ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
NPOC Meeting
Tuesday, 8 March 2016 0930 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Also found on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Rudi Vansnick: Good morning everybody. Welcome to the NPOC Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency Day.

We have a very interesting agenda for you and it's up in the Adobe Connect. You can join us in the Adobe Connect or you can just stay in the room and have a discussion with us live here.

I propose that we do the roll call as we usually do. We go around the table and look into Adobe to see if there's anybody connected online remotely. So I would like to go around the table. I will start with myself and we'll go to the left and we'll come back to the right.

I'm Rudi Vansnick; I'm the Chair of NPOC.

Joan Kerr: Joan Kerr, Membership Chair, NPOC.

Tom Mackenzie: Tom Mackenzie. I joined recently -- at the last meeting in fact. And otherwise, I work for a company called Items International in Paris -- a consultancy firm.

(Ore Gogl): (Ore Gogl); I'm a student from Harvard.

(Stephola): Hi, my name is (Stephola). I'm a (unintelligible) from (Robet).

Carlos Gutierrez: Good morning, Carlos Gutierrez; Internet Society Chapter-Costa Rica.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco; Canadian Society for International Health-Canada, and Chair of the Policy Committee.

Betsy Andrews: I'm Betsy Andrews, I'm ICANN Staff. I work in the Development and Public Responsibility Department. And I'm in charge of the online learning platform ICANN Learn.

(Bran Gillan): I'm (Bran Gillan) and I'm a member of At-Large and a former ALAC member.

Woman: (Unintelligible), (ISI).

(Azella Altina): (Azella Altina); I'm from (Unintelligible), and I'm here as part of the mentor program.

(Foray Foley): (Foray Foley); I'm from (Three Cat 2.0). I joined recently the team. Thank you very much.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus Stoll; Vice Chair for NPOC.

Martin Silva: Martin Silva, NPOC Secretariat.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you and do we have anybody online? Not as far as I see. We have a guest but I don't know who that guest is. Are you connected on the audio page? I don't hear so far.

Okay, let's kick off with our meeting now. I see just Lars Hoffman entering the room. He is from ICANN Staff and he is a very regular participant in our meetings and doing a lot of policy work inside ICANN.

I would like to welcome our new members. It's not always here. We don't have always the occasion to welcome our new members. As Tom and (Foray) are new members, it's interesting to see you for the first time in our meetings and we hope that you are going to help elaborate at one part of the organization, get it bigger and stronger at the other side, and join your participation in the policy development work because I think it's the most important mission that we have.

It's doing and writing -- together with different other constituencies -- the policy that makes DNS working and operating.

And essentially, if it touches upon what we call the operational concerns -- especially for the Not-for-Profit organization because they are most of the time suffering of the fact that they don't have the finances, they don't have the volunteers, they don't have the skills to participate in these discussions.

And that's what NPOC tries to offer -- to NGOs also -- a platform where you can learn on how things are going on in the Internet world through the DNS space and the Internet governance as a global, and to help us correct where we think that ICANN is not following the right perspective of the DNS implementation.

With that, I would like to move over to what we as NPOC are doing during the non-ICANN meeting period. I would say that ICANN meeting itself is for us a time where we are reflecting a little bit of what we're doing during the weeks in between because it's not only at an ICANN meeting that we need to be operational; we have to be active more often in between the ICANN meetings than during the ICANN meetings itself.

For instance, we are working in working groups. We are trying to produce and help developing the right policy, and that's done through the working groups. For those who are new, the working groups are essentially the bodies that are working on specific topics and are trying to develop specific policy that is needed to be implemented in a later stage.

And we will have the pleasure of having people from the ICANN Staff looking into the reviews platforms and the reviews implementation to come and explain how the reviews are going on.

And I know that Tom, for instance, has been -- in a previous time -- working in a review team as an outsider -- as a review consultant company. So it's interesting to have somebody that has been sitting at the other side of the table. He can help us also to operate in a better way.

So in general, our work is essentially focused on being a participant, and if possible, taking a leading position in the policy work.

And I would like to ask Sam to give us a little bit of overview of policy where we are involved, and then we can go around the table and see if there is any...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, of course. That's also part of the policy work that we are doing.

But Sam, you're...

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, thank you Rudi.

The impact policy work, part of it recently, of course, has been riveted on the accountability procedures and the IANA Transition. We are - I think it's better

to talk about where we're going to go with policy now, and that's that we have a variety of strategies to raise the involvement of NPOC and the policy discussions.

The one that is going to be checked off fairly quickly is setting a kind of tree for the comments on requests from ICANN that are there and are time dated. And my strategy is going to be to approach people and say, "Will you take the lead on this particularly one to manage the comments or to promote the comments so that we're giving feedback."

We're an interesting constituency because, unlike most constituencies -- and this is part of the challenge for NPOC -- most of our members come from organizations where the organization itself is concerned about a social issue -- not human rights in particular -- but mind and health. Others are sort of social justice issues. And for them, the question is what's the impact of Internet policy on them -- not on their (unintelligible) mission but on their operational behavior.

And so we have a kind of double task, and that's to recruit people in to help us with ICANN's remit which is making policy in these areas. And we have to help our constituents figure out what this means for what they do whereas if you come from an ISOC chapter, it's pretty clear. But if you come from an organization like mine that deals with strengthening health systems in developing countries, what they're relationship is is less clear.

So we have a double mission. One is to feed into the policymaking of ICANN itself, and the other is to raise the level of awareness and understanding on the part of the constituencies that we come from.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam; Rudi for the transcript. Just for housekeeping rules, it's important that you state your name before you're speaking, and that is for transcript purposes so that afterwards we know who was saying what.

I don't know if there's anybody who is having a question for us or Sam on policy department?

I see Joan.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam speaking. I like questions.

Rudi Vansnick: Joan, you have the floor.

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. So I just wanted to clarify, we're going to the two-prong approach that you have. Does that mean that we would -- with regard to the raising of issues of our constituency -- are we going to ask them to also comment on policies by ICANN, or to feed NPOC with the information?

Sam Lanfranco: Sam for the record. The strategy that I'm hoping to roll out for approval -- and, you know, after these meetings -- will be both.

For example, very short, like one paragraph, briefing statements with respect to the ICANN policies that have reached the point where they're asking for public comment that we send out to the constituents. "Here it is, this is the comment window, these are the three key issues that affect you - us as a constituency. What do you have to say?" So that's very targeted.

The other will be within our membership to say, "Does somebody want to become the steward of this particular discussion process? Do you want to take this one on?"

And then work back - and start there because those are on the cutting edge of decision-making now. They've gone through the chartering and policy development process and so forth. And then work backward into engagement and those because those require a deeper understanding of what's going on and it's very hard to plunge into those from the outside.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam; Rudi for the transcript.

I see Klaus, you have your hand up.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you; Klaus for the record.

Sam, what can we do to make actually policymaking relevant for people on the outside because everybody is aware of that that ICANN speaks its own language, its organization centric.

And the problem I see is, for example, that people don't see the reason why they should spend so much time and effort and energy into making policy. And I find it a little bit arrogant from our self as an organization if we just expect people to do the work but don't do anything to help them -- to (unintelligible).

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, let me reply to that; Sam for the record.

I agree with you completely, Klaus, and I come from a background of being a farmer and an economist and so labor is very important to me; how people spend their time.

And this is why I think that the strategy I'm proposing is for us to say, "Here's a policy document that's ready for - has reached the stage of public comment."

We look at the document and we write up maybe a paragraph that says, "These are the two things that, from this particular policy issue, that relate to our constituency, and we'd like some feedback from you."

And then work backward to that. If people become interested, yes, moving all the way back to, for example, the chartering process. Bringing in somebody new and saying, "Would you get involved in the chartering process," it's like

asking them to grow cabbages on Mars; it just makes no sense, they don't understand it all.

So I think we're going to have to kind of back into this, start where policy is almost ready to be turned into cement.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. I see Carlos and Carlos is GNSO Councilor so he has quite a lot of expertise on the table in the Council itself. Yes Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, Carlos for the record.

If you're going to spend only 5% of your time with ICANN issues, then I could agree to your recommendation.

But I don't think - if somebody wants to spend a little bit longer with ICANN issues, I think this is the perfect time. You said we're finishing a big process -- the accountability.

There are no issues coming up in a very orderly way -- in a very comprehensive way. If you have an opportunity to go to new policy development process meeting yesterday, we have three very big areas that are just starting to be defined, that are just starting to be organized like subsequent procedures.

We are just starting. It's just five minutes. They are creating the working groups, they're just revising the charter, they're asking if they are overlapped (sic) with other things.

I mean if somebody was to spend a little bit more than 5% - let's say if somebody wants to spend - let me finish please.

Sam Lanfranco: No, I'm not going to (unintelligible).

Carlos Gutierrez: If you can spend 20% of your time, this is the perfect time to see a full cycle. This is the perfect time to start and experience a charter vision, to go into a working group, to be with peers that have 20 years' experience, to learn. I mean if you just wait for a commence (sic) period, you will have to go back and read the charter and they might have been meeting for 18 months.

And so I agree. If you just want people who comment, it's fine. But I think it's a little bit patronizing the assumption that you are asked only for commentaries. I think the people who are here who have received support, who have spent a full week and have a minimum background of interest in public policy are more than able to go fully into a full cycle of a PDP. That's what I would recommend.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, Sam for the record. I am sorry that you don't understand; I'm very sorry that you don't understand.

We are talking about the 99.9% of the Not-for-Profit Organization Civil Society Organization that is not here that we profess to speak on behalf of, and we don't speak on behalf of them because they do not have a voice.

I am talking about the outreach part. If somebody has committed themselves, fine. But I am in field; I am working with the Society for the advancement of science in Africa. They do not have a clue as to why they should be involved with this. So we first have to get their attention on something that gives them some traction.

If they say, "We are keenly interested." We will mentor or work with them all the way in; no question about that.

It is that vast population out there of NGOs -- the hundreds of thousands of them -- who do not even know that we exist.

Should they remain voiceless and just a few privileged who manage to get here be the voice of the Not-for-Profit sector? No.

Carlos Gutierrez: I really don't understand. Thank you for taking the microphone.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam and thank you Carlos. I have the queue. I see Klaus and I have also Joan. Klaus, Joan.

Klaus Stoll: Carlos, I really would like to discuss this because I really would like to understand. From my position of what I'm seeing is we are NPOC is Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency.

So what's our job? Our job is to help the Not-for-Profit organizations like NGOs to participate in the - to have a voice in Internet governance and to participate.

As Sam says, the problem here is that Internet governance is a country where 99.9% of the population doesn't even know that their government exists. So there is a real legitimacy problem of ICANN itself. Everybody who is looking at the Transition work can come and say, "Who do you represent? You're not a representative." That's just one aspect.

The other aspect -- which is much more important for me -- is that when you look at - and we did some surveys and we are just starting the survey for Latin America on how operational is the DNS for foundations for NGOs and so on. And you find out that 60% of the NGOs who register a domain name lose it in the first three years for several reasons.

This is a work -- when you think about when you compare -- how much a domain name, how the DNS helps more and helps the development and to achieve the goal of those organizations we are talking about and social media.

The DNS is a wonderful tool, and we need, really, to make this tool operational in the Not-for-Profit sector and that is what it's all about. And the result of that is that organizations will be interested and see that it's worthwhile participating in the policymaking process, and then they will come and then they will participate and on and on and on.

But this is a whole long process. And we have -- as NPOC in my opinion -- to cover all the bases and all the aspects. And I think we are doing actually quite well.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. I have Joan in the queue and then I will go back to Sam.

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. Carlos, thank you for your question. I mean I think that these meetings are for us to explore how we can reach our members and how best to involve them. And certainly, we don't want to insult anyone that we want to interact with.

So with your experience, we would love for you to help us so that we don't insult anyone and involve them in the process.

But I do think that where we were coming from was as a constituency stakeholder group, we identified how little people knew about ICANN and how large and major domain problems exist. And so we're trying to respond on many, many levels; one to raise awareness, one to educate, one to get them involved with very little resources.

So I think that's sort of the underbelly of what we're dealing with. And so with the policy issues that we have to deal with, we felt that as the ExCom, that one of the biggest advantages of us being helpful to ICANN is to get the members involved. I don't know if that puts a little bit of an explanation to it.

Carlos Gutierrez: I tried to do a segmentation. I see four or five people here who are very young, who -- as a result of your efforts -- now got support to get here. And I

think it's a great opportunity since they are here to stay on the stand (sic), the letters now, and the group, to jump. I mean there is no better voice than participate in the policy development cycle.

So for the people who are not here, that's great. But I said clearly, if you want to spend more than 5% of your time, and I see these young people here sitting in this room. I mean who, as a result of the promotion of young people -- young leaders, young fellows, young whatsoever -- they have all a university degree, they have technical experience in telecom, they are lawyers. I would expect them to do a little bit more than just comment.

Sam Lanfranco: Let me respond.

Carlos Gutierrez: No, no, no, no. I want to finish. I haven't finished okay.

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible) what you don't understand.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much. I mean I felt you were patronizing with them, now you're patronizing me. Thank you very much.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Carlos.

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible), no, let me. I - where this 5% number came from makes no sense. No sense at all.

