

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting
Non For-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (NPOC) Meeting

Tuesday 16 October 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.

Alain Berranger: The agenda I propose this morning is to, first of all, do a (Tour de Tab) as we say in French in Canada. So may I ask that we start from the end of the table and then go to the remote participants?

And so some of the - allow me a little housekeeping. So when you speak, please state your name for the transcript or the record, and you can also include your affiliation if you want. Thank you.

(Christy Gage): Sure, I'm (Christy Gage) and I'm with the American Heart Association.

(Todd LaCoke): My name is (Todd LaCoke); I'm also with the American Heart Association. I'm the Director of Enterprise Solutions.

(Scott Windermark): My name is Scott (Windermark), I'm the Director of Strategic Advancement for the American Bible Society and we've applied for dot Bible.

(Edward Mohaum): Good morning, my name is (Edward Mohaum). I'm with the (Yamar Angle) Foundation in Costa Rica and NPOC member.

Alain Berranger: My name is Alain Berranger, I'm on the Elected Chair of the NPOC and I represent (Pon de Jaskenet) as a North American Representative for that foundation - for that Ecuadoran foundation.

Klaus Stoll: Good morning, my name is Klaus Stoll, Executive Director of Global Partnership Foundation and also the Membership Secretary for NPOC.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Good morning, my name is Marie-Laure Lemineaur. I'm sorry, my name is Marie-Laure Lemineaur, I belong to a NPOC executive committee on the Share program. Thank you.

(Catherine Gribbons): Good morning. I'm (Catherine Gribbons) from the Canadian Red Cross.

(Christopher Rasey): Good morning, I'm (Christopher Rasey) with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Cross Societies. I'm new to these ICANN Meetings; I just started with the Federation. And we're NPOC members as well.

(Yelena Cogne): Good morning, my name is (Yelena Cogne) from (Uniform SA). We're an (Indie owned) registry in South Africa.

(Joe Teburn): Good morning, my name is (Joe Teburn) and I'm chairman of the Common Foundation for ICT Development.

(Laura Pace): Good morning, Laura Pace, (Common Foundation).

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much. I will turn to Marie-Laure Lemineaur with the task with keeping an eye on the (unintelligible) connect, the teleconference connection with our distance participants. And Marie-Laure, could you please tell us who's on line?

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: (Unintelligible).

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much. I'll tell you about the agenda, so the first half-an-hour will be housekeeping for the Constituency. It will consist of two parts.

I will give you an activity report of what the Constituency has done since the Prague meeting. And the second part will be presented by Kraus Stoll, and he will tell you about our outreach plans.

So what have we done since Prague? I would say that the first priority has been outreach efforts to international and not-for-profit organizations that have not been engaged in the past with ICANN.

To put this in perspective, we have about 50 members in NPOC. And there is probably 20 million NGOs and not-for-profits in the world although I've never seen actual research that confirms the estimates of these numbers. And talking to our audience today, if you do know about such a study, it would be great to know. So you can see that we really, really only scratch the surface.

And the organizations that come to mind are really federated in the sense that they represent - they have their own membership behind them. The most important outreach we've done this last quarter has been with (Tellus Center.org). (Tellus Center.org) is a foundation based in the Philippines which promoted the networking and knowledge dissemination about tele-centers, or cyber cafes if you want to; that's a rough idea of what it is. Tele-centers have a tendency to be not-for-profits and with social objectives, and cyber cafes are more down-to-earth connectivity for off the street.

And the other organization we have engaged with is (World Summit Award). The last three months have also been marked by the creation of a program committee. NPOC was created in - formally created in the Singapore Meeting in 2011, and most of our first year was involved with organizational issues and elections and recruiting.

You know that the ICANN model is based on Stakeholders consultation and participation, and that means a lot of volunteering is going on. So you either come to ICANN on the payroll of your employer or you are a volunteer. And most of the work that they want us do in relation to ICANN is really not on your job description if you're employed, and if you are a volunteer then it becomes part of your pro bono job description.

But we called for a nomination for Chair Program Committee; we had a valuation committee. We did all this in, you know, in a transparent way. It was announced recently that the (Myra Lamina) who is sitting at my right was appointed as the Chair of the Program Committee.

And we had such an excellent list of candidates that we were pleased to appoint also co-chairs in the persons of Poncelet Ilelji from The Gambia, and he is the Director of Media Digital and Media Center of YMCA of the Gambia; part of that larger global federation of YMCAs.

And (Olevia Koeme) from the Togo; so two members from West Africa if you want, will be co-chairing and assisting Marie-Laure in delivering on our program.

We noticed that for the first time we had a light debate on NPOC Voice regarding the protection of international non-governmental organizations and NGO in general. NPOC Voice is open to anyone in the public who wants to read the archives or would like to get involved in the dialogue.

And what that debate showed is that granting special protection to anyone does open the floodgate of protection for all. And of course, I don't know how to end all that, but I am responsible for sharing this conclusion from this consultation.

I see that our Founding Chair Debbie Hughes has just joined us, so welcome Debbie.

Debbie Hughes: Hello. I just want to say welcome, good to see a lot of non-profit NGOs around the table. It's good to be here.

Alain Berranger: Thank you Debbie. So as I was saying and we'll have a presentation by Klaus Stoll in a few minutes, we have designed to your NPOC outreach strategy and so you'll hear a little bit more about this in a few moments.

The other interesting deployment is that we applied for and were granted a slide session slot at the Internet Governance Forum Meeting in Baku, Azerbaijan. And of course, this is very early, good results for us, and we barely have our program committee up and we have to deliver our first significant workshop in a few days in Baku.

And so NPOC will be represented by two of our program chair people. Marie-Laure will lead and chair the NPOC delegation at Baku and chair the session, and she will be assisted by Poncelet Ilelji from The Gambia on this.

This is perhaps a good time to tell you that we've had wonderful news about two weeks ago, that the YMCA of The Gambia was sending a delegation of three people to Toronto. And you can quickly see and look around the room and say, "Well what happened? We don't see them?"

Well, what happened is that Poncelet was able to get his Visa from the Canadian Embassy in Dakar. But the two board members were not refused, but they were delayed until today. And they were asked to come back and pick up the Visa today which essentially (unintelligible) for refusing them access to Canada in as much as they could attend this conference. Then learned that Canada also refused and denied Visa to about half of the Nigerian Delegation to Toronto.

So when you know the important of Nigerian economy and geography in Africa, you wonder why that has happened.

So NPOC looked into it and we noticed two things. We noticed the Canadians - I have to be careful about how I say this and try to be totally unbiased, but we have as a nation - and this is not a personal opinion or joy, but Canada has tightened its immigration and Visa rules. It's much, much more difficult now to come into Canada if you come from a developing nation.

And the second thing, and that becomes an ICANN issue, is that nobody advised - I don't think there was any pre-preparation for the peak Visa demands for such a meeting as ICANN. And it turned out that the Prime Minister of Canada was visiting Africa at the same time as the surge of these applications was coming.

So we have very small structures and very small embassies, and there was just not enough arms and legs to do both the welcoming of the Prime Minister in Dakar in preparation for his visit to (Unintelligible) to go to the Summit of the (Frankovon) Summit, and therefore there was no consulate staff to give Visas. So this is a bit disappointing.

On the internal administration, we are working out the devilish details on the NCSG application form. This will now be a surprise to Debbie. But just to clue you in a little bit, in order to become a member of NPOC, you have to become a member of NCSG first.

And that's not our rule but the Stakeholders Group rule; when the current Executive Committee came into function that was a reality.

To be clear, we are in solidarity with our colleagues of the Stakeholders Group, but we don't always agree. We at NPOC favor our policy of inclusiveness - total inclusiveness - and ease of access into membership. And we are working on this right now with our colleagues.

And I'm pleased to tell you that we expect to finally business as usual on that front in a matter of weeks. Our meeting, our Stakeholders Group meeting is occurring later in the week for a day; I'm a bit fazed on agenda. But that's the major issue to be resolved.

So as I mentioned, we have about 50 members, give-or-take the details I just referred too. We continue to recruit NPOC members on a regular steady pace, the bulk of our new members being from developing countries and emerging economies.

But of course, do realize that we are thrilled to have new members from OECD countries such as located in places such as North America and Europe. And in fact, it is those members that will give robustness and the developing country members will give us outreach. I had mentioned that these numbers are modest by any measures.

So looking forward a little bit, we are planning a robust involvement in the World Summit of the Information Society in 2012 in Geneva. We will be doing this in partnership with the Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation whose Executive Director is at my left Klaus Stoll, so I will let you know more of our plans there when I report to you again in Beijing.

