we're all doing on the side; so getting people who are willing to put the time in. The website in particular clearly needs much more systematic attention. The list of members I think was last updated in November, 2010. So that has to be a priority in the near term because it is our public face and portal to new people.

(Ed): Could I - I should actually give a compliment. When I'm looking at where to join and where to go in I look at ALAC as being dysfunctional. I look at this group as actually having accomplished things. So that's one of the reasons that I went in this direction.

David Cake: Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: I'm going to - Wendy Seltzer - I'm going to take a cue from one of the few things that does function in the GNSO Counsel and suggest that the person who volunteers with a problem is also volunteering to help with the solution. So if you'd like to help with redesigning the website, I'm sure that we would be thrilled to have your suggestions and input there. Thank you.

David Cake: Do we have any more comments on - does anyone else want to speak to outreach and membership issues? Yes, can we pass the mike down there?

Man: Well I have to say it's rather difficult to get into this without having some background knowledge. So I'd suggest using social media in some way to get people involved with the issues. And once you get people involved with the issues, you get them involved with NCUC and NCSG and the solutions.

David Cake: Mary?

Mary Wong: One small point that I think is not something we can discuss at this meeting but as the UGTLD process goes along I think that if we look at some of the community applications in UGTLD, if we look at some of the IBM based applications, those - and I know I've suggested this before, but the list is now out and I think that in some of those groups there may well be opportunities for outreach to potential new members.

Then as to the point of housekeeping I thank you for the feedback on the form and on the website. Those are - because everybody is a volunteer and it's not like - your comments remind me I've never looked at the form and so

maybe we ought and that's something that we should take back to the executive committee for the stakeholder group.

I think one thing I will say David to your Chair and I think we've all been an NCSG Chair once you get to it, if you look at the new GMSO website and for the newcomers to this space the entire ICANN website was redesigned quite recently as some of you know. THE GNSO website within that for those who redesigned it doesn't make clear where the constituencies go. There's a page of NCSG within the stakeholder group section and then there's a page for each constituency within the constituency section.

And so I think when someone is new and is coming in and saying what's NCSG versus NCUC, in part the website is not helpful. So then unless you know something going back to the earlier comment or you know someone who can help you through it, it really is I think very difficult for newcomers. So maybe that's a point of feedback that we can give to ICANN staff; I'm looking at Brian right here.

David Cake: Thank you. Wolfgang?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes, just a couple of points. I think the basic idea that goes with the list of the NTTID's and to figure out, you know, who this could be in the future in the non-commercial can is a very useful proposal. I think that after the first reading you get immediately five or ten various proposals or you could say the people who are behind this application, you know, are potential partners of our community.

And as we know from the previous cases within the GNSO it means you can be a member of different constituencies. But then if it comes to boarding you can only, you know, have one constituency. I think this is an opportunity. It's a problem but it's also an opportunity to do outreach in a community which is anyhow already involved in ICANN.

The second thing is what we, you know, have to do although it's, you know, to try to outreach to communities which are not yet involved in ICANN. And so far I think the run to outreach meeting is a good opportunity and we should have a midterm planning.

So that means we should use each ICANN meeting, you know, with, you know, for organizing such an event in cooperation with local partners I think in all of the cities; you know, over in China and then in Beijing. You know, hopefully it's, you know, publicly a nice partner to organize something together with one of the universities in Beijing. But it needs to prepare a one-day event publicly at a pre-event before the ICANN meeting or something like that. I think this is an opportunity which we could really use and have it as event which we organize in each - not only in one, but every two or three years - an ICANN event.

At a certain point, you know, we have still a complicated relationship with ALAC and they've said, you know, and to use the home of the civil society. You know, I hear the same works, you know, from the large ALAC committee that we are the home of the civil society.

And yesterday the tenth anniversary of ALAC, you know, the CEO from the NCO came and gave a really exciting and interesting speech and he said you know civil society is let's say the key element in the mighty stakeholder model and he repeated what he said in the opening that the mighty stakeholder needs all stakeholders. If one stakeholder like civil society is missing, then that's no - then we do not have the mighty stakeholder model.

And I think this understanding is very important that the CEO has an understanding because we see a lot of attacks against ICANN from an unfriendly environment and, you know, in the national diplomacy among government and things like that.

And the only difference ICANN makes, you know, to us organizations is that it includes civil society. And this means, you know, includes the lots of other committees as the non-commercial user constituencies. But it means we should even if have problems on the day-to-day operation we should continue, you know, to cooperate with top advisory committee in certain ways and, you know, because we have common interests even if we, you know, are different and have all of the different things.

And the final point is that ICANN support what Bill Drake has said. A large advisory committee has now three or four staff member for support and we don't. But it means that this could be a very concrete outcome from this meeting here if we paid out how our constituency meets and needs staff support. It should not be a collection of money for the ICANN - an opportunity for a person which would give staff support to this constituency. Thank you.

David Cake: Bill?

Bill Drake: Many, many topics that are of interest here. One on the last point - historically actually NCUC didn't want staff support. There was a lot of concern among folks and NCUC has been around for a decade that if the - that if they relied on staff support that would perhaps reduce the autonomy of NCUC in some ways. And NCUC has at various points in time had some issues with some of the staff that were serving the GNSO Council generally; particularly when we went through the chartering experience for the NCSG and so on that led some people to really feel strongly that way.

So the question whether we would ever want to seek staff support and then the other constituencies I don't believe do have staff support do they? Right, none of them do. It has been something that has been discussed - the registrars do? It has been an issue that has been discussed a lot in is certainly something we could revisit. Clearly we need to find to find a way to muster a team to do some basic things.

If you look at the NCUC website - ncuc.org - you see that we have different groups that are formed; but most of these groups really are these days inactive. There were groups on particular GNSO related issues. There were groups on - I'm looking at the list now - like registry, registrar vertical separation, and so on. There was a group on charter revisions. There was a - but also groups on sort of basic functions of an organization like media, maintaining the web space, and so on. And basically all of those have pretty much have fallen at this point I would have to say.

It's not that people don't want to participate, but they haven't had a core group of folks within those groups to catalyze things and often you get this collective action problem of nobody will put work in unless somebody clears as, you know, the okay group as the group that will be - will do the initial laying of the ground.

So we could I think try to in the process of reorganizing things a bit clean up this website and get rid of the old groups but also revitalize and create a group that would do outreach and create a group that would do the web page and other kind of media representations and so on. That would be I think a very useful concrete step for us. We do need to do that.

The second point that is on the question of ALAC; you know, many of us are also members of ALAC At Large. And there not - it's often been viewed by some folks that there is this inherent contradiction or competition between the two, but there really isn't. They serve very different functions. I feel no conflict being both in At Large and in NCUC. At Large is a group that is focused on ICANN as a whole not just GNSO policy. And it's a group that's focused on representing users including commercial users - the people on the hill who work in the private sector.

We don't have people; we have people that may work in the private sector but they're here as individuals representing their own interests. They don't

represent companies or anything like that right. So they are different organizations and we have tried to evolve better cooperation between them.

I'm liaison with ALAC and we've had over the past four years that I've been here numerous joint romps around cities for dinner and drinks after meetings and also joint meetings like we had yesterday to talk about actual policy issues; and we're going to try to pursue some joint initiatives on areas where we have common concerns. But there are - it should be clear that there are points where we have differences of view.

ALAC has tended to take a much more pro-law enforcement kind of orientation than privacy on a number of points. ALAC has tended to take a much stronger pro-intellectual protection of intellectual property rights protection orientation than we have. ALAC is not had the same position on who is and so we have had some differences; but that's okay. Wendy's laughing because she's been on ALAC. It's important that, you know, we just accept that there are areas where we agree and there are areas where we disagree and we cooperate in the areas where we agree you know.

The last point I wanted to make and this goes back to working the website and so on, if you look at the list of members that we have again, we need to do not only outreach to bring in new members particularly NGO's - we have a lot of academics increasingly it seems - but we need to do in-reach with existing members. There are a lot of folks - there are a lot of groups and individual members that I think we could be doing more to engage more effectively than we have been; and again it's just bandwidth issues.

So if we can get a few people who actually volunteer to be in an outreach group - a few people that actually volunteer to be in a media group, and so on we could start trying to re-juice some of these efforts.

Mary Wong: So I'm just going to keep going and one thing I want to just clarify something that I said earlier when I said the registrars had support, I think the difference

is that between the contractor and the non-contracted parties but the contracted parties because they have contracted ICANN they have a staff liaison on the ICANN staff.

And so they have a natural channel or conduit and, you know, how those relations evolve really depends on that group and the staff member. But for the non-contracted parties not just NCUC we don't have that, just the nature of the position within the ICANN community. So I wanted to clarify that; it's not that they have support and we don't because it may have come across that way.

But I want to second Bill's proposal of having a group of volunteers within NCUC to do the in-reach and outreach. I couldn't agree more that we need to do more to engage existing members and I agree with the earlier point. I mean the fact that have a list up that can be very active on issues of concern to many of us is probably not enough. I think those who are used to participating kind of will do it but there are some who don't even read it and they're on the rolls of members.

So I think that's part of the outreach volunteer group or whether there's also a sub-group that does media that works with the outreach group I think that would be something that would be very, very helpful to us to take on board some of the earlier comments. And hopefully we can have that in place before Toronto; that would be quite a good way to get into the Toronto outreach event.

David Cake: I think that's a good suggestion. I know some of the groups that we organized were on the basis of policy issues on the idea that we would eventually end up with interest groups and that structure and that perhaps these are redundant. But in terms of working groups for internal organization, I think that's an excellent idea and we should use them more. Anyone else want to - Joy?

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks I just want to pick up on a couple of things. One is the point that they made about getting - using social media. I think it's an excellent idea and it would be I think in terms of the NCUC website there's already some link to social media, Facebook, Twitter and so on. But I was just wondering what might also be good is to steer some people - some key people who are tweeting or are otherwise engaging on social media already that it might be good if you also pick up some of the same ideas and saying you want to use social media also. I mean obviously you should feel free.

The other thing that I was thinking about just to share that some of the things that I do for outreach myself. Tuesday I have a regular update with APC member and APC staff about what's been happening in NCUC in the last few months, the topics that we're discussing for those various quick scan of some of the views that are being discussed to give people a flavor basically of the particularly sort of sharing any key statements or any submissions that we make with people and asking them to distribute them to the networks and also tweeting and otherwise sharing information during ICANN meetings and NCUC meetings.

So I just give those as some practical examples of things that aren't too hard to do within your existing membership. And if you've got things that you would like us to share - maybe share more widely with APC members or if NCUC has other things that, you know, articles or so on like the leaflet that was written to the Board asking it to uphold the deficient to repeat the daily resolution, then, you know, I'm happy to also share those. It's not an arduous task. Yes, thanks.

David Cake: Comments on this topic? So Bill, do you want to discuss anything about how we went with ICANN outreach plans or the - let's not go there? Do we have any more comments on the whole outreach question because I'm - otherwise we should probably move on to more specific things.

Bill Drake: Why don't we actually see if there is anybody who would like to be part of these groups? Would anybody be willing to work on revising the website and cleaning up the membership stuff and so on? And is raving within? This is new - this is concrete new energy here that we should capitalize on.

Is there anybody else who would be interested in working with (Ed) on that? Okay, I will work with (Ed) on that. Is there no - and David will work with us and so now we have a new - which group are we? Is that the media - the tools?