I partitioned it in the statement. For the people who are inside the walls of ICANN -- the heroic volunteer unpaid labor that is put -- is truly impressive. For the young people who are coming in who are desperately needed, who will make a commitment, that's wonderful. There is no obstacle to that commitment.

My comments about the outreach portion in terms of bringing people into policy have to do with the fact that I have been told -- several times from the

outside -- that (unintelligible) when the Indian contention spoke, the group that I've worked with for 25 years in India that speaks in part on behalf and works with the 250 million untouchables -- and they are all untouchables (unintelligible) -- said, "That's not our voice. We're not here."

Okay, so we have a duel mission to support the people inside the walls to do the work they do; no question about that. I mean there's no disagreement there, Carlos -- none whatsoever.

It's just that the other thing I hear from the outside is that the civil society not-for-profit sector has almost fewer people than GAC. And that the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN itself has a weak wall on that side.

Now if I'm told don't worry about that weak wall; focus on who's inside and let them run as fast and as hard as they can, excellent; that's what we're doing. We are doing that.

But if my remit is to not to worry about those outside the wall, okay, that can be the remit that's given to me and then I have to make a decision on how I allocate my time. But I am not going to ignore those outside the wall.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam, and Rudi for the transcript.

I would like to bring us back to the agenda because we are deviating a little bit of the agenda itself where we would have given an overview of the work done by NPOC members in the working groups, and I will do it myself now here.

I'm engaged in several working groups. I learned through the time that it takes time before you're able to really be operational and of value in a working group. It's not from the first minute that you will be able to really bring efforts. And I agree with Carlos; it's more than five minutes. You need much more time to get involved in it.

I can tell you I've spent a lot of time already, and I engage myself. I'm actually the Chair of the Standing Committee of Improvement of Implementation or Name.

And I learned that there are so many places in ICANN where you can do that job; so many items and issues that are on the table. There's not enough capacity today to handle all of this.

And those who have the most time available will have the highest voice which means that our community -- the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns -- is a community that covers issues that are related to the Not-for-Profit.

If we don't bring up questions that are inside that community, we're failing our job. And that's what the first mission of our constituency is. We need to do policy work inside the ICANN community to raise the voice of our community, to bring up the problems that we see happening and popping up like, for instance, why are they losing their domain name after the first two or three years. That is an issue.

And it could be that we need to change policy to get that modified, to get it in the right direction. But that is not something that will happen in five minutes; it's impossible.

For instance, I was co-Chair of the Translation and Transliteration PDP working group. It took us two years. And actually, we are waiting for the final kickoff of the implementation of it.

And one of the members from ICANN Staff who assists us all the time was Lars. Lars has been guiding us. It's not a job that you have to do alone also. It's very important that you have Staff helping you. At the moment you don't understand anymore where it has to go, you still have guidance from inside.

And it's really a pleasure to work as a team where you have guidance from those who are paid, where it's a daily job to do policy also. They help us if we are just going away from the road we have to follow.

So please, be patient. When you join a working group, take the time. We don't need to hear you from the first minute; that's less important. What is important is that you are able to follow the discussions and you start kicking off yourself and say, "Oh, I am not agreeing with this, I have to raise my voice." And that's how you start doing the real work together with us.

I see, Lars, you have your hand up.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars Hoffman from ICANN Staff. Rudi, if I can just echo that. Obviously from a Staff perspective, you know, we appreciate that the community is very busy with a lot of projects going on on parallel track, and so volunteers are always very welcome.

And if there is an issue of being new to a process or to a subject, you can always reach out to the policy staff. We have some standard courses online that we put together, but also on a one-on-one basis, any question or any information you may need -- subjects you understand -- you can always reach out to us on a personal basis and we would be very happy to answer questions and to guide you as much as we can. So please take advantage of that as much as you want to or need to. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Lars; Rudi for the transcript. And I know. I have been calling quite a lot on the team to help us.

Even in as a co-Chair, you know, you're not needed to know everything. You have guidance -- people who help you -- and your colleagues.

And the idea that we have in NPOC now is that each of the officers is going to mentor a person that is willing to join a working group. We will help guide you; we will help you in understanding what your position is.

And once you will feel comfortable, we will step in the back and let you pop up. That's how you guide from old to new people -- to young people. That's the transition that we need to go through.

And as I said earlier this morning in the Fellowship Meeting, NPOC is very young. In June, we're going to celebrate our fifth anniversary. It's still a young baby. It started babbling; it's not able to have a full vocabulary.

But we're going there. And we need you to build our structure; to be able to be more visible in the policy work. We're too small today to be able to produce big stuff although we are participating in the working groups; we are there. And we have even a councilor on the table. That's important.

But, two, Edward is sitting at the end. Yes, maybe those who came late in. Edward, can you just tell who you are and what you're doing?

Edward Morris: Yes, it's not a good question to ask here at ICANN. I don't know what any of us are doing at times.

My name is Ed Morris. I'm a Councilor on the GNSO Council representing both NPOC and the NCUC.

All of our councilors that we currently have are NCUC councilors, and I feel it's important that -- as someone who represents you on council -- that actually knows what you talk about internally.

Not all my fellow councilors agree. In fact, I'm Skyping some of them trying to explain what I'm doing here, and inviting them over. I think it's important that

we here from both groups. So I'm trying to do the best I can to ensure that you have representation on the GNSO Council.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much for that and it's much appreciated. We'd like to see more councilors coming to us in order that we know what we have to bring to the table also. It's bi-directional work.

Edward Morris: Yes, and just so you know, if things come up in Council and any of your members -- anybody in this room, anybody remotely -- have questions, want to ask my position, want to lobby me, email me -- contact me. Ask Rudi to get in touch with me.

I'm open to everybody. I want to be open to everybody. I want to make sure - it's very important to me that we break down the barriers and the animosities which have existed between the NCUC and NPOC. We need to work together. We already are outnumbered terribly on Council and every other place in ICANN.

Both segments in the Non-Commercial community -- at least in my view -- need to work together to maximize our potential here.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Edward. I saw, Tom, you had your hand raised.

Tom Mackenzie: Well, as a newcomer to this group, I was struck by one thing that you said about representation. I mean that this is a sort of country with 99% of the people who are unaware that the government actually exists.

I would say my feeling is that as far as non-profit organizations are concerned, maybe they are less; their voice is less heard in these meetings. And that contrasts with the for-profit organizations.

And we can see that they have -- the for-profit organizations, some for-profit organizations -- the TLD operators, et cetera -- they have a very obvious sort

of reason for being here, for pushing forward certain agendas. And they can afford to have people here, to be pushing forward their interest.

That's going to be something which is going to be harder for people in the non-profit kind of world do -- to afford to have people here permanently pushing forward their agendas.

And then to come back the discussion that was going on here with Sam and Carlos I believe, I think Carlos said something interesting which is that we should be taking part in the policy development processes from the word go. I think that's very important.

Having looked at these processes from an outsider's perspective -- let's say as a reviewer of these processes -- what we've seen is that quite often, animosity happens too late in the process; that people, tension and things like that, and disagreements, happens because the whole sort of long month-to-month policy development process has sort of gone on. And suddenly, another bit of the system becomes aware of what has been decided and where there seems to have been this sort of consensus, and suddenly realizes that they're not in agreement.

That seems to be problematic as far as a decision-making multi-stakeholder decision-making process is concerned.

And to the extent we can get involved very early on, I thought that that was probably interesting.

And then just one final point. Of course 99% of the people aren't here yet. I mean there are only a very few number of us sitting around this table.

But it's probably incumbent on us to at least represent or try and represent the interests of the people who aren't here yet, but who, hopefully, you know -- with a bit of luck and with a lot of effort on our part -- will slowly over time

become aware that this place -- this forum exists -- and that there are interests that need to be pushed forward.

I mean there's a lot more that I would like to say. I mean in a way, I mean one of my feelings about other, you know, decisions that have taken place in ICANN, I feel - you know, when we look at the example of the gTLD program. My feeling back then in 2008 was not the program that had been pushed very hard by one constituency -- very successfully.

In a way, I take my hat off to them. You know, that's the way you push forward agendas. If you want to push forward your agenda, do exactly what the gTLD people do; that's how you're going to win.

And I regret though -- I sincere regret -- the way that that program was eventually approved without particularly sort of taking into account lots of other very valid, I think, viewpoints that were, you know, already around but were just sort of incapable of being expressed in a way that had an sort of effect whatsoever on, eventually, the Board, who passed that program.

So anyway, I mean I shall stop there.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Tom. And I have to agree with almost everything you have been saying.

It is still the question of chicken-and-egg. I'm not using the 99% example, but rather the chicken-and-egg situation where, in fact, when you look back, if we are not raising the voice that are not here, they will never come.

You have always - you need leaders that are willing to step up and create the road so that they feel, "Okay, something has been paved for me; now I can step in." And I think that's very typical for our community.

You need some samples before people start and say, "Okay, I can follow. I want to go along with you."

And that, I think, I would rather skip the 99%. It doesn't make sense at the end. If we are not doing our job, they will never come. You will always the 99% left to find. So it's our duty to bring them to the table.

I have a queue. I have Klaus and then we go around the table.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I've got two comments. First, a very quick one to Tom.

Tom, with the new gTLD program, as you all know, it's a general failure. They're just not selling. And if they would have listened to and not grounded through, that situation would be different though they shot themselves in their own foot. And they are at that point.

The other one I wanted to violently disagree with with Rudi on his statement that we are just a babbling baby, I think that NPOC has more maturity than a lot of much older stakeholder groups in ICANN. And I would like to give the argument for it.

There is more to policymaking than just simply participating in working groups or making comments. For example, what NPOC is doing now since more than two or three years is trying to help ICANN to understand, for example, the nature of outreach.

ICANN's outreach is ICANN center. That means that everything -- not with DNS is promoted -- but ICANN as an organization is promoted. We expect - we produce materials which basically explain how ICANN works, but don't explain why it is important for people to get engaged in things.

And for example, I will ask this afternoon in the meeting with the Board a question into that direction. That is one aspect of policymaking which is really

really important for Internet governance in the long-term. It's something which we don't see in documents or in papers or in things, but it's going on in the background.

And we had discussions this week with Jean-Jacques and Adam Peak, and we're having strangers (sic) for months and months and months of this topic.

And there's another thing is that also NPOC is involved with other organizations in outreach and capacity building down on the ground. It is NPOC who does it, but NPOC is involved and NPOC is supporting and doing it.

So we are covering a hell of a lot of bases already. And we might not be as strong in numbers, but I think we are very very strong in capacity.

And they will come; they will come. And that's not the problem. And I really think that 99% trace is from me, and I think Rudi is right that I have to keep abusing it but it's just too nice.

And I think in exchange, Rudi has to give up about us being a baby.

Rudi Vansnick: Well, sorry; Rudi for the transcript. Thank you, Klaus. But I love that because then I feel young.

But I have a queue. I have (Azella).

(Azella Altina): (Azella). I said before that I am here as part of the mentor program, so I want to take (unintelligible) to what Rudi was saying before. That mentor program - the mentor program is a title program. This is the first edition, and I am here as a mentee. That means that Martin, who is mentor, is going to guide me to get more involved in NPOC specifically, but in the ICANN community in general.

For me and for more organization, this is very important because we can be here; we can be talking to you right now with our voice sharing our work. So it's a title program, but I think that it's a very good way to address this issue.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. Indeed, it is an important way of improving the way of getting you people in. and we have also an idea and we will be talking here later on about our Ambassador Plan Initiative that we have -- which seems to be seen by the Board as a very productive way of getting you people in it. But we will talk about that later on.

I have Lady in the queue. Please state your name before.

Lady Murrugarra: Yes. (Unintelligible). I'm with the (Alliance Profitable Internet).

My just quick observation, this is my second ICANN; I'm a second time fellow. And even in my first meeting, I had in interest in NPOC, but it is really difficult. Unless you're either at the leadership level of the NGO that you are here representing, selling the NGO coming on board is not quite as easy for most mid-level professionals. And so, you know, so just kind of I think that becomes daunting.

And so perhaps maybe looking at a strategy to get folks that like kind of involved with NPOC but with the long-term goal of help them bring their organizations along. I think that would be really important.

But also, just personally, my (unintelligible) is in (unintelligible) management working with NGOs and attending (unintelligible) in the land profit sector specifically.

And I would basically, you know, just listening to this conversation now, to me it seems like a conversation where we need an outreach strategy that focuses on federated organizations.

So for a good example, I would take an organization like Consumers International. That is an umbrella association of, you know, over 250 organizations because as a federated entity, they have an interest in the sector that is involved which is really the issues that they're talking about. They're talking about the DNS of the non-profit.

It's about the health and viability of the sector as well as ensuring that their member organizations are solid. So, you know, (YWSAS) is another example of a federation and they have other independent NGOs that fall underneath them.

That if those type of organizations get the message, I think that would be a good inroad into some of the other organizations as well.

So if you look at even the say like (YWCA), you look at their Web site. Their Web site of their affiliates are still embedded within their own Web site. So there's already someone who is in charge of (ICT); there's already someone who's in charge of governance issues around their association, the blending, and all of that.