We have four minutes before our first guest speaker will come to this mike, so let me tell you about the program for the rest of the time. We will first hear from the (Connette Foundation), (Dr. Josette Tabone) with the - (Connette) is also the Secretary of the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative, so two non-(unintelligible) activities, and (Dr. Tabone) will tell us about this.

At ten o'clock, Vanda Scartezini will come and tell us about the NomCom, the Nominating Committee. So this is a committee that recommends appointments to various positions in ICANN.

And as I speak to you, of course NPOC as a new constituency does not have a seat on NomCom. But the process is moving forward. The reason is that it needs NPOC to have a member on NomCom requires a change of the status of ICANN. And that is - it can be easily done but it takes a little bit of time.

People are coming up to me and whispering in my ears since I've arrived in Toronto, "Don't worry, be patient; the process is going as fast as it is." But I can only inform you officially that we have requested membership and we are waiting response.

That said, I'm quite optimistic that we will be granted a seat very soon, enough for us to do the call for nominations over the next three months and to have a NomCom Rep for NPOC fully operational at the Beijing meetings of the Nominating Committee. You can imagine the important of the Nominating Committee in our structure.

At ten thirty, we will have Olof Nordling and Alice Jansen; they will come to talk to us about the accountability and transparency issues at ICANN.

At 11:00, we will have the pleasure of meeting and hearing from Renalia Abdul Rehim with - besides the previous Executive Director of the Global Knowledge Foundation based in (Cola lum Pore), is now an executive of At-Large Advisory Committee. And she will come talk to us about our three paper which is a position paper authored by At-Large about making ICANN better; better organized, more efficient organization.

I know Klaus, that I have not left you very much on the presentation of the outreach. Do you want to take an executive swap at it please?

Klaus Stoll: Thank you Alain. Just very quickly and don't take it as a presentation, take it as a piece of information. We were thinking about a lot of how we can actually manage the outreach and the membership (unintelligible) of NPOC.

And I think the key theme we are trying to pursue is that we just don't need members as members, but we need informed members, members who know actually what's going on.

And for that we are designing at the moment and you will see on the NPOC Web site and other sites, an outreach plan which includes for example, three Webinars which includes workshops, which includes presentations, which includes newsletters starting from this December.

The aim is to inform the non-profit community and the NGO Community really about the works of Internet Governance in the framework of ICANN. And then they can make a choice of what it would look like to become a NPOC member or not.

The other step which we are doing is very different from, a little bit, what happens in other constituencies before. We are deliberately involving a number of organizations who are normally not on the radar of ICANN. And now I'll all ready mention for example, the (unintelligible) Foundation and other foundations.

And what we're trying to do is we need to do our job in the way that we are serving in that governance, in that we are serving the NGOs and we are not mainly serving NPOC as an organization. And I think that is quite a sound approach.

The other thing is that we are trying also, as Alain mentioned, to be a little bit present in other forums. Like for example, the IGF (unintelligible), but also for example (Oakla in Fusa) presentation which will follow for example, in the Child Online Protection Initiative in Africa, Asia and other areas.

To be there, to reach new non-profits, and new NGOs are developing slowly but steadily.

I have to end, unfortunately, a little bit on a sour note. You will ask, "Klaus, you are the membership secretary and we are the members, 50 for a year, year-and-a half is not much.

Believe me, it's not a reason of organizations don't want to join; we could have easily over 200, 300 members. The problem is quite simply that by first getting over the hurdle of filling out the form which basically has three booby-traps in there, and basically booby traps that says, "You don't take care, suddenly (unintelligible) will see without even knowing it.

And secondly, after you actually successfully manage to get through booby-traps over, you have to be approved. And what do you do when you have a enthusiastic member who really wants to join, who wants to engage, and then that will leave him here and he's in for five, six months or longer because basically the approval process internally just doesn't move forward.

And to be absolutely honest with you, I've got quite a stack of members who want to join, but I don't want to frustrate them. And until we hopefully in this week or next week, solve the problems of actually getting the members moving in timely and good fashion, it doesn't also make sense - too much sense for us to put them into processing.

And the other point is quite simply, you have to think about there is somebody who really wants to become an engaging in Internet Governance in the ICANN process, and then suddenly he hears, "Look, it doesn't work." It takes a few months and maybe we approve and it doesn't.

And so it doesn't make us look good. And I think that's the worse in the matter of the whole thing. It's this kind of problems which are absolutely not necessary, but is correct that we have to get it over. But I want to finally end on a positive note, and actually to end.

Alain, me and a lot of people are getting very good signals that this will be resolved now. Just to let you know what's happened, and I think hopefully this week or so we will get that out of the way, and then hopefully the floodgates open; we're ready for it.

Thank you very much.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much Klaus, and thank you to everyone in the room for letting us handle a few housekeeping issues. And I think it's now time to give the microphone to our guest.

So just before we do, we've had a few people joining on the remote participation and we would just like to acknowledge their presence.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Yes, we would like to welcome (Poncelet), from the Executive Committee as Vice-Chair. And also to (Uliqua), welcome to our meeting.

Alain Berranger: Thank you (Marie). So, Dr. Tabone, the room is yours and your Power Point presentation is loaded up.

Dr. Tabone: Well good morning all, and thank you very much Alan. And we only really became acquainted about ten minutes ago, and I thank you very much for in that short period of time, elevating me to the rank of doctor, you know, which I thank you very much for that.

Before going into the presentation, possibly I should tell you a little about the Commonwealth; some people may not be familiar with the Commonwealth. And then a little about the organization I represent which is very common but I won't spend a lot of time on that.

The Commonwealth Organization really brings together 54 member countries that were former British Colonies. The Commonwealth has been around for a number of years now, and it's mainly purpose in being is largely to promote

values of democracy. And then it is very much involved in collaboration, promoting collaboration, between countries which takes form of dividing the technical expertise, it trains a lot of plastic building, the type in a program. So that is really the Commonwealth.

The organization I try to represent which is the (Connette) is one that has been around now about 20 years. And its mandate is to promote the cooperation between the member states. And that is relating to information technology and retail communications. So that's really to give you a sense, you know, about where we come from in this.

But our purpose here this morning, and you invited us very kindly to be here, is to talk to you about the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative.

I don't know how many of you attended the high level meeting really yesterday, but it was something that we had planned really for a couple of years. It was interesting; I sat through the whole day. And possibly the most, you know, recurring theme in that discussion yesterday really had to do with security.

And that is the whole purpose of the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative. The Commonwealth is part of really a program in promoting cooperation in matters relating to technology; that has been around for some time and set up an Internet Governance for about, you know, four years ago.

And one main reason in setting this up is again, something that was very much a topic of discussion yesterday, is because the makeup of the Commonwealth, really better than half of it consists of small countries or small island states; a really good number of those are really developing countries. And they don't have the means to participate in Internet and Internet Governance related, you know, forum.

And the Commonwealth idea was set up precisely to attend to join these countries in some fashion into really matters having to do with the Internet. And really doing so by way of outreach and helping matters relating to capacity building.

And in the course of really doing so and in the course of setting this up, a number of really public policy issues that were cited by the various Stakeholders that were taking part in this forum, we call it Internet Governance Forum. A long list of issues that really concerned them or they really needed help with, and the needs really had to do with content, with access.

But always at the top of the list was the issue of security, another one was really child protection. And it's, you know, for that reason that we thought that it was really important for the Commonwealth, it almost had an obligation to reach some of these countries, to come up with some initiatives to address this.

And when started out, we were really wanting some training programs or introducing modules in some of the training activities of the Commonwealth to introduce people from the Commonwealth in these developing countries to the Internet while it was about. We also really set up depositories that really consisted of policies and legislation and programs that had to do with security that really, people could tap into which could help to inform things that they were doing in their country, and most particularly, were relating to policy.

But nevertheless, we really had a feeling early into this, that this overtone was not enough. And you had this situation, not only in these countries, where actually they did not know what it is that they needed to protect the citizens, you know, (unintelligible). The very limited access to the Internet was really more secure for them.

So that is how this Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative really came about. The small number of governments and very weak upon ourselves to really come up with what started off as a concept to address this situation in very many of these countries. And really a lot of efforts aimed at providing some sort of assistance in capacity building by a really large number of organizations; the Counselor of Europe, the ITU, the British Commonwealth itself running these programs for law enforcement people or just informational type programs.

But all these activities, you know, were fragmented. And there was, you know, very limited coordination.

So what we saw as being what we needed was really something that was really addressing the needs of these countries in a more coherent and very comprehensive way.

For example a number of these countries did not have the appropriate legal infrastructure framework very on the books. And there's really no point in training policemen or prosecutors if you do not have really legislation. You have really a number of these places law enforcement people who are not even computer literate. So one has to really start really before that.