Do we need a separate group for doing outreach efforts; trying to contact existing members or beginning to reach out to new members? Is anybody interested in doing a little bit of work on that? It doesn't have to be an enormous amount of work but maybe it's an hour or two a week; I don't know. Well, we can pose this also on the list server and see.

And we should also point out to those who are new the lists are - have been the principal of kind of public space for NCUC and we've often had periods where it was really, really live debate where there were dozens of messages a day and then there were periods where things just kind of go dark. And part of that is the rhythm of ICANN meetings and what's hot and happening at a particular moment.

But sitting in a dark room like this with no windows in the morning and trying to get juiced to talk about this shouldn't lead you to believe that we are a sleepy group. In fact, it's often quite lively and we allow people who are on that list who I think we could probably reach out to who have contributed before.

I should make one other point by the way. The new budget if it goes through in the way that it's been presented would allow for bringing up to three NCUC members to the meetings. And one of the things I think that always makes it difficult to get people excited about participating a lot is that you don't think

you are ever going to be able to go to a meeting because it will cost you a couple of thousand bucks out of pocket to go unless somebody is paying for you then that might give you less reason to feel really connected to the process. But we now have the possibility that somebody who gets...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: Now Wendy I'm talking to Lou. Misuse of every action; don't get too techy.

Bill Drake: Now that we have the possibility that somebody for example gets involved in a genius working group on something and starts really contributing and that group is going to be meeting at the next ICANN meeting, maybe we would be able to bring them to that meeting. So it could help to anchor people and engage people more than we have been and possibilities which we didn't have before.

Bill Drake: Joy are you staying?

Joy Liddicoat: I was just inviting Avri to come up to the front here especially if she's got that knowledge or something. Don't sit way at the back; there's plenty of more room over here.

David Cake: Yes, that's a good point. We're looking like in the brave new, very wealthy ICANN world where we're going to have a little more travel funding. Specifically we're going to have - specifically in addition to the travel funding for our counselors which we often juggle a little bit. We will be - we will have three travel slots at the meeting for NCSG executive in theory but we really don't have - I'm sorry an NCUC executive but we really don't have three NCUC executives to bring necessarily every meeting so we may well have a spare slot that's already funded.

And in addition NCUC has a small amount of its own funds which traditionally has probably been mostly used to get its executive members and new members there but has been pretty tight. We will be able to use that little - with a little more discretion so we should be able to bring a few people and people who have been enthusiastic and participated already in processes and working groups and so on are likely to be good candidates.

Yes, just before we briefly move on I know a few people that have entered the room since we did introductions. Yes, it is a very weird...

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: Yes, that would be good. While the - yes. So we've had a few people - while the furniture rearranging continues we had a few people who entered the room since we did the introductions. Can I just get a brief one sentence introduction on some people? Yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay I'm Avri Doria. I'm a member of the NCUC, a member of NCSG - well, of course that goes without saying. And I'm a member of At Large and who knows what else I'm a member of. And also newly an applicant or a member of an applicant group for Duck NELOC - the community applicant.

David Cake: Perhaps - yes, well perhaps Carlos - and Carlos might introduce yourself.

Carlos Afonso: Oh, hi. Sorry for the delay. This is Carlos Afonso from the (unintelligible) Foundation in Rio and next to me we have - Carlos Afonso from (unintelligible).

David Cake: No, we've got the microphone for remote distances.

(George Nyabuga: Okay, my name is George Nyabuga. I'm from AfriNIC which is the internet registry for Africa.

Verena Saydraouten: My name is Verena and I'm also from AfriNic.

David Cake: Welcome. Okay the next topic is specifically our Toronto outreach event. Who is a good person to talk about this? I would have thought Robin but she's not here. Bill? Do you want to talk about it?

Man: I'll do it.

David Cake: Okay, if you can explain it that's - until Robin is here. I have no idea where Robin is. But I'll presume she'll turn up eventually so, yes - okay.

So the next issue then is the charter and the elections. Sorry - briefly we need to have - we have several people whose terms are expiring and roles and we need to have elections fairly soon. Several of the people involved are term limited so have to step down and can't move back into the same role including myself as Asia Pacific Representative.

And we would - we are going to need to have an election and consequently we are also going to need to ratify some changes to the NCUC charter. The NCUC charter needs to be changed just - basically the main issue is compatibility with the NCSG charter. I think we'll start with Avri if you could - could you be able to discuss the charter changes issue?

Avri Doria: Sure. I hadn't really expected to but okay. So yes, there was a group of people and we've had this unfortunate or fortunate thing in that we had to change Chairs in midstream because someone got a really good job. So the charter was basically going under revision. There had been a committee of people that had reworked the revision as David said to basically bring it in line with the new NCSG charter. You know things like you had to be an NCSG first before becoming a NCUC member - that wasn't quite in there. There wasn't an alignment of the committees.

So a group of people did a good job restructuring it. Being probably the person that has memorized the NCSG charter best, I then did a scrubbing of it recommended a few more changes that I think I sent to the list or to some list or to some group of people. I think it's now ready. Obviously someone from the executive group or you, David, has to sort of accept the changes I proposed because I did it that way. But then I think you all are ready for it.

The last thing I do think that Constantinos did work with (Glen) to set up the election and the list. You may if you have new members now need to confirm that any new members have actually been added to the voting list. But, you know, so probably getting a copy of the voting list out is - and, you know, published so the people can look at it and make sure that their names are on it and then do the voting.

At that point I think it needs to be blessed by the Board - by one of the committees. If they are offer any subsequent changes, then you'll have to go through the same process we went through with the NCSG charter which was it comes back to you all, you read it, and then you hold another vote to accept or not accept. If you don't accept their changes, then you go into a negotiation mode with them. And that's sort of the process we've been following to date. I don't see any problem with what you've got. I don't see any reason why the committee wouldn't accept it, but you never know.

So I think it's ready. I think it's ready but someone has to accept the changes that I recommended and, you know, I don't think we did set a session for walking through that thing which is really good. But certainly if any of you - so I think you're next step is accept or don't accept the changes I put out, publish this on I guess the NCSG discuss list - if that's the only list we've got with the header, you know - NCUC charter update - let people read it, confirm that you've got the voting list ready, and then announce, you know, two weeks later the start - or three weeks later - the start of the vote. So, does that cover it?

David Cake: Yes.

AvriDoria: Any questions are fine and once the thing comes out I'm willing to answer any questions about charters and the relationships of NCUC to NCSG. I'm not responsible for anything anymore but I'm probably a good historian on charter development.

David Cake: Yes, for those - the history for the new people with the creation of the NCSG charter in particular was a long and sort of somewhat fraught process but we're not really expecting the NCUC charter changes to be particularly controversial or difficult. I think we probably will accept those changes or throw them to the executives first but I don't there'll be any; I'm not expecting that to be dramatic.

The big issue is really we just wanted to let people know why we're changing the charter, what the reasons why, and if anybody has any feedback - like if anyone thinks the double charter changes that we really should be trying to put in at this opportunity. I don't have any pressing urge to change the charter any more than minimal.

Any more comments on the charter issue? The only deal - the biggest sort of practical issue here is that traditionally getting all of our members to actually vote is quite hard work. So look forward to many, many emails asking you all to vote and encourage you to find all of your friends on the voting committee and have that vote and make them vote and so forth.

Is there anyone - and I'd just like to let people know of anyone who has not been that actively involved in sort of the core of NCUC would like to sort of step up and be more involved this is an excellent point particularly we are looking for some executive committee members and so. All right anyone else want to talk about the elections and the charter?

Bill Drake: Yes, just to be clear so. I'm looking at the website. So many people don't know that we have an executive committee that's regionally based right. So there are five regional representatives some of whom are in the room now as well as the Chair and they nominated you committee representative. And the term according to what's on the website of existing executive committee runs to 17 December 2012. And we were talking about that that seems out of sync. I'm not sure who wrote this but that's what it says - 17 December 2012.

And presumably we have to elect before Toronto three new counselors, right? Sorry - I'm sorry, you're right.

Avri Doria: Sorry, that's the NCSG elections.

Bill Drake: There's two different elections.

Avri Doria: Right, there's an NCUC election for Chair and committee and then there will be an NCSG election which will probably be discussed by Robin in that meeting, her new counselors, and an NCSG chair.

Bill Drake: Right - correct. Thank you.

David Cake: We will be trying to do the charter issue and the executive committee at the same time because it needs to be in advance of them being actually seated.

Bill Drake: So I'm just trying to get clear on the timeframe. So is this 17 December 2012 inaccurate? So then we could do the election staggered and do it after Toronto?

David Cake: I think we would prefer to try and do the charter vote and the elections at the same time and if that means having the elections early so that people aren't seated for a few months after they are elected, then we'll do it that way.

Bill Drake: Well then we have to readjust the cycle.

Mary Wong: And I don't know where the 17th December date came from either. I have no issue with having all of the elections at the same time. I guess there is a few questions. Do we get the charter through and then do the elections or can we do them concurrently?

But with the elections there's a concern that it's important to clarify that what we're talking about now are internal NCUC elections not for council seats which is on stakeholder group basis but within the internal NCUC elections there - we need to do the Chair election. Actually we have to do it before the 17th December because of the six month interim issue, don't we? So we may want to do it all at the same time but there is a rule that is triggered specifically for this particular cycle I think.

David Cake: Yes, there's a specific rule we have to our election - we have to reelect a new Chair within six months of resignation of the president. And that's probably our biggest time constraint here. I don't know. Anyway I just wanted to - I think - is there anything else to say on the election issue; just to let everyone know what's going on?

By the way earlier I was told that some people are finding the agenda on the screen behind me difficult to read. That agenda is - that's just from the ICANN schedule website. So you should be able to bring that agenda up on your own screens fairly easily. I don't have any easy way to make that bigger or anything.

Well my schedule is in disarray; I was wanting to speak about the outreach. We've got 20 minutes before the coffee break and the only thing left that I have before the coffee break is outreach and the Toronto event which we can't.

Woman: Can we move down to...

David Cake: Yes, we can move down to policy and I think we shall. I'll move on to policy. Carlos?

Carlos Afonso: And if you guys don't feel like discussing policy for some reason before the coffee break we can always discuss the workshop in the IGF on Nikon and human rights. So if you guys were prepared to discuss one event we can exchange one for the other and maybe discuss the IGF workshop either like now or in your business by the end of the meeting; just a suggestion.

David Cake: What's the general feeling of the meeting? Who wants to move on to policy and who wants to...

Avri Doria: I think there's a very low energy level in here. So I think picking a nice policy topic that might get our blood rolling before coffee break would be great.

Woman: I also think that too.

Avri Doria: And I think it's great to do that but I think we need some boiling blood. So maybe we should talk about ICRC, IGO, or you know - I don't know.

David Cake: Okay, well let's move on to policy and we will discuss the events later in the - after the coffee break.

Okay, so policy discussions. Well, I'd like - the first thing I'd like to see if our counselors would like to fill us in what they see is urgent policy issues that we need to discuss at this meeting. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer. And one of the policy issues that I've been raising is coming to council but is currently out more at a community level and between registrars and ICANN. The Registrar Accreditation Agreement which is being renegotiated and I think non-commercial users are in a key position to provide commentary on that and input because while it's nominally an

agreement between registrars and ICANN, it governs the terms on which registrants and users of the internet can register domain names.