So I just think that, you know, this conversation is really great. It's unfortunate that not many people realize the importance of being here.

But having worked for non-profits for over 20 years, I know that it's really difficult to get, you know - this is a decision that needs to happen at the top -- at the CO level.

And I don't think - in fact, the first I came to ICANN, I took leave because my CO didn't think that we needed to be here even though I was working on (unintelligible) and consumer rights. You know, so it took me making that personal sacrifice and taking annual leave to come to ICANN to be able to now I'm back here at ICANN, and I didn't have to take leave this time

because now they have an opportunity to see the value of my participation with ICANN.

So I can understand the calling in terms of reaching out to NGOs. We have very limited resources and that makes it difficult.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Thank you so much for bringing up something that we are also really trying to work on.

I would like to have you and Joan having a chat -- have a cup of coffee together -- have a talk about the process because you're bridging in fact a little bit to the next agenda item.

I know that Klaus wants to bring up the (Path Finder).

Klaus Stoll: No, no, no. I don't want to have a coffee (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: No, we already had a coffee together. We already have our date.

Rudi Vansnick: So Klaus, very short.

Klaus Stoll: No, not short. Let me explain why I'm saying that.

You were talking about exactly what we are not trying to do; what we are already doing. And you have to understand that NPOC is about policymaking and we can't go into other areas; that is not in our remit.

But what we did is to partner with other organizations like (Unintelligible) Partnership Foundation to create a program called (Path Finder). This is a path finder approach, and if you want some that we know later - and (Path Finder) does exactly what you're doing.

So for example, we had events with other organizations and explaining to them why this is relevant, why it's important and things like that. We have all the videos and so on available online and we are starting already a nice library of things, for example, DNS security and things like that.

But in a language which is not an ICANN language -- the language which the organizations can actually understand.

And we made - we are just changing the program slightly. We always expected people to come to us -- to come to our events -- and now we are actually making the presentations at events at annual meetings of exactly the organizations you are talking about.

What I need from you is a list of organizations we should go to and to whom, and we will do it. And let's work on that one together. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Klaus. And I would like to use that as a bridge for our next agenda point.

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: However - put your mic off; thank you.

I would like to bridge to our next point on the agenda. But before doing that, two points first.

Actually, there is an idea that is bubbling up that I have been discussing with a few other members of other constituencies. We all know that there is the ICANN outreach strategy; that's one. But that's ICANN's strategy.

What we are missing is the community's outreach strategy. And I propose to launch an ad hoc working group across the communities that would create

first the community outreach strategy. And then put both together and see if it fits and see where the failures are.

That's the only way we can improve it because the top down -- especially for not-for-profit organization -- doesn't work. Nobody wants to get dictated if you're doing volunteer work. So we have to build from the grassroots -- how to do the outreach to our communities -- to better understand and work closely together because in the Non-Contracted Party House -- this is the Business Constituency. There is the NCSG, IPC, ISPC.

All together, we have the same goals; we have to serve people. And that should be the target. We need to serve people through the DNS, and that's the first mission we have.

And I would like to jump a little bit on before going to (Jon) for giving us an overview of the membership as there is somebody from the staff. I think it's a little bit from the E-Learning Department.

What's your feeling when you hear this? Do you think that ICANN has something to offer immediately, or do we need to help you get that done because I think there is still quite some question marks about where is it if it is there, we didn't find it, (unintelligible) people are looking for. And if it's not there, we can help.

Betsy Andrews: For the record, I'm Betsy Andrews; I'm with the Development of Public Responsibility -- Development and Public Responsibility Department.

If you need to contact me incidentally, it's Elizabeth.Andrews@ICANN, but you're welcome to call me Betsy which is my nickname.

I am in charge of the online learning platform; it's called ICANN Learn. And my role really is to facilitate any content that the community wants to develop. And that can be within ICANN or externally.

And it's free. And I have the resources to help consolidate information. But it requires you to determine what kind of course materials you want to have. So anyone with the energy to do so can get in touch with me and I can help reach out to the right people who can provide content. And together we can work together to generate whatever course material is necessary; if there's training that you think that you need or if there's information you want to get out; or like you're talking about going and speaking to these different groups.

If you want to point them to one place that's a repository of information, and can guide you in terms of how that can be set up, how that can be presented, how it can be best received.

And ICANN Learn can host video content, it can host text. You can create quizzes. We have a lot of flexibility in how you want to present information, and we find it's a lot more successful than just a brochure or just a Web site which is why Development of Public Responsibility has invested in it as a resource.

But I want to make it very clear that while it's free to you to use to create courses, it's free to anyone to take a course. My role is really to facilitate the process. So I can't just create a course for you a particular topic; we need to interact and determine who you want to provide the content and how you want to present it.

But having said that, I am a resource available to you. Please.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Elizabeth. And I saw that you have (unintelligible) some people here in the room. They raised their hand; Klaus and Carlos.

Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: I'm really sorry to have to tell you this because what you've just described is exactly what we didn't want. And I'll tell you why.

I'm in that area now and for over 30 years. And I'm telling you there are so many and so good resources available, we don't need any kind of new resources; they are all there, they are all existing.

For example, if you look at the Path Finder series, the organizations there -- or a good percentage there -- have huge educational databases. And the good thing of these databases and of these materials are they are not ICANN organization centric.

They are not talking about ICANN; they're not talking about how to participate in the working. How to do this, how to do ccNSO work and so on and so on. That material on the ICANN Web page is brilliant.

But what we are talking about is a completely different kind of material. It's material which says why the DNS is valuable, how it comes and what it does.

And what we are suggesting for -- and NPOC is standing for -- is that these materials are created by the communities -- for the communities -- and not under the hospices of ICANN Staff.

And the problem, for example, I can name names but I don't want to do that. We even have organizations who say, "We don't want to give our materials to ICANN because ICANN uses our materials to promote ICANN but not what we want to do." So to that point, so we don't need any more materials.

What we need now is methods and ways to deliver the existing materials to where we want to go and where it has to go, and it has to go to the masses and not to specific. And that's why, for example, it's good for the outreach and the newcomer programs and things like that that we are already are only reaching already certain elites; but not the broad masses.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. Elizabeth, you wanted to respond?

Betsy Andrews: Yes, please. Thank you for that feedback. For the record, that's the (NJ's) DPRD ICANN Staff.

With respect, I understand what you're saying, but ICANN Learn is not a promotional platform; it's an access point. So if there is material that people want to make freely available, I can give you the opportunity to have that free access on ICANN Learn.

If you want to coordinate a course that says why the DNS is valuable, I can give you a place to put that. So it isn't a (coms) activity, it isn't a marketing activity; it's just an opportunity to consolidate information and direct people towards it.

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible), is this place - dozens of this already exist. Basically, ICANN shouldn't waste its time and money on something which already exists.

ICANN really should think about effective outreach and delivery of existing materials; not on the materials themselves.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. Carlos, you?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, I don't want to close this session without giving you a practical example of this mentoring that (Rasena) just mentioned.

I count at least seven under third this year, and Lars slightly over 30. But I have a very good example of what's relevant for NPOC. I mean we're talking about non-for-profit. I mean half of the country codes -- ccTLDs -- are non-

profit, and they're very relevant for NGOs; not only the Dot Org, but the country code.

I've been engaged with Lars over the last year on a very series discussion about the country code and the ccTLDs. And Staff has helped us to produce an incredible amount of history on two-letter country codes and three-letter country codes. And these papers are ready; enough for discussion.

And I would really like to invite the seven young people who are here -- who are interested in not-for-profit from the point of view of your country's city -- and Argentina has a wonderful example of a ccTLD which has been public. It was free for a long time; now it's less free.

So these are great opportunities to jump into initial that is very relevant for not-for-profits; it's relevant for each country. The papers are almost ready. We're about to push we hope by the end of the year to convert these working groups -- ccNSO, GNSO working -- into a policy development process.

This is good training material; believe me. It's very well prepared. It doesn't take a lot of time. It's one call every two weeks. It's one hour every two weeks on Mondays.

And probably you don't have to read more than one hour of preparation, so it's really one hour per week between here and October on a live example of policy development.

I think this is the best material available for people to take a look at how policy is being developed only one hour per week. The material is ready, and they can be very productive in bringing this experience back to their countries.

So this is the example that I want to use here. It's easy; it's ready. You have Lars, you have me. And if you have one hour per week between now and --

the ones who are planning to come in October -- you will get a feeling that you are contributing, that you are producing and you're getting a deep, deep, deep, deep into a position where you're opinion counts.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Carlos and I fully agree, and I'm quite happy that you are willing to jump in and help us. We cannot do all the work by just ourselves.

I'm looking to the agenda and the time. And we are expecting having the (Finenstein) coming in in about 30 minutes.

We still have to go through the status of the membership database. I think it's important that Joan can give us an overview of what we have been doing -- except if there's any question that somebody has.

Yes, go ahead.

(Stepha Latin): Okay, my name is (Stepha Latin), (Unintelligible). I just want to add something about ICANN Learning.

I find the idea is really brilliant. It's really more accessible for us. I'm a newcomer. This is my first time at an ICANN meeting. I didn't know about ICANN until last year when Mr. (Unintelligible) came to our institute to give us a presentation about ICANN.

It sounds really interesting to involve in this organization. First of all, I appreciate the multi-stakeholder model because it gives everyone the opportunity to express their opinion and to show what their reason is for their interest in this organization.

Also, the content of ICANN Learning is really important and it helps us, especially me, to know more about ICANN. I'm still exploring this organization

and I want to join you, but I don't know which department to join yet. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. And I would like now to go over to Joan so that we can at least have an overview of the big work that Joan has been doing in the background. Those who are members will know about, but I would like you all to know what she has been doing the last two months.

Joan Kerr: Hello everyone; it's Joan Kerr for the record. And I'm going to the status of the membership database is actually going to be broken down into two parts. And I'll address the NPOC side first and Sam will address the NCSG side second. So I'll quickly talk about our database.

When I started in October 2015 - no, 2014, I had interpreted the job as a marketing outreach sort of because I was knew as well. And like everyone else, you kind of have to interpret and get to know everything.

And so the first thing I asked for becoming the Membership Chair was the database. And I was sent six different lists. And so I said, "Oh, who do I market too, who - et cetera?" So I won't go through all the details.

So I set out as my path to find out who was actually really on the list -- meaning were the current, are they still at those organizations, are they still responsible for that portfolio, is the information current such as the email address, et cetera, et cetera.

So first, I want to thank Staff -- Maryam Bakoshi for helping me as well as Rafik Dammak. They were very very good at - we worked together to make - okay, you guys ready for this? One list that is completely updated, completely verified like completely.

And I am happy to say that right now we have 60 members that are...

Man: Verified.

Joan Kerr: Sorry? Verified members; real members. I made sure that they communicated with me and that I was actually interacting with them. That's how current it is.

So for the last couple of days, being at the GNSO meeting, one of the issues that came up was this whole idea of diversity.

So I just want to go through that very quickly and tell you the breakdown of our members if that's okay. And this is a work in progress; we're going to be breaking this down a lot. All right, ready for this?

Gender. We've got 75% of our members from organizations -- we only deal with organizations -- are male. So 25% are women. So we have some work to do I guess in encouraging or looking at organizations, so that's one thing.

So we broke it down further into geography, and here goes the numbers. Africa, we have 25% membership; Asia, 19%; Europe, 24%, Latin America - we're going to be breaking these down into countries as we go as well - 11%; and North America, 20%. That's as far as we got.

Now, at the next meeting, I'm going to try to actually break it down into countries. Yes?

Klaus Stoll: Klaus, very quickly to the record.

Rudi needs these numbers because he will be asked by the Board this afternoon about the diversity in NPOC. And I think at least the last set of numbers shows that basically we're fairly balanced in the geographic membership and we have to do something about getting more females in.

Joan Kerr: Especially since it's Women's International Day.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, congratulations to everybody.

Joan Kerr: Sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: I see a hand up over there. Yes?

Woman: Yes, so how do you - I (unintelligible) agenda when the member is in an organization. It's kind of something that's not within NPOC's control because the organization that's a member determines who is best to represent them.

                 So I'm not so sure if - I mean I think it's important to keep (unintelligible) in, you know, just for us to be kind of aware of it. But I would keen also in terms of organizational size like the size of the organizations in another breakdown.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, that's a very good point. That's what I put. We're actually going to be drilling down into how big or how small, you know, how people, the countries, that sort of thing.

                 But what are they addressing, things like that. But this is as far as we got. So thank you for that.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes, yes. So we'll work up a strategy later and address those - I had some other things to talk about membership. But I just want to say that thank you to everyone that helped with this database.

                 And we're going to be now -- just for your information -- now that we've got a really great current database, we're going to be interacting more with our actual members. And also, our second phase is to do a lot of outreach which we'll be addressing in a few minutes.

So I'll just give it over for Sam to talk about the second part of the database for NCSG. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Sam, the floor is yours.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you Joan. Sam Lanfranco for the record.

What I'm being asked to speak about here is the overall database for membership database for NCSG/NCUC/NPOC.

The existing practice is that a list of members -- or multiple lists of members -- are currently kept in Google Docs. The procedure for updating those memberships up until now has been that somebody sends an email to the Chair of NCSG, and the Chair of NCSG goes in or gets somebody else to go in and make a change in that field.