So the concept that we developed - this initiative - was one that addressed this capacity building requirement of the other countries in a more holistic way. And really in the course of doing that, you know, we also recognized that the commonwealth itself as an organization has very little byway of resources to do this.

And what we saw as the emerged tactical - the emerged approach to this - is to try and draw in the base entities that had something to contribute to this. So what we started doing is we started approaching these mini organization like the consultant of Europe, the ITU, the UN and our country which later though we have about 25 different organizations that are involved in this. And

all of really which organizations have something to contribute whether it's by way of a specialist capacity that they have or other resources to really enable many member countries to be better equipped to combat cyber crime.

And we agreed to formulate this initiative which we presented to the commonwealth heads of government. They meet every two years and they did so last year in fact. And the commonwealth heads of government saw this as a very working initiative. And it was something so they really endorsed this. And I think that - well we don't have to read it, you have the slide there before. I think we were provided with a copy of this.

Alain Berranger: Yes.

Dr. Tabone: So this initiative was really endorsed by really heads of government and then in the course of the last, you know, few months we really immediately we set about translating this really concept into a practical, you know, reality. And the demand first of all we have because of a number of really partners in the space and the nature of the accuracies that we're involved in is we have really established a governing structure for this initiative that reflects the diversity of the consortium that is involved.

And the government structure essentially consists of we have a board which you would call an executive management group which is, you know, responsible for making important decisions about really project activities. And then the management group is really made up of government - member government representatives.

There's a steering group which is drawn from all the agencies - the entities - which are represented. And then there's the second chariot which is the operation of the initiative. And then in the recent sponsor we have been really going around and informing many member countries really about this. And the response has been very overwhelming in that we are now really have projects in really several countries.

In Africa the first project is Ghana. We're working with that country on a development of a strategy on the cyber crime. And the strategy is in effect really a checklist of the several things that would need to be done in the country and it identifies what needs to be done, how it needs to be done, who will be responsible really for this establishing time frames and really looking at the aspects of really financing this. And the initiative to computations of its consortium members then provides the assistance in which is required out of these countries.

Aside from Ghana, we have a request that we're dealing with from Kenya, from Gambia, Demoreleves, Trinidad and Tobago and I think there was another country and Uganda. And in addition to that, several countries who have really indicated that they have an interest in this.

I think that's really what this really initiative is really about. It's something that is, you know, very much needed. It's something that has resonated first of all with these partner organizations that we're working with. They see value in us really working together while we're then, you know, tripping over each other in the course of work that we're trying to do.

And they see also value in this, you know, coherent I suppose as to, you know, fragmented approach. And the truth of the whole thing is now really in the next few months or so when we start really showing some results on the ground and that legislation that we have helped with has really been enacted and that the implementation of that is really taking place in these countries and they have really capabilities of really monitoring, investigating and prosecuting and for doing really what is necessary.

I haven't really followed the presentation. I don't normally do that. But I thought the presentation maybe showed a reference point to members about that. But if you have any questions but I thank you very much for inviting us here.

Alain Berranger: Well thank you very much Dr. Tabone for joining us in this presentation. I will now turn it to the remote or in the room audience for any questions or comments. Let's check the online. Is there any online questions right now?

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: So far, no we don't. Oh, (Amber) is saying thank you for the presentation. And they are following also on Twitter.

May I make some comments? Okay. I have the mike so I'll take the opportunity.

Thank you very much for the presentation. It's very interesting. We certainly know that we must train law enforcements together with UK and law enforcement in the US are leading in the field of cyber crime protection. They are doing extraordinary work in the world and a lot of interesting training in different countries and continents.

And it's very interesting for us to learn about what you're doing and sharing, you know, the lesson learned because some of our members actually in jail are involved with cyber crime protection. So I want to thank the foundation (unintelligible) if I may mention is also starting working on cyber protection in Africa for its appealing to us and we can also see from the presentation that you are working.

The partnership model is also appealing to us because this is the way we work and we really believe that together - institutions together - can have a better shop than working on their own. So thank you very much.

Alain Berranger: Excellent. So I'm surprised that we finished ahead of time. Our experience is we finish late. So thank you very much for that too. Typical good commonwealth discipline isn't it? We will use the next speakers or colleagues that have come to meet us are not in the room yet so I think I will mention the session that -- going back to NPOC programs -- mention the session that we

are hosting tomorrow at 9 o'clock and it's a 90 minutes panel session on the subject of multi stakeholders process of the NGO perspective.

The use of the multi stakeholder at ICANN is very ICANN specific. And we thought we would bring in some expertise from the outside to tell us how this model is used in other organizations. So we invited - we were lucky enough to have Dr. (Sam Manfrankel) from York University come to speak to us about that. Dr. (Manfrankel) has about 25 years of experience in the field of information and technology communication for development or as others like to say for poverty or addiction.

And so he will help us open up our horizons in ICANN in terms of how others use the multi stakeholder's process. And we are all doing this - we realize the discussion at ICANN about the evolution of the multi stakeholders model process is a long discussion. It's not going to start or end with the NPOC session but we just wanted to help along and contribute to the dialogue. We will do this in collaboration with at large colleagues. And I'm looking forward to this event. One moment please.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Sorry to interrupt. We have (Yolina) a remote participant. She's representing an issue based in France. It's called together against cyber crime. And they've done interesting research. She's mentioned that the data research work with the University of Strasburg and cyber land protection and they are a member of the copy initiative of the ITU.

Man: It would be interesting if they could possibly send us a note about that to enable a connection.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Fine. I think they're listening to us and she's saying that they're very interested in sharing. They did actually present the results during an IT workshop engine but again I think they can send us the presentation of the results of this survey and then we can upload it and send it to you too.

Man: That's something I'd be very interested in. Thank you very much.

Woman: You're welcome.

Man: Just as a side remark - seems to be re-clustering (unintelligible) of the ITU. We will be very interested in talking to you about this.

Man: TKPS - the Kenobi Partnership Foundation which runs the executive directors, also a member of the copy initiative of the ITU and we would be also interested in connecting with you about this.

Man: Okay. Thank you very much.

The ITU is really one of the partners and the ITU has really a range of resources that have to do with securities, cyber requirement and also child protection. But we are very interested in even establishing a name with your organization was a nonprofit organization really ourselves. So I think that we're very happy to have had this opportunity here. Thank you.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much. Alain Berranger speaking and welcome to (unintelligible) on the remote participation. There's an example of how ICANN works in an integrated way. (Yoliva) has already registered her membership application into NPOC. And I find it very interesting because she bumped into the new CEO in Budapest. And the new CEO after realizing that she wanted to get involved - their organization wanted to get involved in ICANN - she got in contact with us.

So that's a good example. Thank you very much Dr. (Taverna) and we will move on to the next group of speakers just in time to do the chair rearrangement. Thank you and we'll be right back.

For those of you online we are just doing the connecting with the next presentation. So thanks for your patience and we'll be back to you very soon.

Woman: Yes. Thank you for having us here. And I think you are a recent group. A recent group - I would like to ask you if you want to have a moderate general view about all the NomCom issues or we go straight to what happened using this year from last year. And we can have this. One presentation is more and we have (unintelligible).

Man: While we're doing this I want to formally introduce you to (Vandolf Kartizini) who is the chair of the nominating committee. And I think we also have in the room Olof Nordling and Alice. Welcome.

But actually I would like to go back to taking the time for you to do a tour de table and to introduce yourself one by one please.

(Vandolf Kartizini): Thank you. Well my name is (Vandolf Kartizini). I am (unintelligible) the 2012 nomination committee. Personally I am here since 2000 - a little while. But it was really a good opportunity to come here. And we are here mostly because 80 of our committee demand that we now come each year and ask for each AC and SO what the requirements that they have for choosing persons for that on constituency - in this case GNSO - and for the board.

So and we can show today what was the last year requirements for this year and how we match these requirements in our task this year. Thank you.

(Uri Lanzepolar): Good morning. My name is (Uri Lanzepolar). I'm from the Iscor Finland and from Euro Aboard. And I'm the chair of the nominating committee that starts actually its work for 2013 - starts its work on Friday.

(Shirley Zinor): Good morning. My name's (Shirley Zinor) and I'm kind of HQIC because I'm the chair elect for 2013 and I get to play in 2014 as chair.

(Adam Veek): Good morning - (Adam Veek). I'm the associate chair so (Uri) has asked me to help him with the 2013 nominating committee. So I'm a nonvoting member

and just generally been around ICANN for sometime so will help the best I can with the committee and all of the constituencies. Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible) 2011.