So at the microphone session on Monday several of us here - Avri, Joy, (Kathy), I - all provided commentary on the problems that some of the law enforcement requests would pose for registrants from non-commercial and individual perspectives. Law enforcement is demanding verification of by phone and by email, is demanding long-term data retention, is requesting that the verification be done before the domain name is allowed to resolve all of which would make it very difficult for somebody to register a domain name to engage in political protest or social movement or social organizing and have it resolved quickly and easily to point to their online speech.

One of the things that we are trying to do to aid in that effort is to reach out to privacy and data protection commissioners. Other parts of government and law enforcement who can provide more input to the negotiation and so I thought it would be great if around this room we have people who might have additional contact in governments or in privacy circles and to suggest what we're thinking of is to prepare one or two pager describing the issues, send it out to them, and ask for input with a clear group call to action please write to the ICANN Board and submit comments so that they have this direct input.

And I would welcome any thoughts on that subject.

David Cake: Would anyone like the LAL renegotiation issue is a pretty big subject. Would anyone else like to talk on that one? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, just a few extra things I would like to add. First of all we also had a good conversation last night with some of the folks from the US and I think we may be able to get a privacy statement from them. What I also would like to ask is any of you that within your own countries do have contact or do have a way to reach your privacy or data retention officers to please reach out to them. This letter will be coming but don't necessarily wait for it.

If you've got a way to reach for - either because you're in a multi-stakeholder committee with them running the countries' internet or you're doing something else like - and of course I look directly at the country that is going by a multi-stakeholder group but. So if you've got access to any of those people, don't wait for the note from, you know, the cheat sheet or the short thing from us; just approach them.

Approach your GAK people here; you know, if you come from a country and you know your GAK representative approach them and say, "Hey, you know, where's our data protection officer? What do they think about this? How does this match our country's laws?" Most countries have some sort of data protection. You know, yes, there's certain allowances for law. There's usually allowances through some notion of, you know, due process. But still every country does have some notion of protecting the data. Okay. I exaggerate. Perhaps not every country.

But make sure that, you know, talk to people here, approach them, buttonhole them, shake their lapels basically. Because we've got this situation now where it's only law enforcement that people talk to. And that only gives, as I was saying yesterday, half the story. And that half the story is sometimes a dangerous half of a story and, you know, for many different groups.

So and it's really up to this group. You know, it's the NCs, the NCUC mostly, that has to take on this mission. If it doesn't, keep screaming about it if it doesn't approach people, if it doesn't talk to people. Then law enforcement is all that ICANN hears. If law enforcement is all they hear, law enforcement is the community they respond to.

ICANN for all of its faults is really good at responding at the people that yell at them. And so we have to make sure that if we care about privacy that we're

the ones that are yelling at them. That it's our privacy people that are yelling at them. Because if we don't, it's just going to get ignored, so.

Man: Okay.

Woman: So I just wanted to add to that for those who haven't been following the issue that when we say law enforcement agencies or LEA for short in ICANN speak, really this process has been driven by three law enforcement agencies, the FBI from the United States, the Serious Organized Crime Agency from the U.K. and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police from Canada. The Interpol and others are observers to the GAC.

But the reason I mention that is also because there are law enforcement agencies out there that haven't been a bigger part of this discussion but more importantly they're looking at data protection laws in countries such as the various European countries. That would be a very good way to contribute.

And for Wendy and those working on this issue I think what we've been hearing at least at the Council level in conversations is Thomas Rickert for example, the NomCom - one of the NomCom appointees to the Council is with eco in Germany and he's got an interested in the issues. So there might be other people within the community we can talk to to help us reach out to say the German and other European data protection authorities as well.

Man: Yes. I think this is a - we had a really good update on this yesterday, on Monday. We had some good discussion - yes, yesterday was Monday. I'm clearly confused.

We had some really good discussion from the negotiating team in our policy meeting quite a few of us went to - not me but it looks several of us - I was only a part of that session but several of us went to that - the whole RAA negotiating session.

And it's we - so we had some great statements of the - from the floor from NCUC members including (Joy) and Wendy and (Cathy). And we - but the point has been made to us several times that what we can do really useful here is help bringing privacy - other privacy organizations.

And it's been suggested that one of the things NCUC should really be doing - whether it's NCUC or NCSG I guess or something we can discuss this afternoon. But whether to organizations like the Article 29 Working Group and which is the (ten) European privacy law group and any other privacy organizations that we feel we should be including.

So do we - do you think we have got sort of - does anyone else want to - do we have consensus actually to move on to a bit of a - to an action there on that sheet? Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Something I think we all forgot to add in terms of the urgency is this is happening now. This is not something that we've got time on. This is something where we've got weeks, maybe a month or two to start getting letters into, yes, into the Board. It's basically they're doing it now. They're trying to rush it through.

Woman: Sorry. Just to add to that (David) I wonder, you know, if you (unintelligible). Electronic Frontier Foundation, you know, maybe with getting some input from them or even Privacy International Article 19. I mean some of the other civil society groups more broadly who are experts around privacy issues other than just simply - or in addition to data protection offices that governments might - whether there'd be some way to (see like) some input from the (unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I think so. I think are definitely people that hear that who would be - (BFS) don't take an active interest in ICANN but I think for this one they're definitely willing to help us draft appropriate letters and things. And I have

some - of course the International Outreach will be (unintelligible). It was a previous member of this group and previously with the (ethics).

Woman: Sorry. Is there something you want to follow up? Yes.

Man: I'll follow that up.

Woman: Go ahead.

Man: But I was thinking more generally do we want to - I think firstly is there general feeling that we should be drafting - does anyone disagree with the idea that we should be drafting those letters? No. I see no disagreement. And do we then want to - do we want to sort of set a specific drafting team or just leave it to the - would anyone like to be part of a specific drafting team?

Man: Are we going to (coordinate)?

Man: Yes, yes. Yes.

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes, I think we need a small group to coordinate that. Does anyone want to be - who would like to be a part of a small group to coordinate drafting letters to privacy organizations? Do I - do I hear...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. So that's...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...that's a volunteer from (Ken Heitman). Does anyone else want to be part of that group to draft some letters?

Wendy Seltzer: I'm happy to help distribute them and...

Man: Yes.

Wendy Seltzer: ...to share my notes of the - some of the points we had yesterday to help in drafting here. I don't have a lot of (unintelligible) to actually write it but I can maybe can distribute and also...

((Crosstalk))

(Carlo Fonsu): Hi. (Carlo Fonsu). It would be like very helpful for us if we had like just one-pager on the specific topics. It would be great for us to address with the privacy officers from our countries. So I know that every time we create a drafting team people get this (silly) affect that oh my God I'm getting into a drafting team again.

But like this simple one page can be very helpful for us to draft something I would say more leverage in our own language and then to address our privacy officers and government representatives. We are asking like for something that is really not big but some guiding lines focusing of course on the approach that we would like those issues to be addressed.

Man: Yes. (Bill).

(Bill): Just to say also, we should really - I think that's a great idea. Link this to the (in reach) strategy. We've got members - member organizations like the ACLU and Electronic Privacy Information Center and so on that have not been very engaged but they sign on and, you know, they vote when we have an election but that's about it.

And this would be a real good way of trying to reach out to them and saying, you know, we're really pushing on issues of direct concern to you and see UC

as a vehicle. So we might want to go through our existing membership list as well as thinking about some of the other groups that are out there and try and say you guys take that, you know, you're already a member and here's what we're doing and trying to energize them.

Man: Yes. No, I think that's a great suggestion. And I clearly think we should ask for volunteers on the mailing list as well. And perhaps (hint) two or three of them in - specific ones like (ethic) but perhaps you really should - you could be really helpful here.

Wendy Seltzer: So I'm going to suggest give the time pressures and the higher bandwidth of face-to-face that maybe we can meet in the small group while we're here and looking at the schedule I'm trying to find space. I'm wondering whether in the 10:30 break on Wednesday there might be a bit of time for lunchtime around noon on Wednesday.

I know there are lots of things that people will be in and out and interested in on the schedule. But it would be really excellent to try to find time while we're here.

Man: Do you have a...

((Crosstalk))

Wendy Seltzer: I propose 10:00 am on Wednesday right after replacement of the Whois protocol in this very room.

Man: We have a meeting with Bill Graham at 9:30. How long is that going?

Man: I'm - and the meetings with Bill Graham will go until 10:30. So let's not mess with that.

Wendy Seltzer: I propose 10:30 at the Barcelona room.

Man: And by the looks of it...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...yes. Yes. So that looks doable. Yes. Okay. And we might also be worth trying - is it worth trying to get someone from the registrars negotiating team to give us some advice - no.

Avri Doria: Quick question to the person that's leading this effort. As opposed to showing up with a blank sheet of paper, is it possible that at 10:30 you'll show up with an outline we can start from?

Wendy Seltzer: It is entirely possible.

Avri Doria: Way cool. Thank you.

Wendy Seltzer: Stranger things have happened.

Man: All right. So we have a plan. We'll try and get at least a very basic draft out at the end of that and then we'll - I think the aim would be to try and get something ready to send by the end of the - maybe not the end of this week but - okay, we'll try.

((Crosstalk))

Man: All right. All right. So as soon as we get a draft we can send it to people like (unintelligible) and so on and get a little bit of feedback.

Wendy Seltzer: Great. And thanks to all who have expressed interest.

Man: All right.

- Wendy Seltzer: Now you can find me at wendy@seltzer.com if you don't find me directly.
- Man: Okay. Well now I believe it is coffee break time. And we do not get - we don't get coffee served here. But I believe there will be coffee served somewhere. (Robbie)'s pointing.
- Man: (Unintelligible).
- Man: Probably somewhere outside in the hallway. All right. So coffee break?
- Woman: How long?
- Man: Yes. It says half an hour on the schedule but I think we'll go for 15, 20 minutes.
- Woman: Fifteen.
- Man: Fifteen.
- Man: Good day. This is (unintelligible) calling from South Africa Durban.
- Wendy Seltzer: Oh, welcome.
- Man: Yes. Thank you. Pardon me for my late entry. I just received the program for the meeting.
- Wendy Seltzer: We are about to restart from a break in a few moments and back to discussion of policy updates and outreach events our next item.
- Man: Okay. So how was the - I'm sorry to be asking this. This is one (unintelligible). I'm sorry. How was the outcome of the previous point in the agenda? Is it possible to get a brief outlook of what has been discussed or maybe we can look at that (later) at the minutes of the meeting?

Wendy Seltzer: We started with a discussion of the membership and agenda and then moved on to agree that we would reach out to privacy commissioners and others who could help us comment on the (unintelligible) agreement.

Man: Okay. Okay.

Man: Well that - the coffee break did take a bit longer. We didn't count on the chaos of first the...

Man: Okay.

Man: ...(unintelligible) and the chaos caused by the line up for (gala) tickets. We will...

Man: (Gala) tickets.

Man: We will - yes. The (gala) (unintelligible) tomorrow they just...

Man: Okay. No problem.

Man: I don't know why they do it that way. It's very messy.

Wendy Seltzer: Because the lottery would be random and that might subject them to lawsuit under California law.

Man: And then we should have digital (unintelligible).

Woman: Four G.

Man: The physical - maybe we could have physical archery competition.

Woman: I think that should be (batched)

Man: Being (batched) ticket (unintelligible).

Woman: The (gala).

Man: Yes. I particularly like that they always put them out on Wednesday. Sorry, are you (unintelligible). They put them out on Wednesday afternoon. That's guaranteeing that anyone who is busy doing work wouldn't get a ticket to the (gala). That was an excellent innovation. But yes, some of you are lucky enough to have (unintelligible). All right.