This is particularly relevant for NPOC where organizations belong and an organization may designate somebody else to represent as (unintelligible) changes and as membership changes and so forth.

So affiliated with that are the application procedures for joining NPOC or NCSG or NCUC, and some of that is in combination. And those are handled in a variety of ways.

But there are two/three issues there. An ad hoc committee of NCSG has been formed -- along with the current chair -- to address the following issues.

It's very cumbersome to update the data. Running it on Google Docs does not allow a member to have access to a membership profile. They can go in and update their own information. If their email address changes, they have to send an email to somebody and hope somebody goes in and changes that.

There's no way for NCSG, NPOC or NCUC to say, "You have to go in and edit your profile at least once a year to remain current, and if you don't do that, you're no longer current. But you can come in and validate it."

And it also would facilitate how we get the voters lists for the various elections. Okay.

So what is being planned and what the vision is -- and we're at the early stages of this -- are a membership management database -- one of the ones that is out there. It may be open source; it may not be open source. That's being discussed.

It will be hosted on a server. Where that server is to be is yet to be determined.

ICANN is contributing financing to this -- adequate financing, you know, I believe in terms of the numbers they've talked about and what it would cost us to do this.

So the attempt is going to be to arrive at a membership database that is accessible by members to their own profile so they can keep them updated. A membership database that allows NCSG, NCUC and NPOC to extract their subset databases for their constituencies for their members that they have to deal with, and possibly other membership management services -- none of which are available such as mailings, et cetera -- none of which are available if we simply have this ragged list that sits in Google Docs.

So we are at the very early stages of that. It's a small team of one/four of us pulling the ideas together. They will be circulated for discussion.

But the hope is to end up with a membership management database that serves members, serves NPOC, serves NCSG, serves NCUC, serves the

admission procedures, the application procedures for those three groups as well.

Any questions?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam and thank you Joan for the terrific work you have been doing. It will allow us to have a closer contact with our membership anyway.

Yes, Joan?

Joan Kerr: Just to say that we need a consensus decision on going forward with the application process for NCSG to make it one application.

And since I'm done, I just want to say that when I first came to my first Constituency Day, there were only five people in the room. So I just want to thank everyone for we have a full house, so thank you so much for supporting us as members.

Rudi Vansnick: Indeed, thank you Joan, for highlighting this.

And I recognize that we've got the NCSG Chair -- Tapani Tarvainen -- joining us. Welcome to our meeting Tapani.

And I think we are just in time to get the Finance Team. Xavier is joining?

Man: He is.

Rudi Vansnick: He is, okay. Then we'll wait till he arrives. But I don't know if there's any question about the - yes, well we've foreseen a break, but I didn't see any coffee here.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, exactly. How can we have a break and survive here for the next four hours without coffee or at least a bottle of water.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, I don't think...

Klaus Stoll: Matters of catering my dear are really going down. Did you spend it all last night on Fadi (unintelligible)?

Rudi Vansnick: So we can have a short break and wait till we have Xavier coming in from the Finance Team, and I say we come back in in five to ten minutes maximum. We can pause the recording.

May I ask to come back to the table so that we can start our next part of the meeting which is - I suppose the recording is on again?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Oh sorry. I (unintelligible).

The presentation is uploading. While we are waiting till the presentation uploaded, I would like to thank, first of all, Xavier...

Woman: Sharon.

Rudi Vansnick: ...Sharon for joining us and giving us an overview of two aspects. One is the process of the special budget requests where we are proposing programs/initiatives/ideas that are then converted into a project itself, and how this is going on from the Finance side, and secondly, giving us a view on the Public Comment Period on the financial budget Fiscal Year '17.

So Xavier, the floor is yours.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Thank you Rudi and thank you everyone for the opportunity to come and speak with you. This is a pleasure to be with you so thank you.

(Teranne Presley) is with me. She is the person who runs the entire budget process as well as a lot of financial reporting at ICANN. So as I like to say, she's the one doing everything and then I'm trying to look good as a result.

We have a 30 short presentation. I suggest, Rudi, that we go through that because very quickly, we're going to hit the process of the additional budget request as part of this. So we'll get a chance to give you an overview of the overall budget process, and we'll look at the specific process relative to the additional budget request as part of that.

So next. Yes, thank you.

This is the presentation that we're using to provide an update on the operations of ICANN to any group that we visit like this one. An overview of the budget process, we'll talk about it a little bit more.

We also have an update on the dashboard process which is the dashboards that ICANN produces with KPIs describing the progress and performance across all activities of ICANN.

An update on operational excellence which is our EFQM program which is a business excellence and operational excellence program that is a European based organization that we use the methodology of for operational excellence; an update on our enterprise risk management activities as well -- a function that was created at ICANN two years ago.

Some people are interested in the IANA Stewardship Transition expenses and costs which have been largely the subject of a lot of interest. That's simple why we provided this, and of course we can discuss any other topic.

I will go straight away into the budget process and we'll get these budget request. Next please. Thank you.

So this is a busy slide, but it describes the various steps throughout the year for our budget process -- operating plan and budget process. I will simply comment on a few highlights.

This year for the first time, we proceeded with an update of the five-year operating plan that ICANN produced last year. The first year of that five-year operating plan was the year that we're in right now -- FY16. The second year is the year that we are budgeting for that's coming up -- FY17. So we have updated the five-year plan for the expected achievements of the year one -- FY16 that we're in.

And adjusting, if necessary, the achievements of year two -- which is FY17 -- as well as readjusting if need be the year three, four and five of that five-year plan. So that's one thing that we've added this year as part of the process. We didn't have that five-year operating plan before and now we have it to use.

That five-year operating plan update then leads us to focus on FY17, and the Annual Operating Plan of the organization, and then it's dollar quantification which is the budget, so the two go together. The Annual Operating Plan is what do we do; the budget is how much does it cost.

Highlight, so we're here; March -- 5th of March is the publication of the budget -- that was two days ago -- 6:00 or 7:00 am local time here. We published this five-year operating plan update and the annual FY17 operating plan and budget.

Sorry, when I say FY, I mean fiscal year. And our fiscal year goes from July 1 of every year to June 30 of the next year. That's our fiscal year as opposed to calendar year.

So FY16 means that it's the period starting July 1 2015, and finishing June 30, 2016. FY17 starts the day after that and finishes June 30, 2017.

The next step -- which has started of course March 5 -- is the public comment process on those two documents -- the operating plan and annual operating plan -- which starts of course last Saturday on the 5th and lasts until the end of April -- the 30th of April -- which is 56 days. It's the longest comment period that we've managed to offer as part of this process on those documents.

There are two documents so it's a lot of information, so hopefully, the 56 days is going to help in covering this.

It's also March 5, it's also the earliest we have ever published the operating plan and budget which hopefully allows more time towards the end of the process to allow then adequate time to go over the comments and provide responses.

And we have a fairly incorrective step to go over the responses on the public comment by having calls now with the organizations that have submitted comments. Those calls involve the Board members who participate to listening to the comments to be able to provide insights on how we're going to respond, so it's a fairly interactive element that we have added to this public comment process.

The Public Comment Process is very broad, right, very wide, and not very interactive. So we have added that step; that's been useful last year. And we're going to repeat that this year.

And once we have formulated answers, they are submitted to the Board Finance Committee for review in sort of quality control. And then we submit a final version of the budget to the Board, and we do submit to the Board as well all the comments that have been formulated and all the answers that have been provided so that the Board has an adequate understanding of what community has said about this budget and what the staff has responded.

And then the approval on June 30, it's not normative; it's probably the 30th of June that the budget will be approved because that's the Thursday of the Meeting B in an undisclosed location that everybody knows about.

Rudi Vansnick: In Helsinki.

Xavier Calvez: (Being) Helsinki. If the Board approves it in two days from now, right. Let's just be clear on that; it's not yet confirmed.

Any questions on this slide? Okay, next.

So this is simply to show you a picture of the Public Comment Web page. Yes, Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, maybe just to inform people that every year we have the ability with a few people from the community to sit together with the Finance Team to explore all these figures. And we did it two days ago in the evening. Having the ability to look into all the little pieces even, and it's remarkable how detailed you can get information from the team.

The knowledge of this data is incredible. I was lucky I was one of the members.

And it is important that we participate in it because it tells them also sometimes addressing things that they don't expect being important. So it's important that we participate as a community also in this effort.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Rudi, to emphasize this. This is an opportunity for interaction and interaction is obviously not one-sided; it's providing information. So that then we can get input as to are we making the right assumptions. Does that make sense? Is it clear, is it not clear, is it comprehensive, it is wrong -- simply/honestly?

So that's a very useful exercise and certainly useful from our perspective. And I think Rudi is indicating the general sense, I think, that it's useful for the community members who participated.

By the way, this is not a defined closed group; it's anyone who wants to participate. We use a mailing list which is the community-finance in which we add anyone who is interested a respective which organization/which role or anything. If you're interested in the process, just give us your email address, we'll add you to it, and you'll receive invitations to webinars, notifications on the process, and invitations to those working groups that Rudi indicated.

There's no limitation to the participation. There's no affiliation to have or to not have; it's completely open. So Rudi has been with his sense of interest and a responsibility with NPOC has wanted to participate and has been able to participate over the past three instances of that meeting.

So this is just a picture of the Public Comment Process. If you go on the ICANN.org Web site on the Public Comment Page, you scroll down a bit, this is the latest of the document offered for public comment. And you can see that it was open March 5 and it will close 30 April after 56 days, and a month after the report is due which is that month that we're going to use to be able to respond to the comments.

Any questions on that? Okay.

This is a similar view but now focused on the SO and AC additional budget request process -- which is what Rudi was talking a little bit earlier.

So this process -- quick background -- was created probably five years ago to help - to offer a venue for the organizations to indicate what type of funding would be useful to their specific activities. So ICANN supports the operations

and the activities of the Supporting Organizations, of the Advisory Committees, of the constituencies (unintelligible) in a various fashion.

But the support is relatively generates my point being that we provide secretariat services to everyone. But then each organization has their own activities -- their own topics of interest and certain ways to do what they need to do whether it's outreach or publications or things like that.

So we created this process to help the organizations be able to formulate requests for funding of certain specific activities that are of particular interest to them.

The process works as follows. We have a period of submission of requests -- and I'll come back on the process of submission. So there's a period of submissions during which each organization can formulate their requests that they would like to submit. The deadline for submitting requests was February 15 -- about a month ago.

And then the requests are being evaluated by the Staff -- reviewed by the Staff -- and also reviewed from a quality control standpoint by the Board Finance Committee.

And then the Board receives the recommendation for approval of those requests -- for approval -- because only the Board can approve a budget.

And you notice that we are targeting a Board approval by the end of April. We need to fix the date with the Board to synchronize that with their regular Board meeting that is expected to (unintelligible) then. It may actually happen early May because there is one scheduled early May and we're waiting for the schedule of end of April, so we don't know yet for sure.

The reason why we have a separate board meeting approving these requests versus the general board approval is because over time, the organizations

have indicated -- that are getting the funding -- have indicated that they would like to receive notifications as to whether their requests have been approved or not earlier than the end of June because if you made a request for an event, for example, for participating in an event that happens at the end of July, you kind of want to know about it to know whether you're funded or not, whether you have support or not, much before the end of June because then it's too late to get organized, right.

So the bottom line is we've tried to disconnect this part of the budget from the process of the rest of the budget so that an earlier approval can be provided. And therefore, once that happens, then we publish of course the entire list of requests to indicate which ones are approved and which are not. And so that everyone knows what the status is and then can get organized accordingly.

(Teranne), you wanted to speak a little bit about the submission and the criteria and the form and sound for the submission of the request?

(Teranne Presley):   Sure. Is there any way I can be promoted to a host maybe so that I can show some documents? I'm in the Adobe Room under (Teranne Presley).

Xavier Calvez: (Teranne) is going to show you -- on the Web site, on the Wiki -- where all the information is to be able to submit a request and to understand the process.

Rudi Vansnick: Meanwhile, maybe -- Xavier -- while we are waiting for the document to be uploaded - Rudi for the transcript. As I have been talking with you on the issue of 2015 -- 2016 Fiscal Year budget request -- there seems to be a difference in how we are getting results back.

In the past, I remember we got the approvals; the list of all the requests approved or not, and the value. The last year we didn't see any value that was recorded to the project, and that makes it a bit difficult to understand what do we get.

Xavier Calvez: So I think that I'll back up from that but use Rudi's comment on that to explain that there are different types of requests that are formulated by each organization. Some requests are very specific for, for example, travel support to go to an (IGF) event for example; a fairly typical type of request.

So it's one or two persons to participate to the IGF for two days, or one works so there's a slight - it's a number of room nights for a hotel. It's a pretty (unintelligible); it's very easily quantifiable.

There are other types of requests that are for the funding of an activity of outreach possibly. Other examples are for the publication.

The Business Constituency, for example, doesn't use letter at each ICANN meeting that they provide the content on. So what we have done in the past -- and we continue, for example, to do on that publication for the Business Constituency -- that we say we're going to pay for it. And we're doing the work.