(Jwight Hannah): I'm (Jwight Hannah) and I'm staff support for the nominating committee and I've been employed in the committee since 2008.

(Ron Andrews): My name is (Ron Andrews). I'm a member of the 2013 team and have been involved with ICANN since 1998 - a member of the business constituency also a city member of the standing committee on implementation and very happy to be a member of the NomCom. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: My name is Olof Nordling and like (Jwight) I'm staff support for NomCom and for a few other things as well. I have been with ICANN since 2005 and I'm 30 years old.

Woman: Your time in ICANN counts double.

Alain Berranger: Thank you. Alain Berranger speaking. We have one more presentation, thank you - introduction I mean.

(Glenn McKnight): Good morning. My name's (Glenn McKnight). I'm the Norelo representative elect. I'm part of the ICANN ecosystem. I'm also on the ICANN academy and that's it.

Man: Well thank you very much. And I'm just checking on if there are any questions or comments on line. No.

So (Evander) of course you and I have been exchanging and you are not familiar at all with the world of NGO's and (Bart) likes to see itself as a place where NGO's are welcome. In fact we only have institutional member NGO's

and not for profits. And so that's the first point I wanted to make. Thank you for coming.

Second of all I really think that you must be aware that having been in existence in the Singapore meeting that we are I think hopefully we're still considered as rookies. I don't know how long we're going to get away with this honeymoon period but frankly speaking it would be great if you told us a little bit about NomCom. We are not a member of NomCom yet and we have made the request and are patiently waiting. And I will defer to my honorable and venerable previous chair (Debbie) for a comment or question. (Debbie).

(Debbie): I just want to say she has been a wonderful supporter of our initiative. She helped me in the early stages as did (Sheryl) in trying to get this constituency chartered and started. And I just wanted to acknowledge that support. Thank you. And as he said we are babies here in the ICANN ecosystem and would certainly appreciate anything that NomCom can do to help us have a full voice within the ICANN system. And so we appreciate that change is challenging but please if you could support this executive committee and that's my plea.

(Ilan Beronge): (Ilan Beronge). Thank you very much (Debbie). So back to you (Evander) for NomCom 101.

(Evander): Okay, thank you. Well I think suitably that maybe it's back home for me because I'm a share of two or three not for profit organizations in my country. So maybe we'll stay here. Maybe. I found my place in ICANN.

Man: We have three applications right now coming to you.

(Evander): Yes, well I submit mine.

(Cal Stolch): This is (Cal Stolch) of the membership committee. We have to talk now.

(Evander): Yes. I appreciate your consideration but I ask my time. But okay. It's really (Debbie) thank you for your work and really it's interesting approach here and I hope you have the chance as soon as possible to be part of the NomCom. The influence that many groups can bring to the NomCom. And many of you will have this chance to do that.

Think about the same people that have inside your group the vast knowledge about the whole ICANN because it's quite important when you select people for many positions that you have a more clear view about what is the goal of each one of those groups about. So, thank you. Let's go to the NomCom.

So that is the NomCom structure. We have a share enactor now and associated share. And we have all those representatives for each SO and AC's. What we have there is a laxest five members - one from each region. Here the group for the GTLD's - the GTLD's each constituents and each of the stakeholder groups help represent for them. We have a representative from the technical side. So if they ask then these here (unintelligible) from the technical side. No.

But anyway it's two persons from the technical group that normally join us too and also a member from the CCNSO, okay. And GAC can send someone but last year they didn't send. This year they didn't send. And still now we have no one from 2013. But it would be nice to have them but they believe they, you know, as a government they cannot feel represented by one government. So this is a difficult issue inside the communities like government. Okay.

(Unintelligible) and ASO, you know, the address also sends one person to us. So normally it's 20 persons to one. And it's a big community but well diversified. That's very good. So that's a picture of our community. Not all the people there because it was last year in Dakar - some of the people didn't show up.

So just for you to have a sense of these here, we have two members from Africa, two members from Asia, four members from Adolph, four members from Latin American Caribbean area and eight members from Marcum area. And we have seven females and 13 males.

Man: It's quite balanced.

(Evander): It's really not too bad, you know, considering all of the others. We are better than most groups.

So we have this obligation to be transparent and accountable to the community. So we have since the beginning have started to redesign some issues like flyers, information to candidates and the expression of interest, you know, was redesigned to better fit and give the chance for the new candidates to really find out what they prefer to apply. And they can apply for many positions but it was divided. If you don't want to apply for the others, you don't need to answer all the questions that are not necessary for the position that you are applying, you know, make things more transparent for the candidate, you know.

The skill set requirements from that's what we are doing here. It's asking you to give us some recommendations about who is the best providers. We should have the GNSO board and the board itself. So we published that requirement for anyone who wants to apply - have a chance to read before they apply. So a special board advice on skill set for board members. It's over there too.

Guidelines was formally approved in June because it was a process to the ADRT. It started in axis and the board to make all the changes and blah, blah, blah. So we finalized starting with other in 2011 and we finalized all the issues this year and was approved by the board. And NomCom established also new internal (unintelligible).

And so just one of the issues for the community as perspiring to behavior for this committee is to pull up to the top year this timeline. So we pull second into first place and then up to date the timeline for the all-time members to understand what is going on and for the candidates to follow what will happen with their application and so on. So that was what's happened in the 2012 budget.

And we also informed the news from our general ICANN bylaws to the candidate. So about direct compensation because it was not usual before - no director was compensated. And they expect you to find if they want to or not. So we also posted that about for people to know. There is no information about the amount. The amount is not viewable. But there is no information about the amount. But there is information about the way you can have that or just give up and don't ask for that.

Many members inside the committee just asks not to be compensated. Okay. So we also do it - we have a lot of difficulties this year inside the committee. And it was in some parts a lack of understanding of how things work in the organization like that. But because of that we publish also new recommendations. It's also published over there. And it's about ethics behavior, about logistics, about other words, you know, forms of word process and so on. New recommendations for the, you know, added to the already existing procedures in NomCom.

And finally, we have this final report that is also published besides this presentation but - the (unintelligible) final report with the matching methods that we will show to you today. And as a matter of respect for any candidate, I personally emailed from each selected or not selected candidate and thanked them about, you know, their applications and if it was selected, explain that, what is the next steps.

So it was our workforce (unintelligible) and accountability. I do believe 2013 will improve this because this - it was the first year that we had this

responsibility to really make it more clear, more (unintelligible) and so on. And especially because things that (Cheryl) was responsible for the (APR issues).

Now we expected better performance. So just a few information - statistics about our candidates this year for you to have a better view about what's going on inside. So we have 73 candidates. Fourteen were women and 59, men. And candidates by region - we have 9.8%. It was very disappointing and it was one issue that I raised my hand this morning in the breakfast with the board that we need to do something for Africa because it was really, you know, under any good expectation that we have only seven, less than 10% for one region which is too little for - so it looks - certainly it's a lack of information about ICANN and lack of opportunity to be - understand the process itself.

And so it was one issue for my point of view. Something to have - to pay attention on in 2013, is some of (unintelligible) Africa area. So we had - and I - for the opposite side, I'm from Latin America, I'm from Brazil, so - and this year we had a special demand that was to have - there is a bylaw that demands that at least one person from each region in the board should be there and no more than five on the same region.

So it seems to be the person from (that) region was in the end of his third. It was very important to have a huge amount of (black) candidates to select the people from that region. So I personally, since I was from that region, may - went many places to talk about the opportunity of ICANN, made personally visits for, you know, big candidates to try to bring more people from that region.

What shows that if there is some effort in Africa, we also can have enough candidates. Okay. So Europe and North America, so there is regions - sorry - there are candidate options. Candidates can opt for more than one position, so it's the general (distribution) from what people want to go to.

If they want to go to ALAC, if they want to go to the board or want to go to GNSO or ccNSO, so it's a distribution and sometimes you can see that because of (CCs) have just one position and demand very specific knowledge about some issues related to (contricals) TLDs, there is a lot of interest on that in the order but it's still not a bad number, okay.

ALAC, this time, was also few persons from Europe applied. We have each year, once - it's three groups that operate Latin America and the Asia regions and the other year is Europe and North America regions. So 2012 was North American and Europe.

So we have very, very few Europeans apply. We are - we were looking that - we have those few very, very good candidates but it's still (too) few candidates for (Europe). So comparing 2011 with 2012, we have this number in 2011, eight positions and seven positions and most are balanced. A little better, of course, when you have more positions in for the developing world than for ALAC, then when you have, you know, (here out in) the United States. But the order is more balanced.

Okay, those are the - our selectees from North America, from Latin America and a new person from Latin America too, from ALAC. GNSO council and ccNSO. And the final result, that was very interesting to see that even if the less women apply, women have more (effective) results because we got three women in 14 done, the four members for males in 59.