Man: So let's get started. And we're going to be having decisive action on one policy issue and let's see what we can do with the others. What other policy issues do we have to discuss or would you like to discuss next?

I think we briefly - I wouldn't mind briefly discussing the Red Cross Olympics IGO issue. But we do probably have more substantive discussion on that in CSG this afternoon. Yes, (Carlos).

(Carlos): Hello. I would suggest that someone who is better informed give us a briefing of these ICRC issue before we proceed to discuss it. What is the status right now?

Man: Yes. That's a good...

((Crosstalk))

(Carlos): ...could do this.

Man: Does anyone want to volunteer to discuss the status of this?

(Joy): (Unintelligible) point of order because I don't believe it's possible to have a brief discussion about...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Brief.

(Joy): (Unintelligible) and again in the - if there are others who are more up to date who can correct me, feel free. So (unintelligible) the GNSO Council was asked to go do some work on implementing the applicant guidebook provisions, which render the IOC and RC - certainly IOC and RC with ineligible strings for - ineligible for delegation in the new round.

The GNSO Council did ask the drafting team, which is the group that did some work on it. After (unintelligible) to the Council and the motion was controversially deferred from the Costa Rica meeting. The Council subsequently voted on the motion to take forward the drafting team's recommendations (unintelligible) when to the Board and the Board rejected it - rejected the motion.

So in the meantime the GNSO Council has decided to - the drafting team had decided to continue its work. And I believe there's a meeting tomorrow of the drafting - yes - at 8 o'clock in the morning. Someone might like to go and knit Olympic rings while they're watching it. I don't know.

And I mean to some extent I - and Avri - there's been some changes of people from NCUC who've been engaged in the drafting team. I took quite considerable step back from that post at the Costa Rica meeting and the decision to - and NCUC's position on it.

(Mary) has continued to (unintelligible) and Avri has also taken - been more proactive particularly since Konstantinos Komaitis stepped back with his new role.

So there's been at the moment a hole on which the drafting team was digging for itself was getting deeper and more complex. And I'm not sure when it's proposing to report back to the GNSO Council on that. I don't know if (Mary) you have any other (update) or additions.

(Mary): So NCUC has a representative on the drafting team, as does NCSG. And they're both Avri and me and we're each other's alternate. So sometimes you kind of get confused as to who there for the SG and who's there for the (unintelligible). But since our positions are now dissimilar, that's usually not a problem.

I will say two things to follow up on what (Joy) said. It seems I think that the Board was pretty decisive. They don't want to do anything with the GNSO recommendations. However, as (Joy) said, work continues and discussions continue.

Even outside of the drafting team those questions continue on protections for the second level. And the - one reason why that's continuing is because the second level protection there is time. Right now we've got the applications in got the evaluation process, et cetera, et cetera. (Unintelligible) now and the delegation of the first new gTLD to really think through second level protection.

Couple more things. One is the question has been raised and I know for some of us this sounds like deja vu as to whether or not indeed the IOC and the Red Cross should be treated together or is there a case to be made that they ought to be treated separately such that for example, I think that some of us in our group that are more sympathetic to the Red Cross claiming at least certain types of protection over the IOC.

That discussion has kind of (bumped) along under the surface. But both organizations are here obviously but some (unintelligible) from informal

conversations is that splitting the IOC and the RC at this stage may be something will have some support outside of our group. So that's one update.

And the other is that there are a number of things going on in parallel that are related to some extent to the IOC Red Cross issue. Particularly at the second level and going on into the next round. And this is the request by some international governmental organizations or IGOs who sent a letter to the ICANN Board in December I think it was that wait, you know, we're not the IOC and the Red Cross but we're kind of similar.

So if you're going to give them special protection, we should get that too. The Board kicked that over to the GNSO and to the GAC. The GAC responded recently to say we don't really want to do very much with it (unintelligible) point for this round say, you know, that the top level in the GNSO we - well I think they mentioned me by name. That's kind of unfortunate in the issue report.

At the request primarily of our fellow constituency the MPOC wanted the GNSO to consider this on a broader more reasoned basis. And we said look, I mean if the issue of special protection is going to come up, it should be more objective, it should be based on more general criteria including who the heck is (unintelligible) who are qualified.

So the preliminary issue report that we requested was just released by staff earlier this month. The comment period I think ended today. Yes - it (was) the 25th of June. Okay. So the comment period ended yesterday.

I don't think anybody did anything about it. A lot of people in this community didn't even read the issue report. And a lot like that the Board also asked the staff to produce a briefing paper on second level protection more generally.

This then relates to, and I'm sorry this is confusing. So we had the specific IOC RC issues that's related to the Board and IGO issue that is now related

to the broader issue of second level protections in this round more generally for everybody including the (unintelligible) (suspension) system.

And that discussion is going on this week. I do think that as a group we want to talk about these issues even though the Council is not voting on them this week. And that's it.

Man: Okay. Rapid comment from (unintelligible) and then I'll go to Wendy.

Man: Yes. In the - given this summary, should we do anything regarding our March statement to the Board? Should we revise it, do a new one, what should we do? Our statement to the Board at the time was pretty clear regarding our position.

(Mary): I think it would be helpful. That's my personal view. If we were to provide either update or statement to the Board after discussions amongst the membership. We could say we stand by our statement or we could (unintelligible) or different.

I think it...

Man: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. This is (unintelligible) from Portugal. I don't agree with that at all. I mean we made a statement. We cannot be changing our position every time we have some new view on this. So just because the outcome is not favorable to the people who are pushing this issue. I mean we were quite clear on the statements we made. We should stick with it.

I don't even see a point where we're using our time discussing this issue again. I'm sorry. I arrived late at the meeting but I find it very surprising to find again and again this issue discussed here when it's since long disappeared from our mailing list.

Man: Okay.

Man: Who is pushing this issue forward again?

Man: If I can just break in there. We are discussing this because it is still before Council. So the - we don't get a choice in whether or not the issue is up and going. It is still before Council and so we are still discussing it. I don't - so the issue has moved particularly from first level to second level domains, which broadens it considerably.

I'd like to let Wendy speak now.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes. And I'm not suggesting a change to our position. I am - I would suggest that we say our position holds for second level domains or we believe no special protection should be issued at the second level domain period.

Man: So that's not a change in our position in the first place. If it's not a change on the position we already assumed, then I think we should move forward. Otherwise, I find it very hard to explain to the rest of our colleagues who are not in the meeting right now how this came to cause a change in our view.

Wendy Seltzer: I appreciate that it's sometimes challenging to participate remotely. We're trying to use queuing here so maybe you can - remote participants can indicate that they want to join the queue.

Man: Yes. There is - there are ways to indicate that you are able to - that you are interested in being added to the speaking queue using Adobe Connect. But just like - do we have anyone else who wants to speak to this - to this issue? Mary.

(Mary): And I'm not suggesting that we change our position either. I do think that Wendy's proposal is something that merits discussing. There have been a few, not many, there was three comments submitted as of the close yesterday.

One thing that I will say and many of us now this, the public comment period may have closed. There is an informal custom that is used to submit a comment within a reasonable period of time. It will be entered into the record and considered.

I do think that it is something that we should discuss because I think first of all you have to figure out if we want to say something additional, not just (unintelligible) additional - our initial comment on the specific IOC Red Cross issue at the second level.

Secondly, do we want to say something, maybe the same thing, as to second level protection more generally or second level protection and top-level protection for IGOs. They're related issues but they're not exactly the same.

Man: (Bill).

(Bill): The only point I would make is if we were to decide that we wanted to recalibrate or nuance at all given the differences between (those) issues were formulated back then and what we're dealing with now. I would certainly want to be as clear as possible that we're - that our principles haven't changed because we took a lot of heat politically in San Juan for the - or San Jose for position we did take and attracted a lot of interest to it.

So I would think it would be kind of awkward if we were to sort of turn around and go well, on second thought we, you know, now we're in a different place. I wouldn't like to do that. I would like at least if for any recalibrations and shifting of the position to at least make very clear that the underlying conception of what is correct here has not altered on our part.

Avri Doria: I like that principled is I think though one of the principles we were most strong on was not so much - there was a we think it's not proper to give

special protection. But I think there was a very strong part on this conversation is not ripe yet.

This conversation has not - go through proper processes yet. It's not a drafting team that should be doing it. There are wider considerations that need to be looked into. So within that whole set of things - and if you go back to the statements that we made, you know, those were all part of it.

So for us to now say well there's been more documentation. We're going to go into a PDP. There is a proper way to consider it. I think then for us to say listen, we haven't necessarily changed our mind about what we think is right and wrong at the end of the day.

But as part of the consensus process we do agree that it needs to be talked about, that it needs to be talked about completely, that it makes sense to split issues, that it makes sense to consider other things.

So I think we can do that and that's very consistent with all of the stuff that we argued even without change. And in the end we've decided that we agree that this is okay and that's okay. We don't (unintelligible).

Man: Everything in that list where I was in complete agreement. It' simply (unintelligible) the issues. That's something that there's a lot of people who are now feeling that way?

Woman: Yes.

(Bill): Because I have somewhat mixed feelings about that. I (unintelligible) I mean I am - on substantive grounds I can see the arguments. On political and tactical grounds within the GNSO I feel somewhat differently. So I'm just curious what you're thinking is.

Avri Doria: Okay. Can I - oh.

Man: No, you can reply to (Bill).

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. So I actually think - yes I actually think we need to split the issues both on a substantive and a tactical (unintelligible). On a substantive ground, they've made a point at this point and as I said I wasn't sure whether this had already been discussed since I got here late. I apologize but I start talking to people and who knows what's going to happen.

So on a substantive ground, they have both made (unintelligible) generous for we are special because argument that are different from each other.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: They're requesting different things. So we've not got a situation where there's nothing in common. The...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Someone on the line doesn't - someone on the line has - is letting through a (unintelligible) noise.

Avri Doria: So that being the case at the design team level - at the drafting team level to sort of say we're going to keep talking about them as a single case becomes irrational. So substantively it doesn't make sense.

From a tactical point of view the issue and the discussion of splitting it gives us time to get the PDP started, gives us time to move the whole discussion into, you know, if it's split, if it's consider more things, if it's considering the full thing, it - the purpose of the drafting team to quickly decide an issue that's put

together that is now no longer together has a reasonable value in terms of most optimistically taking it out of the drafting team completely.

Less optimistically at least getting the drafting team to discuss the issue of pulling them apart as opposed to rushing to judgment with a complete suggestion. I'm trying to be somewhat less than completely blunt in my tactical purposes. But you get the idea I think.

Man: I'd just like to say something to this (Bill). The - specifically the text of the letter that we sent is significant here I think in that the letter that's been sent on I believe - I think it was April 10 but that we sent immediately to the Board around (the 10th). Although we specifically talked - no, we didn't actually take a position on whether or not the - we didn't really put strong arguments about the proposal itself. We mostly concentrated on the process.

And so we can take a - we can indeed take a different position on what the (outcome of that) process should be being that our main objection with the policy - with the process being circumvented that we had an - we had a - our letter talks about that a motion has been - the most worrying aspect of the treatment of the public comments period.

We felt the - that it was rushed. We said rushed through. We can say quite (unintelligible) with that letter - we can say that - we can take on - well, I feel that we can essentially take any position on the final outcome if we are - if we are - if we accept that policy process has been properly followed.