My point being that the BC defines the content and does the editorial work on -- we want to see this, we want to put that -- and designs the sketch of what they want to do. And then we take that and we bring to a publisher, and we publisher the letter. We bring it over, we print it and so on, so we do all the logistically -- and we pay for the invoices.

The reason why I'm using that example is because at the end of the day, the request is for publication; it's not necessarily for an amount of dollars. And what we need to be very clear on something. What ICANN does is that it supports that work by doing it.

We don't grant funds out; we don't make the nations. We receive your request and we support it.

So when we do travel support for example, we pay for the hotel. We don't give you the money to go and pay for the hotel. We pay for the flight and we pay for the hotel.

So it's a completely different model to say, "Give me $5000 to do this." We don't do that. What we do is tell us what you want to do, we evaluate that request, and if it's granted then we pay for the activities or costs that support that activity.

Klaus Stoll: This is Klaus for the record. First of all, I want to say I really really respect and congratulate you on this tremendous effort and also these ongoing consultations with the community.

And I think what you just explained with the travel support, that makes perfect sense.

But I must strongly disagree with the last part, and it comes, for example, to publications or outreach events and things like that.

I think that that position of ICANN is completely contrary to the bottom-up multi-stakeholder model because a book -- even if it is done under the editorial of a stakeholder group -- it's done by Staff under direction of Staff and things like that. There always will be an influence of Staff on the contents, and I don't think that captures any...

Xavier Calvez: And that's absolutely not true. It's not done under the direction of Staff; it's under the direction of the BC who tells us, "This is what we want to publish. Take it, bring it to the publisher, publish, print it, bring it to the meeting." That's what we do; it's logistically what we do.

So we do not -- at all -- decide anything on the content of that newsletter for example.

Klaus Stoll: The point is -- let me come to deeper point.

Xavier Calvez: Okay.

Klaus Stoll: Let's say we are doing book. To do a book, you need authors, you need editors, you need a tremendous amount of time and expertise. The expertise resides in the community. So the people who should do the work are in the community.

And it's often the case -- and it happens in my community when I say, "Look, let's do this resource." And I go to that subject expert -- who is part of my community -- who says, "Pay me. If you don't pay me, I'm not going to do it."

And this is happening the same with outreach events. People don't want to do outreach events anymore if they don't get paid.

And so how do I solve that problem? What do I tell these people?

Xavier Calvez: Let me try to give a shot at it looking at what you just said from a slightly different perspective -- an operational perspective -- to see how we go about it, not that it will necessarily address the more structural or potentially philosophical aspect of the point which is volunteer time and how do we take that volunteer time into account, and where do the resources that contribute to the work of ICANN come from.

All right, so there's a huge amount - I mean all you here are volunteers, right. And in many organizations, everybody are volunteers whether they are representing their companies or they are supported by their companies to be volunteering time. Basically their companies are volunteering time for them or paying those people to be providing time for them -- to ICANN work.

Let's be practical about the example that you are taking. If NPOC here would like to produce a book -- you were taking that example. That requires

services to be provided by editing, for formatting, for whatever purpose. That requires funding.

I am fine that as part of the request that you formulate to for ICANN to support the book, there is hiring a consultant or a person who has the knowledge to do some amount of content production.

That's what we do, for example, for the BC newsletter. The BC tells us what they want to see in it and they provide often the actual documents -- the actual digital files with the pictures or the graph that have been -- so they are completely in control of the content.

But we get the editor company and we contract with that company to be able to produce the document, the sketch, and then we contract with the publisher for publication just to finish.

If there is content that requires to be paid for as part of the request, that's completely acceptable. I'll finish.

We need to be really careful -- really careful -- with conflict of interest. I have had in front of me a contract submitted for signature -- for not a huge amount of dollars -- of services to be purchase by ICANN. And the signatory of that contract is a chair of an organization of an SO. That was a bit strange to me.

So we need to be really careful that the perception -- and the reality of conflict of interest -- is not that an organization is trying to employ itself.

The volunteer model is what ICANN goes by today. It doesn't mean that the value that can be brought specifically by a community member or anyone in the community on services that can be of high quality, good price, is good value for ICANN and can be used by ICANN.

But we really need to really careful with the perception of conflict of interest and the reality of conflict of interest. So that type of issues we need to be very careful to manage, and we need to avoid putting the organization at risk of conflict of interest.

How does it look outside if we say, "Oh, you know, our volunteers, we pay them here," and it's becoming extremely complicated to manage and it's extremely damageable for the organization.

And it's unfair to those that are not being used. "So why am I not being employed by ICANN?"

So anyway, it's a challenging exercise, right. Let me stop there and let you react.

Klaus Stoll: I see exactly the same way as you do. But I still see it as a slight problem.

Let's say our volunteers volunteered. Not volunteers from Registrars who comes here and Registrars make money. Now volunteers from university who are normally not-for-profit civil society, but the university -- through courses and other things -- basically makes money through the participation.

There's one - and it really works in most of the stakeholder groups -- the volunteer model -- because somebody is volunteering and so who are volunteered, the organization is getting something back.

In the case, for example, is most of the organizations like in NPOC, this is not the case. The volunteers here, every minute they're volunteering is money not earned.

And we need to find ways, somehow, to enable this kind of real volunteers to participate and quite practically to eat and to survive because my fear is what I'm seeing -- to be absolutely honest, what I'm seeing -- is a lot of people

learn their trade in ICANN in organizations like in NPOC. And once they understand the system, they go to another part of ICANN because basically there, they find somebody who is actually paying them to do what we trained them to do. And this is a little bit hard to observe.

Xavier Calvez: (Unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: I mean sometimes it is a stupid sense and I have to do it. Sometimes it's like working in NPOC for ICANN is like taking a bowl of (chesapie) and (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: (Unintelligible), quickly, because we have other participants visiting for our session that we've gone now before we're getting stuck in our timetable. And I would like to have the session with (Larissa) and (Unintelligible).

Xavier Calvez: If we take five minutes to finish everything, that's okay. (Teranne), you want to show quickly the information documents that we have available for the (Unintelligible) additional budget request process?

(Teranne Presley): Yes; (Teranne Presley) for the record.

So what I'm showing here is the Finance Community Wiki. If you go to the Community Wiki and you go to Projects, Finance Community Wiki is the first option, so you just select that.

And we have current year data as well as historical data. You would want to go to the FY17 SO and AC Additional Budget Requests. Here it describes the process, the timeline, the description of what you need to do and by when.

At the bottom of this opening page, we also have a word document that describes the process and timeline, and then also the principles that govern the assessment work.

After all of the submissions come in -- which in Slide 17, we've got approximately 60 which is about average -- and all the requests, they range from travel support to training and publish documents and communications and Web support and things of that nature.

Once the deadline to submit has passed, an assessment team comes together. And the assessment team is comprised staff members from Global Stakeholder Engagement, Policy, government engagement, and also Public Responsibility and Finance just because, you know, there is a funding aspect to this.

So we get together and we review all the requests and we make assessments of the requests. Once that's done, we submit all of our assessments to a recommendations team which is made up of some global leaders as well as Xavier. And they actually make the recommendations the ICANN Board on whether or not to approve, and then the Board goes through and approves.

So all of this information is found on the Finance Community Wiki in addition to the template. The template is - I'll just show it to you here if you're not familiar with it. It's fairly simple to complete. We're just asking you for a general description of the request, what the objective of the request is, how you plan to implement the request.

And, you know, people generally provide a lot of information, and the more information that we have, the better so that we can make a proper assessment. I think that's about it.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Just want to emphasize on one document that (Taren) mentioned which we have there. We provide the criteria that we use to evaluate the requests so that you understand how a request is evaluated and then why it's granted or denied.

Criteria pertain to is it consistent with the strategic plan of the organization and so on and so on. There's many criteria. But so that you understand because of course the evaluation should be transparent at least as to what are the criteria used and how your request is evaluated against those criteria.

And of course those criteria help you understand how to formulate your request and what type of activities have more chances to be funded versus not. And sometimes, by the way, those criteria also simply help understand the requests in order for ICANN to determine is it something that we want to be funding.

There's a number of requests that are sometimes turned down simply because of resource limitations or because of resource limitations, the type of - for example - participation to non-ICANN events is limited.

It's not that it's not of value to have ICANN community members go out to present ICANN to other organizations and that's not good. It's useful but we privilege first participation to ICANN meetings and then we try to offer possibility to participate to other meetings. But it comes next.

So it becomes more a matter of prioritization or the existence of specific program of outreach that then is allowed to - in a targeted fashion - support participation, travel (unintelligible) to meetings that are non-specifically ICANN meetings. But that we look at as part of the criteria. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (Xavier). Rudi for the transcript. Just something come to my mind that in the IGF for instance when you propose workshops and the team that is doing the survey of these proposals, when they see that there is commonality, they sometimes ask the groups to join the efforts.

Wouldn't that be a good idea to do the same here in the sense of when there are proposals that are going to have similar activities that are aligned with the ideas that they could be regrouped and say look, let's do it together. It doesn't

make sense to set up twice the same work with the same outcome at the end. Maybe that's an idea that we could take up. I don't (unintelligible).

Xavier Calvez: So two comments on this. The requests that are submitted are all public, right? So we make sure that of course the requests of one organization is just as visible to the entire organization. And of course to your point there are some commonalities across of your request.

So what we do when we evaluate a request and we see someone wants to go to the IGF here and someone else wants to go to the same IGF or the same panel for example, we try to look at this in an integrated fashion. So that's a bit of an answer to that point.

So we do try to structure together the requests when it's a common purpose and common interest. We have therefore in the past -- and maybe this year as well where we'll do the same thing - when we see that there are relatively common requests then we provide a global answer to their requests.

So this group three or four years ago when (Anna) was at the head of it requested travel funding for the chairs in the similar fashion then NCUC was getting them.

We had a completely separate organization that had a similar issue because of the complex structure of the organization was in GNSO. And when we saw those two requests, basically we said okay let's look at it a bit more holistically.

And we then decided that everyone outside of the contracted parties which was a different structure - everyone in the non-commercial part of the house in the GNSO - would be funded in the same fashion so that everyone has at least two seats being funded.

So that's the way - when we see the requests having common topics, we do that. But that's not addressing the other point that you are making, which is can the organizations work together to develop common requests or a request for a common approach or program that they can all participate to.

That's - I would say it's a community led initiative. Of course it's possible. We completely welcome the idea. And we would be very happy to receive that type of request. It takes a bit of coordination up front is the only point.

Rudi Vansnick: Just to make a sample of what you are just mentioning, we have that. It's the intercession of for the non-contracted party House. It's a common request and I'm looking essentially to Tapani who is the chair of NCSG when we were talking about the request sending in for instance for IGF but (basing) in the IGF.

We had some requests already running in the past where we had one seat for each of the constituencies to go to the IGF. And I don't know. That may be another thing that you could clarify to us is I got the information but maybe it's good for everybody to know that when you have the request from years ago when you see this is really good, it should come to you the next year how that is handled.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. So this process of (SO and AC) additional budget requests is used to allow for specific activities to be carried out. But also a little bit in a pilot type of approach. So if the activity makes sense that it's something that fits that meets the criteria and so on, we're going to proceed with it.

If it's turning out to be an activity that yes works, yes delivers the value that was intended, and that's something that is intended to be repeated because it was successful, not all their requests are about repeatable things, right? So that's why I'm pointing to that.

But if that is a repeatable exercise and the value is understood, demonstrated and recognized by the organization, the community, and ICANN, then it can be integrated into the core budget of ICANN.

So I was mentioning for example the business constituency newsletter. It was submitted as a request for probably three years in a row. After a while we just said, "You know what? Let's just put that in the core budget. You don't have to request for it any more. It's just going to be part of what the department will make sure we work with you to just make happen at every meeting," because it was an awful lot of vetting.

So that's the - I would say nearly the standard mode of operation of this process is that if their request is about an activity that then turns out to be something that is valued and is intended to be continued, then it can find its way into the core budget.

At an aggregated level, so last year we granted about $650,000 of requests, which is 100% of the requests that were evaluated as to be funded, meaning that we didn't limit the number of requests funded by the amount of money. We just limited by the criteria as to whether they were meeting the criteria or not.

However, this comes on top of similar requests from the previous year that had been taken out of that process and simply integrated in the core budget. So when we look at the activities of the two years that were submitted -- FY15 and FY16 -- we found in FY16 about 1.3 million of activities of which 600 did come from those activities from the previous year that we said, "Okay, you know what? Let's just put in the current budget."

So when I hear a lot of people saying, "Oh, you only fund activities for 500K every year," no. This is the emerging part of the iceberg, right? The FSAC retreat was part of the request by the four and three years ago. Three years

ago we said we want it. It makes sense for FSAC. That's how they operate. Let's put it in the core budget.

So then we take that out of the scope but we didn't reduce the amount of the envelope the next year. We left the amount of the envelope - so then something else came in that helped. So just to put things in perspective, we can circulate the rest of the presentation for everything else that's in it so if it's of interest and we're happy to take questions on what we have not gone over... I just don't want to - but you have a question. Go ahead.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco for the record. If we dig into the data that's there, if NCSG or NPOC or NCUC was an entity within a branch of ICANN, we would be looking at our own budget and doing a KPI of our own, assessing our efficiency and effectiveness.