So you can see the math (was better). So - but was is important - from what we got last year from the GNSO requirements? That, as like you, after this meeting to read carefully all those things and think about if you have other points or want to change some points and please send to the (You Share), the information there, the requirements that you want to.

So those are for all positions and those are for the board positions. The - all the registries - it's a group of registries and registrars, business constituents

in a (group) last year. So please consider even if you have no positions left. Your contribution is welcome. And those are just for the seats in the GNSO.

And this time we have two positions for the GNSO, two voting positions. This is important also to raise that the decision offers general council to the bylaws is that the NomCom should select people for the seat itself, not just for the GNSO (council).

So this year we selected a non-voting member from the GNSO. In 2013, we'll need to select two voting members for that. So it's just to you to have this in mind. Not that, in my opinion, there is a difference from voting and non-voting for NonCom point of view because, you know, we need to select the best candidate for the position.

So that's why I don't understand personally if - why we should define - redefine that. But it (being done). So that is the method that we should do comparing our - the slate of board candidates. Okay. (Unintelligible) thought lost.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, I know. I know. I'll offer a (unintelligible).

Woman: We're already in (two minutes).

Woman: Yes, so let me continue. So those matching metrics is the result of the slate and also the slate of the board candidates and against all the demands that we receive. So we put well qualified when we - they don't reach all those three members, do not reach the highest group.

And why is that? Because we have decided our grouping side analyze each profile. We have also an external company analyzing (deeply) each candidate for the board. So that is why we use them. Okay. So that is - we did this for

everything, for the board, for the GNSO and all the recommendations we have sent.

And that's the welcome for the new chair. So - and please send all your thoughts and recommendations to (Euru) because it's very important to have those. Thank you very much for your patience. Any time you can approach me I can explain everything. Okay? Thank you.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much (Evander). So this is really a bonus session. We get two or three new members of (MPac) from Brazil and then we get a really comprehensive NomCom 101. So thank you very much (Evander). So the next group that has kindly accepted to talk to us is Alice Jansen and Olof Nordling so welcome. And they will be talking to us about the ATRC2.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Alain and I changed hats or turned it around, not the NomCom (top) support but also organization reviews responsible for that within the ICANN staff. And together with Alice Jansen, who is the manager organizational (review) and in due course, when we have to change seats and all of that, Alice will give you an introduction to the ATRC2 which you may recall that we haven't had ATRC1 but it's not done and (dusted) with that. It will be with us forever.

So, well, preparing for the next review according to that particular part of the (ALC), so how about timing for you Alice? Are you up and ready to go with the - no, we're not up and ready to go yet. Okay, a little closer to the mic or (unintelligible) support.

((Crosstalk))

Alice Jansen: Okay, there we go.

Olof Nordling: So are we ready?

Man: Absolutely Olof. Please.

Olof Nordling: Okay, Alice, the floor is yours.

Alice Jansen: Okay. So thank you very much for having us and now - the (APAC) members. The purpose of this presentation is to provide you with a quick overview of the (unintelligible) to the application process.

So we start here to the (new mount) of the SOAC info list early in October to announce that we were about to open the application window for SOAC representatives and independent experts on the ATRT2.

So with this, I'll just quickly walk you through the application procedure and timeline. And we'll open the floor for any questions you may have, any concerns and so on. So what is the ATRT2? The accounting (unintelligible) transparency (registry) 2, also known as ATRT2 is an affirmation of commitment review, AOC.

The (ARC) is a paper that was signed by ICANN and the US Department of Commerce in September 2009 in which ICANN commits to review a number of aspects, account (registry) and transparency being the first one. So you may also have heard of the Whois policy review team and the securities (ability review team) or the (unintelligible) team which competed on mandates earlier this year.

And we also have a fourth review which is due to start one year after entry into application of gTLD and that will be the competition consumer (trust) and consumer choice.

So within the ATRT2, the first ATRT, which was led by (Fran Cue), produced the recommendation, final recommendations in December 2010, and actually (Cheryl) worked on this ATRT. So who is on the account (unintelligible) and transparency review team? So we have three ex official members, and

namely, the chair or the GAC, the chair or the ICANN board and the assistant secretary for communications and information in the US Department of Commerce.

So the three officials may be replaced by the designated nominees. And, of course, we've got the (SBAC) representatives and the independent experts. The composition of this team will be jointly - members of the team will be jointly selected by the chair of the board and the chair of the GAC.

And the call for applicants is a central repository for the information you need to know about the (new) ATRT2 process application. Mandates are (still set in form). So if we could go to the next slide please. Yes. So the call for applicants follows this (unintelligible) transfer this (unintelligible) presented and independent experts.

It was published on the 5th of October 2012 and applications will be open until December 5th. So interested individuals should submit their applications to atcandidates@icann.org. That's the address - and should provide a number of documents - the CV, letter of (motivation), statement of interest and those should also specify the SOAC they wish to represent.

Once that's done, everything is sent to the SOAC for (documents) and so the SOAC is willing to reach a decision on who they would like to endorse for this process and will provide a final decision by December 17th.

The selectors will get that information. They factor in the endorsements and then decide who should be on the team by January 7th. And we foresee the kickoff meeting for January 21st. And also important - a date that's very important as well is that we - the final recommendations should be delivered by December 31, 2013.

So that's a lot of dates, I know. I hope it's clear. If it's not, just say so and we'll explain further. So the next slide. Thank you. So you may remember that

(Fadi) yesterday during his opening speech mentioned that the ATRT was one of his main (thoughts) and that the ATRT should become the ICANN DNA - part of the ICANN DNA.

So obviously it'll be a very important effort. And so again, any questions, thank you for having us and we're happy to be - answer any questions, anything you'd like to touch on. Feel free to. I mean, all of (us are in here).
Yes.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much Alice. And first of all, are there questions from the distant participants? Not yet. Any other questions or comments from the audience? Marie-Laure. Marie-Laure, it's all yours.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Marie-Laure (unintelligible) speaking. I read the information that is online and I didn't know whether because it was quick reading but I didn't grasp the difference between individual applica- the application process, are there experts or are they a member of the constituency? Because they're in two different stages, right? So in terms of responsibilities and tasks to be performed - I couldn't quite grasp the difference.

Alice Jansen: So basically the SOAC representative will be there to represent the SOAC but they will also be accountable to - anyone to report to SOAC what's going on and what is - you know, what the activities (for senar). And, I mean, there will be a follow up with the SOAC. Whereas, the independent expert is independent, is providing his expertise - he or she.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Thank you. Which means implies that the workload is basically the same for both?

Alice Jansen: The workload is the same.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Or it's just a matter of...

Alice Jansen: Yes, we expect that the ATRT2 will be (unintelligible) at ICANN meetings and will also have additional (unintelligible) meetings, mainly the one we mentioned for January. And regionally we have - well, calls every (fortnight) every two weeks, so that's the workload. And all the drafting exercises, drafting efforts are also led by the (ULB) team.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: May I ask a second question if - I just thought that maybe one of our remote participants would be interested in knowing whether they can apply as an individual expert even if they're not a member of any constituency yet.

Alice Jansen: Okay, yes - and (John), go ahead.

Man: Yes, well, you don't need to be a member of a particular constituency in order to be endorsed (unintelligible) the constituency so well you only - your application you'll state which one you feel closest to and the individual expert - well, it's a matter of what kind of expertise can you offer to the team.

And in other results, it's perfectly equal as to the workload as Alice has said, but - so there is a nuance there but in order to be an individual expert, you must have some kind of expertise to bring to the table of course which would be particularly of use for the ATRT.

We have had that - we didn't have it first, ATRT, but we did have individual experts for the SSR and the (buoys) review teams. Those were more narrowly scoped but we keep the opportunity open here for individual experts to declare their interests and it may be a useful addition to this one.

Man: Thank you very much. In a way I understood very clearly, Alice, the descriptions of this possibility and the frequ- and the activities and the frequency of the activities. I find - I view an estimate in terms of percentage of time.

The - what happens is that we, you know, good year, bad year, we essentially have - for those of us, we sleep reasonable hours per night. There's about 2000 hours of work in a year out of a total 8000-something hours per year. So what percentage of that 2000 hours would these represent? Is it days per week? Is it a day per week? Or - please help us understand that.

Man: Quick answer we're giving to others who have raised the same very natural question is that there will be roundabout four face-to-face meetings. Presumably, and most certainly in conjunction with the three ICANN meeting from that here, plus the launch meeting at the end of January.