Important one of our major objections - essentially objections to the process of the drafting team in that it was rushed through, that the motion was put to Council before the end of the public comments period and so on. And we also had objectives that the drafting team policy was essentially (unintelligible) satisfy the request of the GAC without looking at the substantive issues.

The - looking at the substantive issues in a legal argument has now begun. And I think we - it would be perfectly consistent with our previous position to say let's just look at those legal arguments on their own merits whatever they are.

Man: (Bill).

(Bill): I guess the question I'm having Avri with what you're saying is that when I talk about political or tactical, again, I'm not sold on this either way. I'm - my thinking is fluid. But the - to me the fundamental procedural problems of the entire way this was handled, not just by the Board and not just by the Council but by the applicants in particular hasn't changed.

And that's - so I wonder if there's a danger that by splitting and potentially seeing the quite different outcomes we are in effect rewarding a party that pursued things in ways that I thought was highly divisive and unnecessary. I feel kind of conflicted about that. That does not strike you that if we - that we're kind of like potentially giving them what they want ala.

Avri Doria: There is an aspect of gee, someone behaves badly; should we do everything possible to make sure? I do think that focusing on outcomes as opposed to behavior correction is probably more useful less at this time. Plus I know that I personally, not speaking for the NCUC, but I personally if I felt blocked would go around any impediment and any process I felt it necessary to do.

So while I can rant and rave against it for political tactical reasons, this is ICANN. This is - we have proper processes. I believe in following them. And when the processes get stupid, I will go around them. So can I condemn somebody else for doing it?

But anyhow, as I say, my first point is behavior correction and such is just I think less material than trying to get to an output that says we go through a proper process in deciding about special protection.

Man: (Mary).

(Mary): I have a quick question and a comment. The question was the letter that was sent to the Board, was it an NCUC statement or an NCSG statement?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mary): I - that's what I remember and I just wanted to - and I - not that it's terribly important but I think it is important in the sense that because we do have a fellow constituency and they have concerns. I think they were concerned about getting the objective criteria.

It would be helpful after this session if we at least had some suggestion that we could discuss with them when we meet with them later and at the SG level because I do think that it is usually more powerful to have a stakeholder group like say as opposed to an individual constituency statement.

Of course if we don't agree on comments and rounds of language, then of course a constituency statement should still be submitted. So that was the point of clarification.

(Unintelligible). The splitting of the issue is something that you can consider in the short-term but also I think in the medium term because I think the broader question then is should this issue be considered as part of a broader PDP. You know, it talks about that and I think - I'm not (unintelligible) and say that we think it should be part of PDP.

And so it's (unintelligible) for us to say that since there is this preliminary issue report and if you look at the issue report, it's kind of interesting. I mean I try not to read too much into these reports. But the staff do indicate in the report that there may be the need to consider more in depth the grounds for protecting the IOC and the RC in conjunction with IGOs more broadly.

So it may not be an entirely crazy suggestion to come from us to say look, I mean look at the number of IGOs I think in that preliminary issue report. I don't remember the exact number because I read it very quickly. But they said - and (unintelligible) you might remember these. There are (thousands) of potential IGOs.

And those are just inter government organizations. We're not even talking about NGOs duty, Red Cross IOC movements within those. Are they separate? Should they be separate? And what's the basis? So I do think that we have a substantive reason based not just on our previous statements but also on what's an issue report to say look, this is complicated. If we're going to do this at all, do this as part of the PDP and not through a drafting team.

And can I add one more thing? Sorry. And this is not that related. But GAC - gosh, I can't remember when they did this. But I'm not sure what the status of the GAC proposal is on second level protections because as I recall - Avri maybe you remember.

The GAC actually wanted the IOC RC to be preserved - to be protected as a reserve names at the second level, which is clearly a policy issue for the GNSO because way back in '07 I think we said no more reserved names for the gTLDs.

Man: (Wolfgang).

(Wolfgang): Yes. With regard to proposed PDP although there should be a PDP, my position is as long as the outcome is (often), we can discuss what it means. But my first estimate would be this leads to (unintelligible) and then the outcome of the discussion would be no special rules and no special protection. Because, you know, we are enter really troubled water here and, you know, if we go only through the acronyms of this in the governmental

organizations which are (treaty) based, there are so many acronyms which are just generic words.

So fortunately (unintelligible) but that WHO is the acronym for the World Health Organization, which is a United Nations special agency and which is among the list, you know, which was distributed in this letter. Or the - we have four or five applications for ECO but ECO is the acronym for a treaty organization called the Economic Corporation Organization.

The Asian counterpart to the OCD, which has members states like Iran and (unintelligible) and others. And it say, you know, gets the privilege, you know, that the acronym's protected. Then, you know, you block too many things.

I think and so far this is troubled water. This is very slippery to (unintelligible). And we will - so it makes sense to consider this. But it has to be clear, you know. If the, you know, let's say the charter for such a team or a PDP is drafted, it has to be open from the early beginning so that means it has not to be, you know, pushed already in a certain direction.

But it has to be clear that the outcome could be of this (unintelligible) or do nothing. My position is do nothing. So it ends nowhere. We have protective mechanisms in place. So there are numerous mechanisms, you know, objections and you can handle this only on a case-by-case basis. But if you start to develop the policy here that's a concrete outcome then, you know, it's a can of worms.

Man: Yes. If no one else is going to - I'll jump in and add my personal comment here, which is that yes, I feel that there are enough tricky examples like the ones (Wolfgang) just pointed out who being the most obvious one. And it's obvious - should be obvious to any English speaker why that's problematic.

The (unintelligible) of IGOs will always say oh, you know, we don't want anyone using OEC, oec.com. Well, no, who.com is a much more complicated

example. And IMS and yes, there are a lot. And so it's clear that we are going to do something. It's a complicated issue that needs to be looked at in reasonable detail and perhaps it does need if not a full PDP but it certainly needs a serious process. Much more serious than a quick drafting team effort.

And we also - and the legal issues do have to be satisfied. And some of them are pretty complicated. One of the arguments from the IGOs at the moment seem to be along the basis also that what they really (unintelligible) is the rights.

What they really want is to be given the same rights that other people have without having to pay for them, which is, you know, oh the taxpayers will pay for it. Well, you're shifting (costs) around is not necessarily going to - it's not going to make that problem go away.

The last point that I really want to make on this issue is that - no I forgot - I think I forgot what my point was. Yes, yes. Yes, (Mary), if you want to clarify.

(Mary): So just to be clear, right. What's going to happen now - what is happening is that the drafting team is carrying on with this discussion or second level protection for the IOC and the RC. There's nothing you can do about that. That's going to go on.

There will be a set of recommendations that will come back to the Council at some point. The GAC is still as far as we can tell supportive of that. With regard to the broader issue of the IGO protections is only the preliminary stage that will now then be a final issue report, which the Council will then consider and vote on whether or not to initiate a PDP at that stage. And I forget the time (unintelligible) within a couple of months.

I still think it would be helpful for this group to say something. And maybe we won't be able to come up with something as today but whether we submit it

as a comment within a reasonable period of time to the preliminary issue report or when the final issue report comes out. I actually think submitting it earlier rather than later would be helpful in terms of directing the conversation.

I know we can't do something now but please be aware that this is what's going to keep happening. And if we can come out with statement, it will be some much the better.

Man: Well I'd kind of like to draw this particular discussion to a close. The real question is is there anything substantive we should be doing at this meeting or considering in the meantime in terms of, you know, a statement on the issue or anything like that. How - does anyone feel that there should be? And I'm going to yield to the Council as they're much more involved in this issue.

(Joy): I think Avri and I have been on this drafting time - I think it should be. We should have a statement but I think that given the discussion today I'm not (unintelligible) draft a statement that is representative of the group feeling at this point.

Certainly on the preliminary issue report I'm not sure we can say because I don't know what the group's feeling is on issue report.

Man: I think it's - I think it's (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) has a range of opinions about the outcome we think should happen so that there's a fair feeling that this is a complicated area. And we may not yet have fully formed opinions on what that policy outcome should be. But do we have any - do we have any sort of consensus on process for example that we think that, you know, that we want to say anything about the whole drafting team continuing? Avri.

Avri Doria: On the drafting team continuing, I think that one's a dead issue. The GNSO already blessed it continuing. And unless the Council members here think that they have the ability to convince others to come up with a Council view that says don't continue it, I think that's a waste of time because...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Right. It's just, you know, it's a law that they can bet their heads against but I don't think the law will break.

In terms of the comment period, we know that even though the comment period's over. Since everybody's here and working really hard being here, no one is summarizing it. No one is really doing anything. And there really is a general feeling among people that you should never end a comment period in the middle of an ICANN meeting.

So I just think you can get an NCUC coherent statement. I think the fact that we've already committed in another area to get something out this week and something. But I think people should read it and I think anybody that's got a thought on it should send it.

And you don't have to do a, you know, so many people go and they write (dock) files. And, you know, they do coherent long pretty statements. You don't need to. You can send an email making the three points you want to make and send it. And that has to be taken into account. It has to be addressed, has to be recorded, has to be listed.

So don't think of it as a hard process. Just look at the - look at the issues report. Say from things you've heard, from things that are your own concerns. You think this is good. You think this is bad. You think they forgot to talk about X, Y and Z. And send in your own.

And then, you then, NCUC later, the Councilors later can use that as part of the arguments and people can use it to build a statement going forward at some point.

Man: Any more comments? I think that's good advice to remember the comment period is still open. We can still submit individual comments and that may be all we - all that is practical and they're able to do.

All right. We can look and move on to any other policy issues people wish to raise. Yes. There must be stuff.

Woman: We had a big policy discussion yesterday so I think, you know, I'm not sure that there needs to be - at least there was summaries. Maybe you want to give a (unintelligible) or anything that there wasn't time for to (end maybe). I can't remember what (unintelligible).

Man: I think the - I mean I think the real - we did have a policy discussion yesterday. I think the - but that was with a smaller group and also I think this is an opportunity to try and act on policy issues. Are there any policy issues that feel we have an (out), that would be - even if they were discussed yesterday still valuable.

And yes, yes, let's get (Robin) to speak.

(Robin): Yes, we didn't get through our agenda at the policy issues yesterday. So if there's time, perhaps we could discuss some of the issues that we didn't get through.

And I don't know what you've gone through already but we've got the new gTLD issues, the IPR concerns, the objection process with GAC, the outreach and poor showing with applicant support, the newest complaint from the big applicants over Amazon and Google getting generic TLDs, the digital archery issue, glitches.

So we didn't really talk about all of those issues with respect to new gTLDs. And then there's the GNSO outreach issue, the standing committee on GNSO improvements, votes, deferrals, proxies, those issues and then the consumer trust, consumer choice and competition issues.

So those are the ones that we didn't make it through. So if anyone's got...

Man: Does anyone want to speak to any of those? Avri.

Avri Doria: I'm talking too much. And I've got candy in my mouth. Impolite. On the (unintelligible). I want to mention what we're doing elsewhere. Within the group that I chair within At Large, the At Large new gTLD Working Group, we decided at our meeting yesterday that not only was this an abysmal failure but we couldn't let it happen again. We need to find some form of remediation.

But more than anything we realized that part of the problem was that we had started too late and that it was time to start now while people were paying attention to the subject of new gTLDs to get the application support program for the second batch - not the second batch, the second rounds or the next round started.