Man: Okay.

Sam Lanfranco: Can we pull both from the part where the allocations plus what's now in the core budget enough numbers so we can assess where we think the overall money being devoted in our direction is being spent well, it could be spent better? Like if we had a finance review committee, could we get enough granularity to do our own KPI?

Xavier Calvez: Sorry, I apologize. I am smiling because your question speaks to a topic that we've been talking a lot about. And (Tyrane) and the team and I have been trying to find ways to - in simple words - split the budget by the activities that are then distributed between each SO and AC. So what type of support do you get? And break that out.

So the very easy example of that picture is travel funding, so who gets travel funding and how many seats by each of the organizations. That's the easiest part in quotes of these type of support that I can provide. The example that I

was taking of the BC newsletter, that's also relatively simple. What we need to be able to do that is there's a lot of data crunching to be clear.

So we have started this process. We haven't finished it. And what we need to be able to do is we need to be able to do a first pass at a comprehensive approach because of course this is not something that you can just do a bit of. We could say well let's look at just NPOC but then if I give you that information into the rest of the organization, everybody's going to say well what about me?

So we need to be able to give a shot at that exercise across the board, which is what we're planning to do is just on our to-do list. And when we will have a first pass at it, we'll have to have an internal validation so that we can look if it makes sense. And then we'll bring that to the community.

This will be big information that to bring to the community that's never been provided before and that's been asked for a long time. There's no question about it. It will be very interesting to everyone. There will be a lot of dog fights that come out of that exercise by the way, but the useful facts maybe.

So it's on our to-do list. It's just a lot of data crunching to do. But the interest is very well understood. There's no other - there's no other limitations to doing that than just getting to it.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks a lot (Xavier). Rudi for the transcript. I think that we got a lot of information now that allows us to think about how we are going to address our next request, how we are going to roll out our request that we have entered. We have proposed one that seems to be seen as a very good sample. We are going to launch an ambassador program initiative we will talk about later.

And you will probably see that that's one of the requests that maybe will get through and could be globalized for all the constituencies in ICANN because we can all be ambassador and at the same time motivate a lot of people.

So I would like to thank (Xavier) and his team for giving us a better view on the whole review process, on the budget request. And I would - all of you ask to have a look at the documents that have been published the 5th of March. I have been through it.

I think you don't have to buy a newspaper in the next two weeks. These documents, there is a lot of thought in it. Very interesting. There is an Excel sheet that is more than 100 pages long. And to Sam, you will already find some detailed information that you are looking for. You will already find some.

The little ones are still not there but at least you will have a clear view on how they are defined because it's by project, by portfolio. There is so much stuff it takes time to get through it. But it is a good learning curve also at the same time.

Xavier Calvez: Can I...? Just to comment, so on that, thank you Rudi. Your review is extremely helpful to us because it can also point out to what information we're not providing or what information is not clear. So Rudi indicated that we provide all the costs of ICANN, 100% of the costs of ICANN, of the expenses of ICANN, broken down by project.

There's more than 300 projects. Those are grouped by, mapped by portfolio, by goal, by objective of the strategy plan. So it says what we do, how much it costs, and why we do it. The why is the strategy plan. This is why we're doing it. It's because it's achieving or contributing to achieve an objective or a strategy plan.

But of course structuring that information takes a certain amount of rules of how we define a project (unintelligible), which we try to apply across the

board. But that also means that maybe it's not very easily accessible or understandable. Depends on what you're looking for.

So comments that you can provide when reviewing this on - well I'd like to understand this or I'd like to understand that topic but differently - is useful for us to understand because then we can either marginally or structurally improve the way we provide that information.

Last comment on the additional budget requests - one thing that helps clarity for all of you when you make your requests as granted and how it's going to be implemented is to have a point of contact for the implementation of that request. You want to do a newsletter. You want to do an ambassador program? Who's going to be your point of contact at ICANN to go about it?

And that's the person who will then coordinate the resources within ICANN to make sure it happens. So we're going to try to make sure that as part of their requests, as part of the lists of requests granted, we associate then the point of contact within ICANN who will be the person who - the first person for you to talk to to say, "So how do I go about it?"

And we've seen many organizations who have submitted requests having the trouble of okay now it's funded. Then what do I do? So that's what we're going to try to improve on this year. Thank you everyone for your time and your comments.

((Applause))

Rudi Vansnick: So I would like to move over to our other visitors - Larisa and Sherwood. Are you going to stay there or you're going to join here - whatever you want.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Man: Yes, yes, small room.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Rudi Vansnick: Larisa and Sherwood are from the team that is looking essentially also into the reviews. But I will allow you to present yourselves. I have been sitting together with Larisa yesterday evening. And as a result you will see we are wearing this new button - reviews button.

It's not that we are under review - although maybe it's good I would be on the review one.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you Rudi. I'm Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff. And Sherwood and I work on the team that is responsible for reviews. And I realize that we use the word reviews loosely and extensively. So I know (Xavier) talked to you about the review process of requests which is a whole other context of reviews.

So not to be confused, we're talking about reviews that are a sort of progress report for ICANN to ensure that we meet our commitments and obligations. So I will let Sherwood Moore speak to you for a couple of minutes. We have a lot of information about the review process.

I know your time is limited so we'll give you just a real brief introduction and then we're happy to walk through a couple of other slides or schedule something to give you a more in-depth overview of how this will work, depending on what makes the most sense for you.

Sherwood Moore: Sure. Thank you Larisa. And I shared a deck that you have in the back there. I guess they're going to pull it up at some point in time but part of my understanding is that you are interested in finding out how to maybe kind of simplify messaging a little bit to kind of recruit people to get involved.

And so I wanted to kind of share. We started off, we had a presentation yesterday to some newcomers about the review process. And so we started off the presentation talking a little bit about motivation.

And it was relatively easy for me because I am a newcomer too. But so thinking about what I'm about to share with you, it's in the context of our target market, our target audience who are individual newcomers.

And so I'll start off talking about what motivates me and why I'm here. And so I was thinking about what would happen if I didn't have the Internet and how would that affect my life. And there are a lot of big crucial ways.

I'm a technology entrepreneur in my prior life to ICANN. So that past ten years of launching companies would be gone. My ability to connect with my friends and family, to Skype with my grandfather for his 98th birthday - gone, right?

And my ability to have a window into all of -- the human window - into all the different cultures and complex issues out there that really help me understand on a fundamental human level and inform myself about what's going on in the world would be gone, right?

And so on a more global scale, what we're seeing is that the Internet not only affects the way we share information. The important thing is it's now affecting our culture and our society and that it's changing the way that we share motivation and resources and actions.

And we're seeing that affect everything from how we're electing our Presidents, as to how - we're taking on huge problems like the environment and inequality. And it's changing the way we're sharing resources like cloud sourcing allows us to fund projects very easily and really from the bottom up make things happen, right?

So the next slides - which I think you have in the back there? Do you have the slides? It's the explain one I gave you. Okay I gave it - I think she's got it. It's not a big deal. We don't have a whole lot of time.

The next slide is about the stakeholder model, right? And so my point is that why we're doing this is - or how we're doing it - is just as important as why we're doing it.

And the reason for that is because something as complex as the Internet and all the different stakeholders and the changing technology environment that we face - the only model that really works to keep it free and open as it is right now is the multi-stakeholder model, right?

And so the interesting thing is the newcomers we were talking to - but organizations as well - we're all participating in this vast new experiment which is simply the largest multi-stakeholder decision-making model in the history of humankind. And we're all doing it right now.

And it's incredibly important in our motivations or my motivation I should say - because I can only speak for myself - is to protect that for myself and for future generations. And it's important, it's crucial, that we do a good job because it's not a guarantee.

This responsibility and this right that we have right now has been offered to us and we need to take it and make it work because there are organizations out there that they would love to take this over and not have the multi-stakeholder model exist as it does today. And so the world is watching us and it's important that we do everything we can to make this work. The power's in our hands right now.

So all of that is about my motivation and the stakeholder model. And I wanted to share that with them and I'd love to ask about their motivation but we didn't have the time. But then I kind of launched into reviews. And for me the

reviews are one of the most interesting things about ICANN because it's what happens - we look at what happens when policy meets the real world, right?

So we look at the difference between what the intent was and the actual impact. And then we figure out how to improve it and make recommendations on how to make it better, which is so important because it's always a changing landscape.

And in order to make these policies effective we have to have kind of a learning center within ICANN. We have to have kind of a health check to make sure that they're still having the results that the community intended.

And so that's kind of the motivation and the big picture. And then Larisa knows a lot more about the specifics of the review process that I just - I'll turn it over to her.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you very much. So before we spend too, too much time talking about the specifics of reviews, I just wanted to leave you with an overview that there are two types of reviews that we generally oversee.

Both types of reviews are mandated by our governing documents so this is the Affirmation of Commitments, the AoC reviews, which cover areas of accountability, how ICANN makes decisions in a transparent and accountable way for the interest of the public.

There is a review of security, stability, and resiliency of the domain name system. And actually that review will be kicking off shortly. We have a review of the WHOIS policy which looks at the accuracy and access of information for registrants.

And then the newest review that you probably have heard about is the CCT review which is the review of the impact of the top level domain program on competition, consumer choice and consumer trust. And that work is currently

underway. So those four types of reviews are a way - address the Affirmation of Commitment requirements.

And these reviews are mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments. Then in addition to that we have organizational reviews. And Rudi and several others of you are probably familiar with one of those reviews that's currently in the final stages, and that's the review of the GNSO.

And the purpose of that review, which is mandated by the ICANN bylaws, is to look at the various structures that make up ICANN and to ensure that those structures are operating effectively and that they are fulfilling the mission that they're intended to fulfill.

These reviews are different in that they're conducted by independent examiners whereas AoC reviews are conducted by a community of volunteers. So I wanted to leave you with that general information and certainly a thought that there is many places that people can get involved in the review process, that community members can get involved.

And we're hearing that it's very daunting for many to think of how to get involved because the reviews are long. They take from start to end - could take as long as three years from the planning phase to the time that improvements are implemented. And that's an enormous amount of time to ask any volunteers to commit.

And many have in the past, and that's really important work. But it's important to note that you don't have to have a block of three years. And most of you don't have a block of three years to contribute. So there is other really viable and important opportunities to engage, starting with just learning about the reviews, providing feedback through public comments to your representatives on the review, and so on.

So for example Rudi is that connection to the group that oversees and serves as a liaison for the GNSO review so that the interests of this group and your views on the recommendations and how they might be implemented are essentially channeled through Rudi and are considered in the broader sense. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Larisa. Maybe to be practical we are in the GNSO, we are part of the GNSO. We know that there has been a first GNSO review. This is the second one. Could you help us understand what the impact is on a constituency like ours?

What could happen to us? What are things we need to be prepared for? Because you have the experience having going through so many reviews or implementation of reviews.

It's good to know for us what is the focus we have to have in the near future or maybe distant future, depending on how critical the recommendations are in restructuring. And we know that there is quite some discussion going on on restructuring the GNSO. It could allow us to be more voiceable but it could be that we are reduced.

So it may be good if you could help us, given a view on what is the implication of the implementation of recommendations coming out of a review.

Larisa Gurnick: Great question Rudi. So the first review of the GNSO took place I'd like to say six or seven years ago. It's quite a while. And out of that came out some sweeping changes that restructured the GNSO and created the two side structure essentially that you're all a part of.

There is important lessons learned from the past experiences and when we were going into the planning efforts for the current review there was a lot of discussion as to whether this review should focus on restructuring the GNSO

or whether it should focus on just evaluating how well the GNSO is able to fulfill its missions and how it's working from an efficiency perspective.

The direction from the board, which comes through the organizational effectiveness committee, was that this review would focus on the efficiency side, not the restructuring. So the specific mandate to the independent examiner was not to come up with different structures for the GNSO. And I know that there's been quite a bit of debate and discussion about that fact.

So there is a lot of work and effort right now including I think a session later this week on open discussions about what should the future of the GNSO be, what should the structure of the GNSO be, to support this strategic direction of ICANN and the GNSO, which obviously would have a tremendous impact on you as well as all the other aspects of your work.

And the board's perspective is that it's a bottom-up process and it's for the community to begin the dialogue and begin the conversations and the actions to figure out what a more ideal structure would be. So that is not one of the outcomes of the review.

In other words, the review does not provide a roadmap for how the GNSO should be restructured at all. There is one recommendation in particular that touches on the structure of the review - excuse me, touches on the structure of the way the constituencies are configured.

But that also is getting quite a lot of debate and dialogue. And it's not clear that this particular recommendation will get implemented. So this will be discussed further at the GNSO Council. And you all have, you know, obviously opportunities to provide input to the GNSO Council.

But in a broader sense there is a lot of recommendations that have been issued by the independent examiner. And these recommendations, some

seem to be really useful from the perspective of the people that have analyzed those recommendations on the GNSO review working party.

I think it's fair to say that staff would agree that many recommendations were useful. Some recommendations are slightly challenged or significantly challenged by the fact that they're very broad and aspirational and it's very difficult to understand how to go about Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, what would be done, how long would it take, what would it cost.