In addition to that, count on fortnightly conference calls. And whether those will occur during the working hours, the 2000 working hours, or sometimes out to three, really depends on where you happen to be, you know, whether it's an agreement to circulate calls and share the pain and so on and so forth soon to be determined by - and I should stress that - that independent review team. So well, beside many matter or really their independence is sacred.

Alice Jansen: Yes, they can build their own methodology. I mean, the ATRT who is (unintelligible) for instance, they have a rotation system so every two weeks they would have the conference call but the time would change to accommodate all the time zones so they - I mean, any region is free to build, so accommodating to the members, where they're from and what time they may allocate to this as well.

Man: Thank you. We - I happen to notice that we have two newcomers in the room and I want to - I spoke to them this morning at the fellowship meeting and I'm pleased to see you're here already. You may have - I've been at ICANN for two years and I find just absorbing this challenging, so if we - you may have some questions from your point of view as a newcomer. So this is your chance.

Man: (Unintelligible) and (David) from (Darkus) Foundation and in that reality, (unintelligible) domain for a GTLD and we've got the background of the other - we've got the other (heads) in our heads because we are from (T Stream), the first (chain) organization in Hong Kong and to know more about the NPOC and the at-large, I just want to (characterize) a question about what is the difference between the at-large and the situation through the NPOC and also from the NCUC, yes? And (I'd be curious) to - just (unintelligible) that I may (exchange) also with members of (T Stream). Maybe you can (unintelligible).

(Jerry): Yes, so I'm (Jerry) and so my sir name is (Cann) so I'm (Jerry Cann). So I'm currently working for (unintelligible) as well and I'm (channel organization) in Hong Kong, so. And the NCOC, the whole idea of how (unintelligible) organizations could be in ICANN, just you know, inbox me and just fascinate me.

And I'm really happy about how various Internet users who are non-profit making base and who might be (neglectable) in other grounds could be involved in this organization. And another really cool thing to see is that there are some minorities or there are some groups (representing children) who are - they often may not be able to participate in the ICANN issues or inter (users) but they are actually the major end users and they're the ones who are actually affected.

And they're actually using (intel) every day. You know, 2.5 million is child Internet users so I think it's fair to let them, you know, have a say in ICANN and perhaps they might not be the one who decides policies but they could have a chance to comment on policies like who other advisory committees or other groups are doing. They make comments but not decisions.

So what I'm wondering is how is it a possibility for information that perhaps I have children come (unintelligible) and NPOC on and so on.

Man: Good. Thank you very much. I think we've just jumped out of the - but I think it's okay - out of the ATRT2 discussion because I think it was clear. So we are going to address your question but I wanted to ask Olof and Alice is they have closing words before we take advantage of the time to answer that - or to have that discussion that was just suggested.

Olof Nordling: Oh we thank you. We're happy for your interest and for inviting us. That's - we're happy to assist and any further questions - this was pretty compact introduction and please spread the word. That's perhaps a message to convey to see who is interested, ready, willing and able to take on this task so the selectors have a good choice of candidates to actually establish a very, very good team to take on the (unintelligible). Thank you.

Alice Jansen: Yes, I think I'd like to thank you as well for this session. It was very nice to meet you all and we would love to respond to your emails so, please, if you have any questions, please free to contact us directly.

Man: All right, good. We will. Thanks a bundle for coming. We will put your message out on the NPOC voice. We have here (Eduardo) the chair of our communication committee and it's quite possible that he may have already put this on Twitter and cer- and on NPOC voice, so we will pass the message.

I just want to not create too much expectations. We are a - still a small, you know, our email list is still small numbers. But it is reaching all regions. We have members in all regions. So thank you for being our friends and thank you for coming. And you can count on us and we know we can count on you. Thank you very much.

Is there a question from the - no? Okay, no question from distance participants. So thank you, Alice. Thanks to Olof. And I give the floor now to Klaus Stoll who wants to comment on the questions from our Hong Kong fellows.

Klaus Stoll: First of all, thank you that you are here and you are very, very, very brave men because ICANN is really, in my opinion, not one of the easiest things to understand. At least I can give you some advice (unintelligible). ICANN is something that grows with you and grows in time.

It's not something you do a crash course and then a fortnight later you understand everything. No. I know - I think the 15th or 16th ICANN meeting and I'm just learning each one something different. To come back here to your question directly, you're asking a very, very interesting question because how do we represent something which basically doesn't have a vote or a voice?

And basically what you are just doing with (kit) and other things, is it's your responsibility to create that (challenge) and create that voice. And, look, you've got a multi stakeholder model in ICANN which really gives you the chance to do that. It's up to you. So the responsibility to do that is up to you.

And how to do that is through constituencies like NCUC or NPOC. You ask a very delicate question - what is the difference between NCUC and NPOC and I want to give you my private answer. This is my personal answer. I see NCUC as a very important constituency and freed of academia whilst - and where you (unintelligible) will have individual academics presence and able to represent themselves whilst in NPOC it's more the general non-governmental organization not (to rope off) with organization.

And there is a reason, for example, that NPOC at the moment doesn't allow individual members. What you have to do, and finally, is to work out now how do you get through these channels into ICANN? But there I have to change hats again as we had this discussion before and it's - as me as executive director of global (mode) partnership is very interested as the organization in charge of online protection.

We have to work together and put it altogether and basically do a concerted (lesson). That's all. That's the best I can tell.

Man: Thank you very much Klaus. Marie-Laure.

Marie-Laure Lemineaur: Yes, if I may add, an interesting aspect of what's going on here is, I think, for you to know is that you can get involved as much as you want to, meaning that, you know, if you have little time, you (unintelligible) have little time, you can, you know, enter the meetings, the teleconference meetings, listen to it, do active listening but not necessarily participating if you are busy at the time.

And then if you have a little more time you can, you know, get into all these groups and apply for different things within ICANN and within our group and volunteer for different positions because many times we do need, you know, brains and hands and then to work on a different project. So it's really up to you and the people who are, you know, on your team and waiting to join us how involved you want to get. Thank you.

Alain Berranger: Thank you, Marie-Laure. This is Alain Berranger -- your friendly chair.

May I - I have a question for DotKids. I am - are you a not-for-profit organization, or do you want to become the next Facebook owners -- the next?

Man: Yes. A very good question.

We are a non-profit-making organization. So - and there is something I really want to - I wish to say that we are not the only two who put the whole initiative into (unintelligible) Gravity.

We have a great bunch of people back in Hong Kong -- a group of teenagers and children who share the same vision and same mission. So for example,

like, a DotKids foundation is a non-profit-making organization that we want to make a domain name -- not just a domain name. We want to make something more community based, so we want to make more out of it.

For example, we have develop Advisory council and Nominating committee that actually checks on registrants so that they are out of pornographic or violent information, and we have a complete takedown process. And over which, we have the voice of children in place -- the committee and those councils we have involved in those children.

So the idea we are - we really want to do is to protect children in one place and actually allow the voices of children to incorporate into the mechanism. So shortly, definitely it is a non-profit-making.

Alain Berranger: All right.

So -- Alain Berranger again -- the obvious thing for you to do is -- in my opinion -- is to apply to become a member of NPOC. And you don't have to wait for any -- there's no reason to wait to do it.

And that will be one way where you can bring the voice of the - of the children into ICANN without -- not excluding that maybe there would be a mechanism by which there would be a child constituency or child issue constituency in the broad side that you mean it, as important high users -- high intensity users.

So we would welcome you into NPOC. I think we -- did (unintelligible) - did you actually -- yes. The - I would like to add to the existence - the coexistence of two constituencies in the Stakeholders group -- the Non-Commercial Stakeholders group has nothing to do with the people you're talking to right now -- the NPOC crowd and the - and the Executive committee.

We understand that there -- as an NGO or a not-for-profit -- you truly have the choice. If you want to comment to ICANN, you can - you can -- as an institution, you can do it through - you can certainly join NCSG anyways.

So you join the Stakeholders group as the charter currently stands, and you will notice that you can either join NPOC or NCUC, and NCUC as both NGO members or institutional members and individual members.

So I don't know if you have the experience of a discussion list where you have representatives appointed by the organization who are very careful about what they say on the discussion list, because they represent the Red Cross, or the represent (unintelligible) dot org or DotKids.

And individuals who can push the limit of the freedom of expression -- and of course I'm for motherhood and apple pie. But when you join NPOC it can only be as an - as a non-for-profit and as a - or NGO, so that you then have what I would say a more - a more homogenous dialogue on the - on the -- but that said, we are - we are in solidarity with the current structure of ICANN.

We came in as a - as a new constituency into this ICANN sandbox, and we play in that sandbox. And until there are organizational reviews, this will be the situation.