And that, you know, this could involve all kinds of things in terms of readiness, in terms of preparing various applicants and developing economies. You know, and people refer to it - I tend to call it developing economies because I don't want to get into nations...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: But however you want to look at it, we need to start doing something now that we can't wait. (Unintelligible) we are in the process of making though that's not final yet because that's an ALAC decision. But my working group is going

to recommend to ALAC that my working group be chartered to keep working on this to ignore the old JAS which we think is kind of dead although I know it's still open with regard to Rafik as its co-Chair being here.

But basically that we work on it on our own as an At Large issue making recommendations that group be opened to any GNSO member, any GAC member, any ccNSO member, to anyone in the community but that we don't try and go through the circus again of getting GNSO approval for such an effort.

There are those on the ALAC that says that's risky because GNSO is GNSO and we should really work with them. I'm being somewhat of a turncoat and saying no. On this issue the GNSO really can't be worked with that well. So I figured I should probably tell people that I'm doing that.

Man: Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. I wanted to raise another of the issues that you mentioned, the consumer choice, trust and competition letter on which we are trying to - where the Council is trying to - a working group is drafting a letter on various metrics of consumer trust choice competition to be sent to GNSO Council to be sent to the Board in response to an ATRT inquiry.

That was a long prelude to I think this is a terrible letter that frames the issue of what we're trying to measure totally and I would like to suggest that we submit comments to the working group that this is a bad framing of the question and then be prepared to vote against transmitting it to the Board when it comes to the Council.

I think we could probably find allies among other groups who haven't been participating very (effectively) in the working group either. The problem that I see is that in trying to define trust in new gTLDs the group takes a very narrow view of trust and says things like we should measure the amount of

spam, the number of complaints raised, the number of UDRP complaints raised and against new gTLDs and set metrics that gives them very narrow windows.

All of which encourage the intermediary platforms to restrict the kind of speech that people can engage in in order to stay within those windows. And so rather than being open to the kinds of innovations of people and new ways of using them, (unintelligible) they encourage them just to be restrictive in their policies.

I don't think this is a helpful way of looking at domain name space. So despite the fact that the group has gone a long way down this path, I think we should try to put the brakes on it.

Man: (Wolfgang).

(Wolfgang): I want to mention also (unintelligible) which was discussed yesterday (because it's human rights). I mentioned the new gTLD process and what we discussed was also to look into or to be prepared to (punt) as something like watchdog and to look into the objections, which will come for new gTLDs mainly from the government advisory committee.

And to check into those objections would be in contrast to free speech principles. So that if one category - if you go through the list of the 1900 you have already included, you could expect a number of objections which are driven up by, you know, to avoid consumer confusion but just, you know, to protect free speech. And so it should be our task then to intervene and to make clean statements that we then, you know, have something to say if the objections come in.

Man: (Cathy). (Unintelligible) one - we don't to get - necessarily want to tune into the human rights issue because we are discussing that in NCSG later this

afternoon. Well we can talk about it here now but we will be discussing it in NCSG.

Kathy Kleinman: I'm Kathy Kleinman. For anybody that doesn't (unintelligible). Kathy Kleinman for anybody who doesn't know me and I'm finally back at home with NCUC. But I've been visiting other stakeholder groups. And you'll hear why this afternoon. We're coming in - I'm coming in with Google to talk about a project we're working on. And we're coming to the NCSG meeting this afternoon.

But I wanted to thank you for hosting my son (Sam) this morning and I need to yank him to do something. And I wanted to volunteer, and this is completely out of order, to help Wendy on the LEA issues because that's huge. So thanks.

Avri Doria: Can I comment on that? I just I'm glad about your son (Sam) but I understood that he's here under his own steam as a member. So I just want to make sure that, you know, we understand that it's great that he's related to the famous founder. However, you know, we must recognize that he is here on his own right.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you. Do we have any other discussion of other policy issues? So I think what particularly - I mean Wendy discussed the consumer metrics. Do we have - is there any sort of (action) to take on that or is it simply a matter of trying to deal with that within the GNSO? Wendy looks...

Man: I'm not sure if I can intervene.

Man: Yes.

Man: Hi. I was just wondering - I'm not sure if this is a question for this point in the agenda but do we have any kind of a task force or watch force over the

proposal from some countries to create alternate DNS to root services, which could ultimately fragment the DNS structure, as we know it.

Man: That is a good question people may ask. Has that - that issue hasn't really hit ICANN yet but that's no reason for us not to discuss it.

Man: Absolutely.

Man: (Unintelligible). Now I think it's a IETF draft at the moment, the alternate.

Man: ITU maybe or I'm not sure.

Man: (Okay).

Avri Doira: Now there is at least one IETF draft that hasn't been accepted by any working group as a work item but there is an IETF draft on the topic now, the AIP proposal.

Man: Yes. I assume that given it's not - you know, an certainly it's a long way - it's not a - it's not an accepted draft protocol yet so there's no - and it would require substantial sort of - my very brief glance at the proposal it looked like it'd require a (unintelligible) buy in from sort of IANA to implement.

Man: (Yes).

Man: So you think it's not worth the - our statement on that.

Avri Doria: Personally I think it's a fascinating topic. Not sure that the GNSO, which is dealing with ICANN's gTLDs, is in any sense related to it even if there were to be multiple roots and somebody were to create a super root that included the ICANN root as just one of it's roots, which is what essentially this AIP proposal if it worked would (do). You know, isn't really a GNSO issue.

Now that's no reason to say - in fact we've had various conversations in other places about NCUC perhaps doing things beyond. You know, just because GNSO is our remit here doesn't mean we can't make statements about wicket, we can't make statements about the AIP proposal and IETF.

What I would suggest on something like that is if someone thinks there's a statement we should make, they should draft it up and send it into the mix and we can talk about. I personally don't know what we would want to say about it but perhaps if someone else does have an idea of what we want to say about that or what we want to say about any other issue, they send it to the other members and we start talking about it and seeing if we can get support for it.

And, you know, that way we'd become more active. And there is no reason just because it isn't GNSO to not tackle it. But as a group of - (unintelligible) is a group. It's got a charter. It's got a charter that constrains what it does within GNSO but there's nothing in that charter that constrains what it does in the rest of world. It can do anything it wants outside of ICANN.

Man: So give that that's not a GNSO issue perhaps - and we're not...

Man: Well, may I comment on that?

Man: Yes, of course.

Man: Okay. So maybe it's not directly GNSO issue. I mean it's none of our business whether we have two or three or whatever else (unintelligible). They are already in the - on the Internet a member of alternate root and alternate domain named systems that can be used by anyone.

My question here is I'm a bit skeptical about and cautious about this kind of proposal because at start they may - the seem to have no momentum and

suddenly some country comes on and proves this kind of - or implement this kind of methodologies and we end up having a problem in our hands.

So in order for us to be able to stop some alternate DNS to come forward and to have domain names that point to one machine on one side of the fence and to other machine on the other side of the fence, I think maybe we should really prepare some letter of concern to say the least and move this forward to the appropriate forum because it will be interesting just to let our partners know that we are cautious and (how you) say aware of what is going on.

So I would like to invite anyone who wants to join me in doing such a document. And that will be interesting.

Man: Yes. I think excellent subject to sort of start discussing on the list but perhaps...

Man: Good.

Man: Yes. Could you try - just for the benefit - could you identify yourself?

Man: Sure. (Unintelligible).

Man: That's what we...

Man: I had done it previously but yes sure.

Man: Do we have any other - do we have any other policy issues that we wanted to raise from that list that we had or one that merited further discussion?

Man: (I've aggressively).

Man: We really didn't get anywhere on the consumer metrics like - Wendy did a good explanation of what we should - why it was a concern and we should be

doing something about it. But what should we - is there anything we should actually be doing about it. Issuing a - I mean obviously it's sort of well advanced within the GNSO but should we be putting a statement about how we feel the - some of the metrics are inappropriate or...

Man: I'm sorry. I'm not understanding. I'm not sure if you're addressing me or addressing generally the...

Man: Yes. It's just - just general, sorry.

Man: Okay. Okay. Sorry. Okay.

Man: I mean I think on the alternate roots issue I think (unintelligible) the one for the mailing list and I think there is - there does seem like there's a fair bit of interest in NCUC or something discussing it.

Man: Yes.

Man: Kind of wanting to...

Woman: Move on.

Man: Yes. I wanted to move on but - yes (Bill).

(Bill): Well (Regis) came over and poked me so I might as well say. On the question of making comments in other spaces, you know, we did have this kind of historical orientation that we shouldn't step outside the boundaries of the sandbox. But - and there are arguments (unintelligible) that. But I do think it's true that we - there's no reason why we shouldn't be able to speak to broader governance issues as well when relevant.

And we did have a chat yesterday with representatives of the U.S. Government about the possibility for example of us providing input on some

of their policy discussions and their development of positions for the GAC. And they welcomed an opportunity to hear from NCUC as to what we thought about the issues that they're - that are on their plate.

We also talked about the wicket negotiations were, which are a pretty big deal - thing right now in which in the international telecommunication in which I and some other people have been heavily involved in. And, you know, it's conceivable that it'd be useful to (think) things as well there on topics like that.

These other kinds of coalitions that are working around some of these broader issues such as the internet governance caucus that was formed in the IGF process - (Alissa)'s process really are sort of at a point now seems to me where they find it increasingly difficult to agree anything.

And we I think have a little bit more focused core team that is able to develop things and work with members and get ideas out.

So if people would welcome the possibility that we might indeed try to broaden our profile a little bit which could help with the recruitment and outreach issue.

I mean it - part of the issue of outreach I think is that unless you're already inside the ICANN space, you know, a letter from NCUC is sort of like well who are these guys and so on.

They're, you know, we don't - we're not really seeing outside of that space with the very kind of like verify world of the GNSO.

So, you know, perhaps some steps that would give us a little bit broader profile and progressive coalitions that are working on, you know, global Internet issues would be useful.

And so if anybody did favor doing something like that I'm going to be doing a lot of work in the coming months on these issues with a couple of organizations.

And certainly would welcome possibility of any kind of joint statement through NCUC, et cetera as well.

Man: It's Avri then (Wolfgang) next.

Avri Doria: The only one thing I wanted to add to that is just because yesterday we had that conversation with, you know, the representatives from the American government if NCUC could come up with coherent views from our particular international perspective we could pass them on as advice to other governments that we had contacts with as well.

I just wanted to - just because the conversation yesterday happened to be with the US I see it as a broader opportunity that, you know, if we can come up with a coherent perspective we can spread it to several different governments that are willing to listen to us.

Man: Yes Wolfgang?

(Wolfgang): Yes from my contacts I can say that the European commission is also very open for a direct contact to the commercial constituency.

But I would, you know, fully support what (Bill) has said. And I think it's even more important also to protect the multi-stakeholder model as a whole because the civil society of non-commercial users, you know, make a very specific profile for ICANN as a whole.

And, you know, we heard yesterday in the Internet governance workshop that, you know, there's some intergovernmental organization which goes around the world and tells uninformed people that the world could be better if

not this California based private corporation would, you know, unequally distribute IP addresses.

So and I think a lot of people in countries which have no contact so far to ICANN or to the ITF, you know, are totally uninformed.

And they refuse their knowledge about just, you know, there is a company in California and they have no clue that this company based in California has a broad range of different constituencies.