So all these considerations have been included in the analysis that the working party went through to prioritize the 36 recommendations. But it's very likely that if all the recommendations that look like they're useful - if all of those get moved forward for implementation, the impact on this group as well as many other - the entirety of the GNSO - is that there is a great deal of work to be done.

And there are some serious concerns and questions that are being voiced about how to balance all this because when we look at the feasibility and the prioritization of the review recommendations, that's all - it's done in a bit of a vacuum.

We just look at 36 actions and try to figure out which ones should go first. That doesn't really consider the overall capacity or workload of everything else that goes on, which is extensive.

So I would say that the best way to prepare for that and to ensure that you have a voice in this is to continue to provide input through the GNSO Council, through Rudi and the working party which is the liaison.

That's the voice of the GNSO which will be considered by the organizational effectiveness committee of the board, whose job it is to oversee this whole process and ultimately the board because all the recommendations and all

the feedback from the community ultimately ends up in front of the board for their consideration and their decision.

And prioritizing and focusing on the most important areas and thinking about what the desired impact and outcome should be and making sure that volunteer time and resources are really directed to the most impactful recommendations that can lead to change -- I think that's probably the best area of focus for you all.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Larisa. Rudi for the transcript. And you're giving me quite important sign (signal). And NPOC is a quite small team actually. Without thinking about restructuring the GNSO itself, the fact that these recommendations are going to land on our table will request efforts from us, from our team.

And if you have a small team it can crash your team because we're volunteers at the end. And if you don't have volunteer time any more, your operation stops. And I think that's one of the issues that we have to look into for the implementation of reviews.

I think we need to prepare our teams. And it's difficult to prepare them because most of us have no experience having implemented recommendations coming from above and readdressing things that we need to do. And that's why I was happy to see that there is kind of team building on the reviews itself to allow us to understand what our mission is in the review process itself because it's additional to what we are doing.

And I think I'm looking to the NCSG chair, Tapani, that this is something we need to put on the executive committee agenda in the future because this is going to request from all three the structures efforts - NCSG as well as NCUC and NPOPC.

And it is all the same people at the end. So I'm a bit afraid of the impact of the implementations of our structure. Anyway, I don't know how you are feeling it, Tapani, but I think we need to be prepared.

And as we were yesterday sitting together in an informal meeting session, I think it's important that we could give deadlines - or timelines sorry, not deadlines but timelines - to recommendations so that enables us to hand work for up front when it is going to happen because we have a small team.

We need to look for effort for volunteers to help us maybe just for the implementation of the review. But I don't know what your view is.

Tapani Tarvainen: Just briefly I agree that advance planning is definitely useful and I'll be more than happy to put in our NCSG Executive Committee agenda whenever you want to bring it up or even if you don't actually. It's something we do need to talk.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Tapani. Rudi for the transcript. I think we can count on Larisa's team to join us on such a call and help us in giving us guidance because we need guidance. I know some of the members in our NCSG structure have experience - like (Avri) for instance. She was in the ATRT2 team.

They have experience but we cannot count always on the same people. We need to enlarge our knowledge and our capacity to react to things. And I would like to ask Larisa if she is willing with her team to join us in a call of the Executive Committee to explain what the work is that is going to happen and when it's going to happen.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. This is Larisa. Absolutely. Any guidance staff can provide as to what happens and how to structure the implementations - implementations are essentially projects.

This is connecting the dots to (Xavier)'s presentation on which Rudi was saying I think some of you have had some inkling of how ICANN as an organization manages our projects. And it's a vast amount of work and details that includes timelines and milestones and actions and, you know, all the great things that a good project management discipline brings to the table.

And we are piloting that sort of an approach with implementation of review recommendations starting with ATRT2 because there is a clear understanding that a two-line recommendation that seems really brief could yield years' worth of work for many, many people. So we are challenging ourselves and everybody else to really look before the recommendation is acted upon before the board or the council.

So yeah this is a good idea. Many things may be a good idea, but that doesn't necessarily mean that there is capacity to implement. So connecting the dots between capacity and what should be done given all the other responsibilities - we'd be happy to provide any guidance on this.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Larisa. Rudi for the transcript. I don't know if there is anybody else having a question for Larisa and Sherwood. If not I would like to thank you very much for your explanations. I think that some of us will be aware that there is new work coming on.

And I'm looking essentially to the newcomers. Hey guys, look, there is work to be done. And some of that work could be interesting to you. Maybe you specialize in implementing reviews. Happy to have you among us because there is a lot of work coming anyway. The transition is not the only thing. It's also the implementation of the GNSO review. It's going to have an impact on us anyway. Yes, Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Just to add to that, as we're looking at how things could get implemented, different kinds of recommendations, it's becoming clear that there is many

different ways that someone could participate in the process depending on the skills and depending on the interest.

There's policy kinds of related recommendations. There's a lot of recommendations on participation and engagement and diversity. And for many of those quantifiable data based kinds of work would be really useful. So if people have interest in numbers and analysis and helping develop KPIs and such, that's another very useful skill.

So not to take too much of your time but think about the kinds of work that you like to do or you are best suited to do and chances are there's probably a place for that.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Larisa. And I think you have a candidate just sitting aside you that when you talk about KPIs he's an economist. I'm almost sure he is triggered now that oh this is interesting to me. Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes I think that while it's a long process, it's one that, you know, we can get involved with. When (Xavier) left I caught him in the hallway and I reminded him of two things. One was that for the breakouts, the data we want, that in open data projects one of the problems is that sometimes you have 100 words for the same thing.

So they're going to need both accountants and linguists to sort out where ICANN spends its money. And the other was the old saying about the difference - he said one of the problems with how we spend money on engagement because we don't agree on what engagement is. I reminded him - and it comes up here - there's a difference between the way the pig participates in breakfast and the chicken participates in breakfast.

The chicken is engaged and the pig is committed. So the trick here is to run these reviews where people remain engaged but one step short of being committed at the level of killing themselves. But we're in it.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam for this cartoon approach. So thank you Larisa. Thank you Sherwood. We will move on with our internal work now.

I would like to have our two ladies from Argentina giving us an overview of what they have been doing as a project in Argentina. And it's a sample of what an NGO can do and will do to help the community, to help us be more seen in the outside world. So I'm giving the mic to (Azella).

(Azella Altina):   (Azella). Yes. We are here representing (Alisay) a civil society organization based in Argentina.

The civil society organization aims to promote civil rights. And they are focused on Internet issues like privacy and data protection. But here in ICANN Buenos Ares we started to get involved in NPOC. We have realized that in Argentina there is a lack of awareness about the importance of domain names for organizations. So we started to - no, to develop these toolkits. We are still in the process so this is a first version. We are presented here. It's in Spanish of course because in Argentina our NCOs speak Spanish so that's why it's here in Spanish (unintelligible). Thank you much.

(Orila):   So the deal was that we realized most NGOs just doesn't - does not care about their domain names and they really don't know what's going on with their domain names. So we realized that it would be kind of cool to have a new approach. And so we made a toolkit which is it's in Spanish as (Azella) said but it's pretty easy to understand.

And we began to ask ourselves questions like what would we do if we wanted to have our NGO and registrar domains. So first we start with what is a domain name. And I was kind of weird because I started asking my friends, "Hey what do you think is our domain name?" And they were all, "Well those crazy letters I type when I try to get online." And that's not the answer we

wanted like we were expecting something a little more complex. So we decided to explain it. And (Martin) can you switch to the other please?

After that we said, "Okay nobody knows how the domain names are divided." And so we tried to get this approach with this graphic approach. And it's much more easier than to tell them. So we decided to use it this way with our Web page which is pretty basic and it's pretty interesting and it happened to work. So then we were to the NICs like where should I - which is my domain. And there was a real question that people asked as everybody knows the .coms are but they didn't know it had an office. They just thought that the domain names were registered by themselves or something like that.

So we also made a page explaining the functionality of the (new car) and that kind of stuff. It was pretty good to do because it also help us get an update on that. And we tried to explain ICANN to them. And that was the most difficult thing to do.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Orila): Yes that's was quite challenging, you know, because they were like, "Oh but you're a lawyer." "What are you doing there." They just (unintelligible) stuff. And I was like, "Yes but you know you should understand how that works because it's actually affecting you and it's actually affecting your NGO and your domain names and further on." And...

Klaus Stoll: Sorry (Klaus) for the record. Do you know what the answer should have been?

(Orila): No. I don't know.

Klaus Stoll: IP lawyers are the richest lawyers in the world.

(Orila): Well I tried to go like, "I am a cool lawyer that likes Internet and you should do it as well."

Rudi Vansnick: By the way you're using a sample here that is even more complex for those who don't understand the domain name world because you have two combinations in your let's say URL to make it appear to URL. You have two combinations which for most of the people is probably so complex that they don't understand anymore. Because if you have the .org and the .ar combined in one domain name. And I think that's the most complex thing you can have even.

(Orila): We got into talk about that and we decided to go with the .org the - instead of the .com because we - yes because we realized that it was important to like to people that are in the NGO movements to realize that .org exists. And it's important like when you decide register your domain name you go - it's accord to the work you do, you know, and the NGO reflects what you do. Actually ADC it's an NGO so it makes more logic to be on the NGO domain that the in the.com that are so that's why we made it like that. Yes please.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes didn't you get the question? This is really interesting you know. When you used the .org .ar didn't you have organization saying, "Well why should I just use .org?" Did the question come up or were they surprised or were they saying, "Okay do I get and the .org and the .ar?" Because this is really a complex combination where I think you...

((Crosstalk)

Rudi Vansnick: Okay sorry that I disturbed your presentation.

(Azella Altina): We use this example because we notice that most or almost all NCOs in Argentina use the .com (.tar). It's kind of if you're going to register a domain name you are going to use the (.tar). So what we want to address here is not to use the .com (.tar). Use it or (.tar) if you are going to use the ccTLD.

(Orila): (Unintelligible) This is (Orila) for the record. Lots of people - lots of NGAs - NGOs just go for the .com .or. And we want to emphasize the fact that it's important to go to the NGO .com or NSA .com that are because it actually makes a statement and definitely assures you to get known as an NGO. And that's kind of the idea that we were having with this toolkit it's to advise NGO how not only they can take care in like the intellectual property and property things but also in the branding stuff because it's actually important and we think it's the thing that's being left aside when we talk about NGOs.

Lots of people here talk about like outreaching but outreaching is not just talking to the people. It's also making an impact by your name. So that's why we decided to go this way. And it was a hard work. We made it and it was hard work to decide on this topic. So we realized that that's what we want to like to improve in NGOs, yes.

Rudi Vansnick: By the way did they tell you why they were using .com rather than the .org?

(Orila): I mean nobody told us but I get the feeling that it's much more spread and is much more well-known because lots of people that are - like not lots of people are into the new gTLD program so everybody's just assuming the Internet is.com. And that's like a common thing going on. Like everybody say okay it's .com, Internet is the .com, you know, well known as that way.

People just don't realize they got a variety of other things. And if you start asking most of the people that got another TLD are people they're (unintelligible) are like inside ICANN or that people that are advising them to do it that way. So that's why we decided to go with this toolkit to start changing this perspective over .com and start realizing we got much many other offers to go with. So (unintelligible) (Martin) (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk)).

(Orila): Guess not, (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Orila): So actually...

Woman: (Unintelligible) about the ICANN.

(Orila): This is the ICANN part where we talk about IANA...

Woman: Very short actually.

(Orila): ...just introducing them to get them curious about it and maybe they will go online and search this. That was the idea. We also talk about a little bit about cybersquatting and those kinds of problems the NGO usually have and they don't know they have so just to get that on the (unintelligible). We talk about level of (unintelligible) as we told you. And that's pretty much it. We wanted to keep it simple because it's a first approach. And the idea of this is to get people curious and approach us.

And once they talk to us we can talk them in about this word. So that's what our perspective regarding this toolkit and this capacity building we're trying to do with ADC.

(Azella Altina): Yes now this toolkit is going to be published in the organization Web page. But now we're starting with a communication plan maybe to outreach the organizations to read it because it's not long but it's ten pages. So we want to develop a Webinar or something like that to express what is in there or maybe an event or something like that.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. This is really interesting. I'm a bit impressed by the way you have been doing it and how deep you have been to figure out what the problem and the complexity is in your communities. And that's what we

need in NPOC. We need to understand where does the organization have problems to understand what it is.

I saw also Google and (Giggle). It's amazing you're touching up on things that are quite often point of problem in an organization. They don't understand how to use email, how to use the Web and I think you're touching up on a lot of things that are quite helpful.

(Azella Altina): It also seems as I said this with freedom of expression and privacy issues as a human rights we want to highlight that domain names are expressions names or ways of expression. And that's important of the domain.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (Klaus) you have your hand up?

Klaus Stoll: First of all absolute congratulations. I really like it. Secondly I would say there are many, many avenues open now for you to promote this. I mean I hereby and I offered in the past this ideal as a basis for a Webinar which we can do in one (unintelligible). We can approach .lap to help promoting this. We can go to .ngo .ong. And let's work together on sorting have a strategy there.