So the choice is really yours, but we would welcome you very much -- especially that you have this community-building spirit behind your DotKids and that you - and therefore could experiment how you could really - in building your community beyond DotKids -- how you could bring them - how you can bring the political voice.

I don't know how you bring the political voice of a - of a child that doesn't have voting rights, for instance, or whose parents don't let them do this and that. But I have no idea what they do on the Internet. So very

interesting/experimental. Please come and - please come and join us and you will find it challenging.

I would say it's like, you know, maybe Pepsi and Coke. With Coke you have more fun, so with NPOC you'll have more fun. Thank you. And I hold this metaphor to my - to (unintelligible), who sprang that on me this morning before breakfast.

We have our new - we have our next speakers that have come in. So welcome to Jean-Jacques and welcome to Rinalia. So maybe this - they're going to be presenting - introducing themselves in a - in a moment, but they've come to present to us their position paper on better and new and improved ICANN.

So Jean-Jacques, the floor is yours. Rinalia, welcome.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you very much Alain. And good morning all.

I'm Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'm a member of the ALAC and starting my second two-year term on the ALAC now. I was a member of the ICANN board from 2007 to 2010. And I created in the ALAC the thing, which is called the Future Challenges Working group.

And the first task we gave ourselves in that Working group was to have a high-level view about the challenges not only to ICANN, but actually to the Internet. And focusing on that, we then thought that we should try to develop a paper thinking about the future of ICANN when - in relation to those larger challenges in the wide world.

So this paper was drafted by six people, and Rinalia is one of the co-authors. Evan Leibovitch -- who will be here in a few minutes -- was one of the two initiators with myself and a co-author, and I am also a co-author.

Woman: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Jean-Jacques...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes.

Woman: ...but one of our remote participants is asking whether you can get closer to the mic...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Sure.

Woman: ...before having this...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Sure.

Woman: (unintelligible)

Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you.

And so this paper -- because it has a fairly long title -- has been reduced to a title R3 -- Making ICANN Responsive, Relevant and Respected -- I should add, if possible.

So R3 has been voted upon in the ALAC and the at-large Advisory committee and it was voted 15 to 0 to 0. So it's not very often that you come across that phenomenon of the full ALAC adopting a document of this kind. And as a consequence, this is now an ALAC White paper, so we're about to send this officially to the chair of the board and to others to make it known and to disseminate it throughout ICANN.

Now, the reason why we -- Rinalia, Evan and myself -- think this is such a wonderful opportunity that you're giving us (unintelligible) is that we don't want to continue thinking only in the ICANN framework, because the

questions that we raise and some of the recommendations we bring forward are very much about governance.

And governances, of course, is not the sole property of the ICANN, nor even of the Internet. It's a very vast topic based on one central notion, which is the notion of the general public or the global public interest.

And that's why, when this was suggested to me by Rinalia -- and thanks to her, I was put in touch with you, Alain -- I was very excited by this perspective of having a comparison of wider framework for our little thing about, you know, the future of ICANN.

So we can go into detail, if you want, but I wanted to make this initial presentation and ask - or suggest that Rinalia give her perspective on this now.

Man: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Rinalia?

Alain Berranger: We still have remote participation, so please state your name and affiliation when you speak and please - and speak close to the mic. Thank you.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you very much, Alain.

My name is Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I am a member of the at-large Advisory committee -- I am currently serving on its Executive committee. And this is my first year in ICANN. I was nominated or appointed by the NomCom last year, starting in October.

And previously in my past life, I was Executive Director of the Global Knowledge Partnership. And Klaus Stoll is here, and I acknowledge that he is now the current Executive Director of the Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation, which is a different entity. But - so there it is.

My interest in governance issues started fairly early in life. And when it comes to the digital world, it manifested itself while I was working in Malaysia with my government. That involved a tri-sectoral collaboration between government, private sector and the non-profit sector.

And I continued this exploration into the governance of multi-stakeholder networks and partnerships while I was Executive Director of the GKP. And in coming into the ICANN world, the issues of global public interest and how issues are represented, how interests are negotiated across different stakeholders are very much a part of the question that everyone is concerned with.

And when it comes to ICANN, the global public has a specific perception about ICANN. And there are challenges and governance challenges that ICANN faces, which it is struggling with, and which the rest of the world has a stake in.

And I think that it is important to address that, because it can be realistically stated that the ICANN model is cutting edge -- that it is providing a model that other issue area could learn from.

And I think the discussion tomorrow on the future challenges about the multi-stakeholder model would be very, very useful and interesting -- particularly as it could provide some guidance in terms of how the different sectoral players could come together better in trying to resolve differences on issues of common interest.

Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: May I suggest that Evan be given a chance to give his view on this -- the...

Alain Berranger: Well absolutely.

Welcome, Evan. Evan and I share a common link with York University. And so it's another (unintelligible) for a colleague.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks a lot, Alain. And in fact I would have been here on time, had I actually brought with me the right bag. So I apologize for that.

I don't know how much Jean-Jacques and Rinalia have gone into sort of the approach that ALAC has been taking with this in the attempt to be proactive. In my time within the ALAC, we've been forever on what I call the hamster wheel, where a public comment request would come out and we'd rush to meet a deadline.

And then before that was over, another public comment would come out and we'd rush to meet a deadline. And before you know it we're swamped and we're trimming out all sorts of things, but it's all-reactive. We're all working through somebody else's agenda.

And so the whole point behind the exercise of not only our three, but of the Future Challenges group itself -- at least as I envisioned it when Jean-Jacques came up with the idea -- is working with this in a way to get at-large and the public interest to start setting the agenda, as opposed to merely reacting to it.

And so what you see in R3 is the culmination of a lot of the frustrations, observations and things that we saw that needed fixing. The fact that the outside community was starting to take notice of ICANN -- given the rapid increase of the gTLD program and other issues -- ICANN was getting on everybody's radar that it hadn't been before.

And as such, you had -- I guess you've mentioned the (Wicked) and -- oh, okay. In light of the ITU, the (Wicked) conference and noises that have been made all over the world about dissatisfaction with ICANN.

We came from the point of view that the problem was not with the concept of ICANN -- with the concept of the multi-stakeholder model -- but in its execution. And so in R3, there is an attempt to try and address this from a very, very high level.

And so -- I didn't bring any slides with me -- it's very, very easy to access with a - the document without going through the maze of the ICANN Web sites. You essentially just need to go to the community Web site -- Community.ICANN.org -- search for R3 -- that's the only match.

So it's extremely easy. There's two matches that come up. One is to a workspace that includes the downloadable versions of this in the six U.N. languages, and the other one is an HTML version of the document itself.

The printed version works out to about five pages. We strive very hard to make sure that this document was not going to be over-long. As a matter of fact, the starting of this was as an executive summary of what -- it was originally a much longer document.

And the executive summary, as we started working on it -- to use the old Mark Twain line, "If I had more time, I'd write less." It can - being concise and to the point, and not too specific, considering we wanted to start a conversation as opposed to be the end of it.

So being too specific was not a goal of this. And so it's intended to be a conversation starter to put out not only to the ICANN community, but to the world at large -- literally -- to get feedback, to get comment and to see what could be done to make ICANN better at a very overall level.

Personally, I would just add that what we've been hearing lately from the new CEO has been extremely encouraging. Some of the comments he's been making about the multi-equal stakeholder model as opposed to just the multi-

stakeholder model -- it seems like some of the words could have been just rewritten and yanked from what was in R3.

So there - I see some very encouraging steps. But it's a much larger conversation that involves a much larger audience, and I'll leave it at that. Do - did you want me get into - get into specifics of it?

I'm really...

Man: No.

Evan Leibovitch: No, because -- sorry? Okay.

So this is - so essentially this is in - this is in anticipation of the meeting tomorrow of talking about the different approaches to the multi-stakeholder model from the non-profit point of view.

This is sort of coming with ALAC's original line in the ground of this -- the conversation starter -- saying, "This is where we're coming from," and saying, "The multi-stakeholder model is important, it's critical, the typical ITU or U.N. model that relies more on governments than anything else."

We did not consider it to be an acceptable substitute for ICANN. Having said that, we are acutely aware of ICANN's flaws and think that building out on this multi-stakeholder model from within is -- sorry; not necessarily from within, but having a larger conversation on making the multi-stakeholder model more representative of the global public interest is what we had in mind in doing this.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much, Evan.

Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: First you all, thank you very much for coming. And thank you very much for doing R3.

The future challenges we are talking about is not just your future challenges, not only ICANN's future challenges -- all our future channel - challenges. And I just want to cut through the chase and say what I would be very much interested in is to explore today, tomorrow and in the future to see how we can actually - to work together and integrate the other players.