But it means if we raise our voice independently from ICANN as just a non-commercial constituency I think this would make a difference that needs to write let's say letters not only to the ICANN board or, you know, to the other members of the ICANN community but to have all the substantial contributions to the ITF to the ITU and other, you know, public forums elsewhere that we raise our voice as a non-commercial constituency within ICANN, you know, representing the interests of a broad range of people and not just of, you know, a constituency based in California.

So I think this would be important also to, you know, to get more profile and to protect the multi-stakeholder model within ICANN against an unfriendly environment.

Man: I know I said my personal perspective that the - we could issue of the idea that we need to be - civil society organizations need to be lobbying the government organizations that go to these things.

But these are often tiny, you know, branches of the government that used to deal with spectrum and are not really - are only gradually coming to realize that these are bigger public policy issues and that they need to be doing stakeholder outreach and so on.

And that hopefully this whole - part of the wicket process is hopefully we can actually put these processes where civil society are talking to these parts of the government in place.

And then hopefully these might actually be a way in which we can lobby the GAC productively which is to say lobby member states to say something during the GAC rather than trying to lobby the GAC itself which is essentially we I think we've all found very not really productive within the ICANN space.

So I think we need to - it's not so much going outside our - the ICANN space but working within a more useful - well useful way.

Yes, treating the GAC as a collection of governments rather than a single entity is how we have to approach this. And that means we all need to start talking to our governments.

And hopefully I think the wicket process will be productive.

Does anyone else have any comments on policy issues because if not I'd like to quickly make sure that we cover the Toronto outreach event now that (Robin) is here?

Any no - no policy comments? Okay so I'm going to close policy discussion here for the moment and we'll just talk about the outreach event for the next thing which we deferred from early on in the agenda? (Robin)?

(Robin): Thank you. Yes so we are going to do an event. NCUC will hold event in at the Toronto meeting. We're looking at October 19 which is the Friday before the event start - the ICANN meeting starts.

And we - we're looking at the model of the event that we did in San Francisco last year to sort of look at that and try to duplicate or (unintelligible) or, you

know, obviously we can make some changes but really try to do something similar to that event.

So in terms of talking about what the overall broad big picture topics are we've been looking at cyber security and human rights and where those two places mix.

And we're fortunate that (Brandon) has been working with the Citizen Lab people at the University of Toronto.

And so they've got a lot of expertise on cyber security issues and human rights free expression and privacy issues with respect to cyber security.

And so we'll have some great expertise, local expertise that we can draw upon. So I've - I'm putting out a call for anybody wants to go to participate to plan this session. I'd really appreciate it and you're more than welcome.

Let me know and I think with this week here and we haven't had a chance to do too much planning yet because we've been preparing for this week.

But now that we're here we can really start to focus on this and get ready for organizing it at the next ICANN meeting.

So I just kind of want to lay that out there and then I'd love to hear what others think about how we should do this or, you know, if you got ideas, if you want to get involved please speak up.

Man: No I will only point out that just I don't know if you were there at the time but we did mention this last night with the Larry Strickland.

You know, (Fiona) and Larry said well if you are doing something on wicket that would be real interesting to us.

So you've got the Assistant Secretary of Commerce expressing potential interest in participating if there's - we might consider maybe having a panel.

I mean if we have - if we're going to do it like what we did in San Francisco and have four or five panels we might do one of those on wicket at one point.

And I think clearly you want to do some on security partnering with the folks from Toronto. Whether you'd want them - there was some talk about making the whole thing security focused.

First of all this might be worth talking about as a group whether I mean when we did it in San Francisco we cast the net pretty broadly global public interest in ICANN.

And we took on a range of different issues, development, intellectual property, privacy and so on.

And do we want to do the same kind of smorgasbord approach or do we want to have a more narrowly focused on?

Personally I'm for the smorgasbord. But I've heard people say why don't we make it all about cyber security?

So it would be good to hear what others are thinking before the group of us go off and do this (unintelligible).

(Carlos)?

(Carlos): Hi. This is (Carlos). Does jumping on (Bill)'s point like every time you put up a new event like this one prior to in ICANN meeting it's a terrific outreach opportunity.

And certainly it's a good opportunity for us to communicate the relevance of the petty issues that we deal here in ICANN to people who are not aware of the relevance of those issues.

So that is to say to put up the events on cyber security and human rights certainly we can bring to the events people that are not that much aware of ICANN issues.

But they are interested in cyber security and people that do human rights (unintelligible) in Canada and in the regions certainly we can be - can feel a little bit more interested in what we are putting up here.

But my challenge here is to see how can we bridge the cyber security issue with the ITU1?

But just to get ourselves around this concept that's this is an outreach event. This is an event that's - states the relevance of the human rights approach in ICANN subjects.

So it will be good for us not to lose this track because I think it's good not only for the outreach purpose but to make a statement on the relevance on the issues that we tackle here on NCUC.

Man: (Kay)?

(Kay): Thanks. I thanks (Robin) for the initiative and thanking you - work you've done on this already. I've already indicated that I maybe to some help in some way.

And differently I think to try and engage with APC members to support the event (unintelligible) based in Canada in Mumbai.

One thing that I've been thinking about in terms of the cyber security, I agree with (Bill) it's good to have a smorgasbord particularly around an outreach event where we're trying to encourage people to see the range of issues, the range of human right issues, and any related issues that NCUC deals with versus what might be useful particularly as it - this happens before the ITU because it would be happening in Toronto in September, yes?

And the idea is that in November is perhaps to have some kind of smorgasbord about the sorts of the cyber security discussions that are going on in these different forums.

In other words what is being talked about in the IGS puts a focus on security? What's happening with the counterterrorism measures and the work that's happening (year round) the Internet? What's happening in the ITU as (Carlos), you know, rightly sees how is it related?

To try and encourage an understanding about some of these issues are connected specifically to ICANN there are some areas of overlap and some errors of distinct focus.

So and also and too I think it's very important if we can to encourage the ICANN fellows particularly those who've have come this time to seek to come again next time. Because this event is happening and it will be very important I think to get some of the ICANN fellows participating in some way.

And particularly if we're thinking about participants bringing in cross regional speakers particularly from developing countries, from Africa region, from Latin America from Asia-Pacific so that we do get different regional perspective on cyber security as well.

And again I mean ATC's got, you know, good network (demand) within those regions and would welcome an opportunity to try and reach out to them and bring them in in some way.

(Moliffi Ntluvo): Yes on that point can I comment?

Man: Yes.

(Moliffi Ntluvo): Yes this is (Moliffi) from Durbin. Again I thank you for the outline of the plans for the outreach activities in Toronto. It sounds great.

I would also really like to participate only because also it is our - my first exposure or interaction with some of the procedures of the ICANN and especially the noncommissioned users constituency.

And it will be an opportunity for and to us all see how to breach the gap between the advocacy work in civil societies spaces and the relevance of ICTs as a tool in the advocacy work and so on.

So just to say what would be the ways that one would prepare to participate in an effective way for the Toronto event?

Man: Thank you. Avri?

Avri Doria: I don't have a question. I don't have an answer for that question. But that is - it's actually interesting into that question in terms of how does one prepare for this event once we know about who the speakers are?

And maybe having a, you know, reading list of people's articles, the people that are going to be speaking presented beforehand might be a good thing so that you know who it is you're going to be listening to.

I had a different point that I want to bring up and I think that organizers of this know parallel to this completely separate from this there's been work on putting together a three day what's being called pilot leadership training within

ICANN which will be for all the newly elected/appointed leaders of, you know, new councilmember's, new board members, new committee members.

That'll be a three day training before the Toronto meeting basically overlapping, you know, so the Friday of your - of the NCUC seminar, that will still be ongoing.

Now that will take partly a 1 issue is that will take some of the people from ICANN that you might want to pull in out unless you happen to be collocated, you know, in the same place.

And I know there's been discussions about whether this thing happens at the university or happens at the site.

The other thing is that I'm wondering whether there's any value in sort of an active approach to trying to get at least one session scheduled in such a way that it can actually be fit into the pilot leaders and as this is about human rights issues and ICANN and if when you're doing the scheduling of your seminar especially if it's collocated.

If it's not collocated the whole thing falls apart. But to find a way to basically sort of have at least one session out of the three days of the others that is a common listed thing so that it's just a thought.

Man: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Okay I'm just want to say that it's not just focus on the cyber security. The event is supposed to be an outreach event for NCUC to show what we are doing, what kind of topics we are covering.

So if I remember in San Francisco event we talking - we had a panel about development. So should we - we maybe we can define different topics. One of them is cyber security but we should not focus only on that.

We can also talk about the privacy human right and so on and try to cover that from different perspective special issue (unintelligible) perspective. I'm sorry again and I don't want to see anything (unintelligible).

Man: (Bill)?

(Bill): Two points, first the - I think we are going to have to decide about the locational issue. Was decided?

Woman: Well I - we - it's been decided by ICANN staff that they're offering us the space in the venue so...

(Bill): Okay good.

Woman: I think then...

(Bill): I - then we should communicate that to the folks at Toronto because they were I think really talking like they were expecting we were coming over.

And we might consider whether we could do some sort of an evening event with them or something like that.

You know, it's (Brian Hubert) and his group and they're very progressive cyber security and Internet policy group. And they've got, you know, various people there.

So I know that they wanted to somehow host us in some measure. So maybe we could do an evening activity or something.

If we are collocated then I would say, you know, similar to what we've done at the IGF where GigaNet the Global Internet Governance Academic Network

has done joint things with APC because we were both conflicting at the same time.

It there's no reason why we couldn't try and work something out. It's no longer called the Academy. Now it's the...

Avri Doria: The Academy is the broader range of what at large would like to do for all newcomers.

(Bill): Okay.

Avri Doria: But what ICANN has agreed to and to get the confusion out of it is...

(Bill): Right.

Avri Doria: ...is to call this one a pilot leadership thingy. I think they called it program or whatever. Thingy works.

So a pilot leadership thing which is leading into the Academy but...

(Bill): Okay.

Avri Doria: ...separated the terms.

(Bill): So that sounds right sized. So I'm on that list but I'm not as active as you. You're much more engaged.

Maybe you can take the point to them that if they wanted to do a joint - I mean I don't know what the focus would be. It would depend on the rhythm of the training session or, you know, where you'll be in the curriculum on Friday.

Because I think don't you do kind of like general issues the first day and then the second? I mean by the third day aren't you doing kind of detailed ICANN process things?

Avri Doria: No the third day we're actually doing detailed policy issues.

(Bill): Oh okay. So maybe...

Avri Doria: So it would possibly fit in. So I'll certainly bring it up within that context. But you'll be on that, you know, that list will get active. This is just, you know, the hallway discussions that have been ongoing here.

Man: (Joy) did you want?

(Joy): I just wonder what the queue was on - I do have something to say but I don't want to jump ahead of anybody else.

Okay, okay yes unlike Avri. Please sir. I just want to pick out Rafik's point and I think it's a good one that - and I'm just wondering whether we shouldn't have some kind of working title maybe for the day around ICANN public policy, you know, focusing on private security development and whatever other thematic issues.

I mean you got a day. You can actually get through quite a bit in a day. And then, you know, drawing the thing to the end.

So that might be a way to do it so that it feels inclusive for those who are looking at - across a range of issues.

Man: (Mary)?

Woman: Okay.

(Mary): I guess you are doing cyber security I could offer up my husband as a potential speaker.

But more substantive point I'm in there is a point to that is that, you know, obviously for speaker (Schlutz) and things you want folks or companies around the industry maybe to talk about development or sort of technology or sort of trends that they see so that we can look ahead and see what kind of impacts or comments we might need to make to them whether they're doing things for ICANN or for private industry or for government contracts.

So just kind of general suggestions for in terms of the type and range of speakers that you might want or the industry might be quite a useful perspective or not depending on what the organizing committee decides.

The other point is that as you may have noticed there is a concerted effort on the part of the board at ICANN led by Steve Crocker to make the board more available to the community during ICANN meetings.

I mean the cancellation of the Friday meeting thereby freeing up the board from having to rush through resolutions has met that they are wandering the hallways a little more and have a little bit more time to chat.

So I know we've tried to do this when we last at there down in San Francisco that (Robin) organized in such great success.

So the location issue being settled I think it would probably be easier for board members to stop by either to be speakers or to socialize or attend a few events. And hopefully that will happen.

Man: Do we have anyone? Yes (Bill)?

(Bill): This might be too big a kettle of fish but I just thought I'd open - because we're wrapping up right?

Man: Yes.

(Bill): Yes. I just wondered if - I just wanted to see the looks on your faces when I say this and that will tell me whether or Avri, the look on Avri's face says no it's not a good idea.

I - and she doesn't even have to know what it is but that's okay.

I had a talk the other night with (Bayertron) and some other people. Actually it was the first night I was here.

And we were kind of brainstorming about the point that some of us had made when they canceled Friday.

And I'm pretty sure (Wendy) who's falling asleep disagrees with me that just losing the Friday is kind of a pity and that there could...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Bill): Okay, and that there could be a different a different kind of use of it, made of it which would be to do something like a kind of bar campy but real bottom-up optional brainstorming group think type thing that has no outcomes and so on where people could sort of just announce topics and form little discussion groups around them.

Because it's - well we we're talking about and I really feel strongly about this.

So a lot of the most interesting conversations I have at ICANN meetings are in the hallways.

There is just, you know, you bring all these really smart talented people together and then they go into these like amazingly constipated heavily

structured sessions. And it becomes painful and you sit there and you want to fall out of your chair.

And you kind of wish you could kind of go off and just think over the horizon with some of these folks about different types of issues.

And we started talking about whether one could do something that isn't required. Anybody that doesn't want to come to them doesn't have to come.

But they could, ICANN's could simply make the rooms available and make this a kind of a place for over the horizon thinking about stuff that isn't fitting into the narrow confines of a schedule.

Personally I think it would be kind of cool to try something like that. And I think it would be potentially nice as a silo breaking down outreaching and reaching kind of thing.

I wondered whether (Ang Beartron) was very interested in it. And of course he likes new ideas and some other people did too.

I wonder if people here have any views on whether something like that would be good or they just prefer to get the hell out of town and - or go on tourism?

Man: Rafik, (Wendy)?

Rafik Dammak: Usually people leave by (unintelligible) Friday. Usually people leave by (unintelligible) Sunday.

So if you are on GNSO council they push you to leave on Friday. So...

(Wendy): So despite my outburst earlier I don't in fact this agree with that idea. I was completely in favor of canceling the board's puppet theater on Friday.

But I think it would be useful to give people time to interact more than they get to during the highly scheduled meetings.

It would be very interesting to imagine this community engaged in some un-conference exercise.

I am not sure whether you could get people to take an extra day out of their schedule and stay. But I wonder how much it would cost the organization to try to host with the space and what it would (unintelligible)?

Man: (Wolfgang)?

(Wolfgang) This (unintelligible) idea is a great idea. I support it fully. But to be realistic after one week of ICANN meetings on the Friday people are totally tired and say want to get rid of all this customs and want to go home.

So it means probably one idea could be, you know, to push the organizers to have, you know, within this one week Tuesday, Wednesday before it got a - then a free afternoon where, you know, for the self-organization of things like that.

So we have not scheduled meetings. We're just going to say okay here the space, you know, come together and probably, you know, like poster sessions in a bar camp the that you can collect this (budget note).

But I also share really (Bill)'s experiences that sitting for six, or seven, or eight hours in a council meeting while the real life goes outside in the hallways this is not the most efficient way.

On the other hand I understand that you have to have these meetings and it means you have to do both and not to play against each other.

Man: (Unintelligible) I take one (tired) and would suggest that if it was any such a venture not start first thing in the morning.

And but yes it's working. Do you have any more comments on this because I - we still got a couple of things I'd like to cover briefly if we can?

Avri Doria: I got one quick one which is while it's probably a nice idea I don't see how you would get most people that have to budget for and whatever coming the meetings.

And I think you have to recognize that those that aren't volunteers in the GNSO and having to sit through the session we do have our bar camps at other times during the days that we're already here.

So while in principle it's really kind of a cool idea I'm not sure that you get anybody to stay here on a Friday afterwards to actually do it.

Man: (Joe)?

(Joe): Maybe the version (unintelligible) also Rafik's point about ICANN travel support and hotel nights and all that maybe if they were to reinstate Friday as an official day and simply stretch the main schedule out and then stick half the - half a day of unstructured thinking or, you know, whatever in there that might be one way of doing it without it being a separate segment that you would make a choice to spend the money to stay for that, you know?

Avri Doria: Well we used to have that. That was what happened Friday afternoons. Everybody got together on different crowds doing different trips and talked about whatever but yes.

Man: If we don't have more comments on this one I know we had a couple of items of business to fill. And one of them was (Joy) had an item for any other business?

(Joy): I did. We just had the announcement that Beijing will be the location of the April 2013 meeting.

And I think it's a good opportunity for us to reflect about any message we want to send to the ICANN board about that meeting and (unintelligible) processes for it.

Yes for example if there was an idea of having a further follow-up to the Toronto pre-event, you know, there is - are there issues around (IT), you know, exits participation in the ICANN meeting or meetings around it that we might want to raise?

You know, are there any meetings that we might want to send about, you know, security online while we're there and giving secure open access at the - at least at the venue arrangements around accommodation and making sure that they are accessible to the venue.

I know in other conferences been organizing past experience (you need), you know, some distance away from conference venues and so on.

So I just think it's an opportunity for us to deliver the planning and the timing-wise it may be useful to make some kind of comment about that now.

Man: Any thoughts on that? Yes (Carlos) you wanted to speak on something else? Was there any other comments on the Beijing?

Gee I think it's a really good comment but I'm not sure if it's anything we should be doing right here. But yes it's a very good issue.

All right I'll move on to (Carlos).

(Carlos): So this is (Carlos). As we are running a little bit out of time so just very quickly we have this workshop approved with for next IGF.

It's a joint proposal from APC, CTS, FTV, our center back in Brazil and CUC. And the workshop's called human rights Internet policy and the public policy role of ICANN.

So we have our deadline I believe this Friday to send out the confirmation of the panelists, the people that are going to be speaking on our panel.

So I would encourage you to give us suggestions on good people that we could have on this workshop.

I know in every single year we have this situation which not everyone that are around here at NCUC and attending ICANN meetings is traveling to the IGF, especially this IGF of this year with a lot of complicated issues that we don't want to and have the time to dig deep on that right now.

But we're going to send you guys I believe most of you know about this workshop. But so far what we have is the submitted panelists as someone from APC, with someone from NCUC.

That's a first place will be (Robin) but I'm not sure if Robin will be able to travel towards Beijing.

And it will be important. And this is a topic that I would like you to suggest names. We need - it would be great to have someone from the ICANN board to be in this panel.

It makes perfect sense as we are setting up this workshop to have a good conversation on human rights impact on ICANN board's decisions and the activities played out by ICANN.

So suggestions on someone from the board that could fill this role will be great and someone from the GAC as well.

And unfortunately for us we had suggested that the GAC representative from Brazil would be a good person to have on this panel for a number of reasons.

And for Brazil's statement in previous meeting and that we had - that we needed to have some regional diversity so it'll be good to have someone from Latin America and the Caribbean to be in this spot.

But unfortunately we're having a change in the Brazilian representative in the GAC so probably this is going to be - and my colleagues here from Brazil can confirm this, will probably be the last meeting that (Homer) is attending as the Brazilian representative in the GAC.

So we need to get into a conversation on the GAC representative that we'll be having in this workshop.

So I would say apart from a discussion on the topics and the contents that we want to address in this fairly broad placed workshop, the wording's very broad on the impact of human rights on ICANN itself.

On a more practical tone we certainly need suggestions for those two slots and the panelists. Some are from the GAC, some are from the board.

I wouldn't say not specifically one person but a couple suggestions would be good. That's it. Any suggestions?

Do we...

Avri Doria: A suggestion for you. I don't know, Sweden's been really big on trying to do human rights stuff at this time. I wonder if you'd talked to (Maria)?

Man: And you're confirmed as well Avri just...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes I know. I saw that.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: So you might consider talking to (Maria) from Sweden because Sweden's been very active this year especially in human rights issues. Bo I don't know but that's a possibility.

Man: Any other questions for (Carlos) on that?

Woman: (Unintelligible) that the governor of Ecuador may be interested in participating. I mean I think I'm saying that in jest.

But I think we should also think about which government because, you know, all governments have mixed human rights records around the Internet on the (near thinking) in Brazil but certainly one that's willing to engage.

So let's have more discussion and ideas may be on the list. And as people have thoughts and contributions, you know, they're - we're still open to them so...

Man: Any (unintelligible) (Wolfgang)?

(Wolfgang): I don't know how many workshops in Baku will deal with human rights issue. I don't know whether this is the only one or the main one or whatever.

But, you know, there is some ongoing debate on this issue. So there was the conference in Sweden. I also wanted to propose (Maria) as a potential speaker.

There is a conference on human rights and Internet governance organized by the German Foreign Ministry in September. And a lot of material is produced.

So that means my recommendation would be, you know, if you prepared a workshop, you know, to have on - at least on the Web site a list, this related documents so that people can prepare.

And so that means that you, you know, really positioned yourself with this workshop like a spider in this network of various other things.

So and it would make absolutely sense, you know, to find out, you know, what (unintelligible). Probably (Bill) knows because he's in the MAC, you know, how many workshops are dealing with human rights issues.

Because this could become against the background of human rights record and also (Vadan) could be a very, very delicate discussion that goes far beyond ICANN issues.

Man: Do we have any more comments on that? We are out of time. So if you've got no more questions for (Carlos) I think we'll probably draw this meeting to a close.

Of course many of the other issues discussed today we will have - we will be able to raise again in the NCSG meeting this afternoon if we have time.

Okay in that case I'll thank you all for your attendance. I would ask those who are remote participation if those of you who are still online if you could just I'll just do a bit of a roll call for attendance purposes. But the rest of you thank you. This is - thank you for your attendance.

So who is on line, who's remote participation?

(Muno Pacia): Yes on remote participation this is (Muno Pacia) from Portugal.

Man: Yes anyone else?

Moliffi Ntluvo: Yes on the remote participation for another line on the phone line from South Africa this is (Moliffi Ntluvo).

Man: Sorry I didn't get your name?

Moliffi Ntluvo: (Moliffi Ntlovu), N-T-L-O-V-U.

Man: Yes sorry I'll have to follow that up. And I know (Joe Lee) was there earlier. Thank you all for your - anyone else on remote participation or online?

I thank you all for your participation during the meeting.

Man: Thank you. Goodbye.

Man: Goodbye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: That's right 1:30 the NCSG meeting starts not here. It's in the (Carlin) 1/2 room.

END