You just mentioned ITU, you just mentioned the U.N. Yes, they have different approaches, but I think they are part of the dialogue and they can learn a lot. And we can -- with that multi-stakeholder model -- help them to understand things a little bit better and make things a little bit better.

And just as - me as the present Executive Director of (unintelligible) Partnership Foundation, I would really love -- as the Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation and representing its members, and with its members exploring how we can take this out and can get that dialogue out.

And one of the things is, for example, we just talked in the last few days about the GKPF and (Embark) and other outreach programs, and I don't think there would be too much problems complimenting each other, integrating each other, and (unintelligible) and for example, having as a concrete example, (unintelligible) GKPF (unintelligible) years (unintelligible) this is 2013 forum to bring that into another area and really start up doing the dialogue.

And the most important thing is -- and I didn't find the right words two minutes ago -- we really have to demonstrate, show, explore, enhance the multi-sector - stakeholder model in different ways.

I think what -- Evan, what you just said about in ICANN -- that there are problems, but it's still the best we have. And I think there is already so many experiences. It's just a question how to mine that mine better.

Thank you very much.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much, Klaus. This is Alain Berranger -- your friendly chair.

Is there any other comments or reaction? Jean-Jacques, I see you - that you are ready. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes. You saw me fidgeting. I'm sorry for that. This is Jean-Jacques.

Alain Berranger: That's fine.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Chair, the problem that we were assigned about half an hour with you, which is a great privilege, and we have 11 minutes left.

And I think the purpose of me being - sitting on this part of your meeting is that we should be more specific about the preparation of tomorrow's open session.

Would you allow us to approach that now?

Alain Berranger: Absolutely.

I'm in total agreement. In fact, it's a very efficient use of the time that's left. It may be less interesting for our DotKids friend from Hong Kong, but their learning curve. So fellows, we've sat so boring meetings too, guys.

So before I pass that back to you, Jean-Jacques, (unintelligible).

Woman: I just want to add that it would be interesting for our remote participants to hear to what you have to say so that if they want to tomorrow they can also join us for the session.

Alain Berranger: All right, Jean-Jacques. Please. Thank you.

What are you - further views on the - on the - on the Fine Tuning meeting tomorrow?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. ((Foreign Language Spoken))

So I think that the challenge of tomorrow's meeting initiated by you is to not be too specific about proposals which are contained in the R3 paper. That's not the point.

We can reply to questions and therefore be more specific, but our duty - our first duty in the overall presentation -- which I will come to in a moment -- is to create awareness and to elicit reactions on the general concept before coming into detailed stuff. Otherwise we will be bogged down in detail, because we only have 1 1/2 hours for the general session you have organized.

So my second point is that I read with great interest the written contribution by Sam Lanfranco. Is Sam here? Oh, he's not. I'm sorry about that. And I must say that it's an excellent written piece which would deserve to be published as such.

However, I think that for the purposes of our presentation tomorrow and the debate, because it has to lead up to a debate -- it is perhaps not completely adjusted. And I suppose that was his intent -- to give us his thinking -- and then we can narrow down and help him do that.

So because of that -- and although I have not had time to consult Evan and Rinalia about this, but please forgive me -- I thought about this and read Sam's paper very carefully.

I think that I would suggest a slightly different order of speakers tomorrow. Naturally, you would open the session by explaining why you took this initiative in the NPOC and then I think that I would open the session by inviting all the speakers of the panel to - each person to present herself or himself. I would not be doing that in their stead.

And the order of speakers was initially Sam, and then Rinalia, and then Evan, and then I would open the floor to discussion. Now in my proposal -- having seen Sam's papers -- is this. We should start off with Rinalia, who would set the stage by saying, "Yes it's about governance issues in a wide sense, but we are here in an ICANN meeting. And the challenge for us is to really connect between the two."

And I think that Rinalia has the right sort of talent to do that in a very limited time space. I think we had allocated anything between 7 and 10 minutes, or between 6 and 10 minutes for each speaker.

She could say why it is interesting to look both at the general perspective and to focus on ICANN or Internet governance issues, and be more specific about ICANN. And then, we would ask Evan to talk about the R3 paper and to concentrate also in the same time limit of 6 to 10 minutes on what he sees or what we see as the major challenges in terms of governance -- for instance, the problem of how do we define the global public interest -- things like that.

And then we would invite Sam to stick also to 6 to 10 minutes and not to concentrate on ICANN, because his paper is a mixture of ICANN and other things.

I would suggest that under your indisputable authority, Alain, that you persuade Sam to concentrate on the non-Internet and non-ICANN multi-stakeholder model and governance issues. In other words, what you've suggested was the (IALO) case.

And in this way, it - I think the public - the attendees would get a better sense of the relationship between the ICANN governance or the Internet governance issues and the wider governance issues.

I am grateful to Rinalia for having suggested part of this solution to me at - on our way from another meeting to this one. So - and that's why - it explains that I was not able to consult first with Evan before suggesting these (unintelligible), unless you blow up and say something like that.

So that is our proposal and we'll consider that as our proposal. Thank you.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques.

I have not spoken to Sam since he shared this paper. But in true transparency and democracy, we've put it on NPOC-Voice, we've put our Executive committee, and we are - I am personally in agreement with your evaluation of the paper.

It's an interesting paper that -- of course it is a discussion paper. It's not been peer reviewed at all, but it's probably publishable and we will talk to you about another initiative of NPOC, which is to put out an Internet governance publication series and -- but that's not the time to talk about this now.

I've - I prepared last night my - the first three or four minutes of my introduction. And I see that the way I had thought it out last night was -- in fact, there was nothing in my introduction that wouldn't give you total freedom to organize the presentation and the debate as you see fit.

In other words, I'm - I was comfortable with what we had proposed before. But in light of this, I would propose two things. And -- well, in fact -- just before I make my proposals, may I invite questions or comments from my colleagues first?

(unintelligible)

Woman: No questions from remote participants.

Alain Berranger: Okay.

Klaus, do you have -- or can I react if you have any -- no. All right. I totally agree with your - with your proposal. And in fact, even if we hadn't had the chance to talk about it today, the way I was handing over the session chairmanship to you would have allowed - given you that freedom to do - to do that.

So what I can add is yes, let's do it that way. And I will talk to Sam before and tell him that we would prefer and that he concentrate on the outside view and spend his time on the ILO model, just to show that the multi-stakeholder model is used elsewhere.

And now, I've known Sam for a long time. He's not a difficult academic. He's a real - a - he's a real practitioner. His interest is in the field. He is a - he is a field guy and very rounded and easy to deal with.

So I don't expect any difficulty in him accepting this recommendation - this strong recommendation, because we are in charge of the strategy and, you know, we live with the consequences of the - and the quality of the - of the debate.

And also, the last 10 minutes summary that you will do and proposal forward, Jean-Jacques, are key to this entire exercise. So great. I like it. Let's do it.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you so much. This is Jean-Jacques.

I would have liked to hear a bit more, but maybe this is not the time for that. I would have liked to hear more from Klaus about the way he (unintelligible) possible cooperation on this theme through the organization he represents, but I'll leave that to another moment perhaps in the margins of our meeting tomorrow after it has happened.

But in conclusion -- in affect, to answer your question, Alain -- I think that that would be the important part of the conclusions. We have to chart a way forward, which would include the actual way of disseminating this debate and making it happen.

As Evan aptly put it earlier, it's a talk piece. I mean, it's something to initiate a debate. But we'd like to get it outside and beyond ICANN, of course, so that would be one of the avenues. Thank you.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. This is Alain Berranger.

I see that Rinalia wants to say a word, and then Evan.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you Alain. Rinalia, for the transcript record.

I want to say that in my context setting, I will start with some kind of a historical context for a multi-stakeholder collaboration as it has - collaborations that have happened around the world in other issue areas.

And that also touches on the ICT world, and then we'll go to the ICANN-specific space in which Evan will talk about the multi-stakeholder model, because I think that needs to be articulated, and then the challenges which we - and then Sam will touch on, well, here's the challenges and that.

And I think that will provoke a very good discussion. I just want to clarify that I'm also bringing in some of the external perspective at a higher level.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much Rinalia. This is Alain. That's it.

So maybe it's been a long morning. I do want to say that this is not the first nor the last time -- it is my hope that this is not the first or last time that we will collaborate with at-large, and I see much potential in outreach effectiveness in us collaborating.

So we probably should set a time aside for meeting as two groups together and to say, "Hey, besides that, what else can we do and what else should we do?" And so I - we still have some people online, so there's no final question.

So before I close the meeting, is any burning comment that - from anybody? All right. So I call for the meeting to be closed. I thank everyone for being here, and see you next time.

Bye now.

END