And thirdly I think this is just the beginning of a series of things. For example the next one should be on privacy and security and things like that. And these are living documents which can change all the time. So I think you did something tremendous start here and I just want to commend you on that. And I hope that we can support you in that as much as we possible.

Rudi Vansnick: I have using a proposition to there. As you said it's only in Spanish for the moment. I would call on ICANN translations and we will have a chat on this. I will ask ICANN translation to translate this. I can put it in the NPOC context and say, "Look this is what NPOC needs." And I am sure that as (Tapani) is here, the NCSG chair this is indeed good stuff, good material for those who are in the grassroots of the not-for-profits. This is material we need.

I will claim translation be done in English and French and maybe other languages so that we can bring it up on in the NPOC community and the NCSG community because this is helpful. Yes (Olivier)?

(Olivier Corni): Thank you. Yes, (Olivier Corni) for the transcription.

Rudi Vansnick: (Olivier)...

((Crosstalk))

(Olivier Corni): I would like to congratulate the ADC team because of this job. It's a great job but I would like to know if you have the support of the NIC Argentina? Thank you.

(Orila): No. We don't have the support of NIC Argentina. It's going through a big change right now. So the information which is for on the document is objective information that we acquire from the Web page. So it's a nongovernmental full document with information that is publicly in this position for people.

So the 80 hours to keep it that way and not to get our opinions on the toolkit. So this toolkit was basically in that area which has got together all the information that was flowing through the NIC, our Web page. And we just put it on the document to have it much more easier for NGOs to approach it. That's it.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. Sure you can get support from them if you approach them. I'm sure you will get support.

Klaus Stoll: We know the guy who runs it so...

Man: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: I have also (Joan) in the queue. (Joan) you have the floor.

Joan Kerr: (Joan) for the record. Great work guys. And I was going to suggest that English so I won't talk about that since it's been addressed. This could be a really great primer for us for education outreach. Because really people need to know the basic, basics of domain names because that's what we are struggling with. People either don't value their domain name or actually don't know the value of their domain names or even some of the extensions that are available. So they go to Facebook or, you know, use social media when that's also a problem. So I'm really happy to hear that we would be able to translate it and with your permission if we could have it as a primer on the NPOC Web site.

Klaus Stoll: This is (Klaus) for the transcript, two thoughts. Thought number one, one of the big problem is always why domain name and why is domain name better than social media? And (Sam) two years ago in Singapore gave a wonderful, wonderful presentation on that topic. So maybe a good idea (Sam) if you could pass that one over here be - and for a new version or so that might help them a little bit to explain that because I think it's very valuable to explain what the value of a DNS is.

                   And as a second thought (Tapani) why shouldn't we make this the Webinar or whatever in front of the Helsinki meeting and present that as Webinar to finish outreach and to finish NGOs?

Tapani Tarvainen: Sounds like an interesting idea. I guess I we'll to get it translated into Finnish as well and Swedish for your benefit too.

Klaus Stoll: Yes but we still got time. That's what I mean if you start thinking about it now.

Rudi Vansnick: (Rudi) for the transcript. I have already started up in my mind to and I wrote it down what is my duty in the next few days is. We have seen the lady from (Elizabeth) from the e-learning platform. We can use them also to do work to

help us getting - get around in the world. So I have a track of actions that I need to do is one, in attrition tradition in our agenda today the end of our day is about the NPOC strategy 2016 outreach.

This is a beautiful sample of outreach in a specific domain in a specific region. And this is something we need to repeat. So what I'm going to do is talk to the people that I need to talk to in ICANN that before I'm leaving Marrakesh I have a plan for you, a plan of action because otherwise it will not work.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Yes with them but for them but with them of course. So I see several hands popping up already (Joan) and (Sam). (Joan)?

Joan Kerr: (Joan) for the record. May I ask a question though? If we could just take a quick step backward (Klaus)? That's okay. Just - you've design this but there has been no outreach to date correct?

(Azella Altina): Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

(Azella Altina): We are presenting it here.

Joan Kerr: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: So I'm just wondering if it's a pilot project if we should allow you some time to do that process to get some feedback on some of the issues that, you know, you can have a great idea and then you go out there and it's like thought I had a great idea. But then you have to then it's a living document right?

I'm just wondering (Rudi) if we could maybe take a step back and let them do like you know our support already. There's is no question there just to say that this document was created in Spanish. Here's how it - the outreach went. Here's some of the feedback so that we when we do it in English and stuff we can also have some of the issues that came up and how they were addressed and so you know I mean, so that we're going actually to the next step kind of thing? I don't know if that's a suggestion that's doable.

(Orila):   (Orila) for the record. Yes that's actually our idea. It's we finished the document like not so - yes like two weeks or three weeks ago and we were looking forward doing some Webinars or an event to show it and to see how people react to it because that's actually our idea but nevertheless we will need the support to do this stuff because we just don't get on with the (unintelligible).

So yes for sure. We are looking forward to seeing all this reacts, how the NGOs react in Argentina. And yes for sure I think that's the idea to go step-by-step right?

Joan Kerr: (Rudi) if I just could clarify. I didn't mean that we take away the support for you to do it. I'm saying for the next.

Rudi Vansnick: (Sam)?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay I just wanted to elaborate briefly on (Klaus)'s comment about the choice between social media and DNS domain names. I'm going - I'm reworking the material at the moment because the area has actually expanded. Most of the discussion is about having your own brand name and worries about security and so forth but there are several other issues that have developed over just the last little while.

One of them is a very serious list of ethical questions about exposing your constituency your clients to data mining by those who come to see you. You know, if you have a women's group in downtown Buenos Aires and people walk through the front door you don't ask them for details about themselves and sell it to somebody. But if you go to social media that's what happens. They ask for details and they sell it to somebody.

The last one is that there's a growing issue about whether or not social media are going to remain free or not because they are running into problems in terms of their sustainability. And so it may turn out that NGOs had better develop some internal capacity to deal with a crisis that may come down the road where they simply can't get access to social media the way they wanted to.

So there's a whole bunch of stuff there that needs to be put together for a module and I'm working on that and I'll share with you.

(Orila): Yes sure, thank you very much. Actually a kick start for this was like why everybody or why NGOs are only on Facebook and the Web page are so old? That was the first question we raised like why do they have these ugly and very old looking and difficult Web page and the Facebook page is so updated? I know that but this was the kick start question where we started like okay what should we do?

And so we came out with this group toolkit like the first thing before looking into companies just looking or how you display your domain name. And we found out these things we were sharing and that's why we came out with this. And we would love to see your work and to people and getting on that. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. (Rudi) for the transcript. And I have even a proposal. We have a survey that we have been doing in Europe on NGOs to get a view on what are the problems that they have to have a scope on. We have that in

Spanish now available. We will send you the link and you can send it out to your community.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Perfect. So sorry that I'm repeating it. I would like to go over it a bit around the table looking to the new people in our room here what they think about such projects? Is this something that would work in your country? Do you think this is valuable? Because then we need to look into how we can help you get it done in your region together with ADC of course.

I think it's important that we know that this is something that is on your plate eventually too and how we can help you to get people in our community to help us doing the policy work because it's a two-way action. So I don't know what you think about...

Man: Thank you very much. I think that as I apply for the first time on behalf of Africa 2.2 who was my (unintelligible). And my second question to Mr. (Tapani) is about whether I can be part within the NCUC as a member from an organization and also as an individual for my country.

And the reason I - my motivation was that I can see that not many people from Africa actually are contributing a lot to this structure and I think that we need to bring more people inside. And I want to work along to make a successful outreach for that.

And this morning after the intervention of (Klaus) I just ask him whether it's possible for me to replicate this event within West Africa or in my country because it will help people know more about that. And I think definitely we need to make and replicate something such as the Pathfinder initiative and how we guide to do that both as a member from my organization or as an individual actually if my request is accepted. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay just as for joining NCUC is an individual while your organization is an NPOC that is perfectly possible within the NCSG rules and NCUC as well although will be up to the NCUC Committee to approve you or not. But I do not see it's likely to be a problem. There are several people from Uganda including (Rudi) here for example and many other NPOC members have their individual members in NCSC and NCUC as well.

And regarding your proposal you - it sounds a very good one. And I hope we will be able to help you in that in whatever way we can.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (Rudi) for the transcript. As (Tapani) said we welcome people that are willing to join us. And we are willing to join you in your efforts. For instance as I said earlier I was at the (Third Trifecta) Summit.

The initiator of the Pathfinder initiative is GKPF. And that umbrella I went to the (Third Trifecta) Summit in the context of an MOU that we have signed with (Victor) which demonstrates that inside the GNSO although we are in different constituencies we can have agreements between them and well use established that they allow to do work together.

And that's - and that reason that I went to the (Victor) Summit in Joburg in August last year where I did it in a half day DNS workshop. And they claim me back already for this year. I have to go back to do it again. So I'm happy to come to your country and do the same thing that I did in Joburg because the result of that is that we had three new members from Africa in NPOC.

So it - there is a return but we need indeed - and that's one of the questions and it fits in the discussion is the end of our day to day is the outreach. What does it mean in ICANN but also what does it mean outside of ICANN? And one of the things that we need to highlight more and more and as I said I think in the beginning of this meeting there is the outreach that is a strategy defined by ICANN and ICANN staff.

And they say they consider input from the community. Although our strategy is different and we need to have a strategy, another strategy that isn't built from the bottom. We have to fit together and have a working group. And there is enthusiasm on my proposal. I have to make it official on the SO AC leadership list this year or this week to get it kicked off. What I would like to get is and using the samples of the youngsters here bring forward ideas and ways they are doing and being successful. These ways we have to put them together and say look this is our strategy. It's not a big corporation talking to NGOs no, It's NGOs talking to NGOs. Bring them at the same level. Don't put somebody, don't put Bill Gates in front of them because they will just be feared by.

And I think that's one of your essential objectives is you talk at the same level. You bring down the issues at the level they can understand. And that's the outreach process that we need to have a look into. And I know and (Klaus) is getting nervous because he is so enthusiastic about this approach also that the outreach needs to be done in a different way. So (Klaus) you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: (Klaus) for the record. No. I just wanted to share with you the question I will ask to the board this afternoon which goes directly into that direction. I know it's too long. I know I need to learn grammar and English but here it is.

It is a two-part question. Part Number 1, does the board agree on the need for greater awareness and capacity building for broader and deeper engagement in ICANN? If CIANN cannot find practical ways to enable deeper and wider participation this will threaten the very legitimacy of ICANN's multi-stakeholder governance model.

And part two what are the parameters under which the outreach and capacity building should be implemented? ICANN is doing a huge and highly recommendable outreach effort. We observe that these efforts focus very

often on promoting on ICANN is an organization and it mainly executed by ICANN staff.

Would it be - would it not be more consistent with a bottom-up multi-stakeholder model if the outreach would focus on the DNS and it's policymaking processes? And should the outreach and the awareness building not be implemented and executed jointly by all SOs and ACs following a Joint Cross Community Outreach and awareness strategy?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (Olivier)?

(Olivier Corni):   Thank you (Rudi), (Olivier) for the record. I would like to reply to my brother and friend from Berlin (unintelligible). Okay, we are here because of not-for-profit but in Africa DNS is not well-known for now. In Africa and ICANN is working to promote business with DNS in Africa first. If - for (unintelligible) years that I'm a member of NPOC I'm trying to do outreach. And I'm sure that the people who need NPOC containment are from the developing countries.

But now from - for now they are - they need to do business before and so to understand why a not-for-profit is necessary for our developing countries. That's the problem. That's why we are not enough in NPOC at this moment.

So I'm glad to see that you (identified) by Pathfinder project (unintelligible). We can collaborate and see if you can do something together with (Catogo), and Ghana, (unintelligible) is the West African Civil Society Initiative in Ghana which is a network of association and NGOs so we can work together for this. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Olivier). Well I would like first to come back to the text that (Klaus) has been proposed. Is there any objection or remarks with regards to text that (Klaus) has been reading? Because that's what we from NPOC are going - and to NCSG are going to bring as questions to the board? No objections? Yes (Sam)?

Sam Lanfranco: I just wanted to say I think it's short and sweet and to the point and that's good. There's no preamble. There's no whereas. It's just we have a question.

Rudi Vansnick: I have to agree with (Sam). I'm really impressed (Klaus). You did really marvelous. That's to the point and there is no negativity in it. It's...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: It's a perfect...

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible) it's the negativity of everything because the ratings between the NCSG and the board just asked for more (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: No it's (Rudi) for the transcript. It's really great text. This is going to demonstrate that we are willing to sit together and work together and look each other in the eyes and agree that we need to do more than is - what is done today.

So we still have 12 minutes left, more plans for the new future. Well you all know that there is work to be done in the working groups. That's not new. That's old stuff and there's much more work coming up with the IANA transition that's going to be happen or not happen -- whatever it is.

But aside that as already (Klaus) has been mentioning the next normal if it's an agreed and when the resolution is going to pass in two days the next meeting is going to be in Helsinki, not in Panama. And although I'm European it allows me to have short travel I would have preferred being in Panama because our target community is rather there than in Helsinki.

There are NGOs also there but they have much more capability to participate in meetings like this. While in Panama this is a region that needs that we come to them and we will probably go anyway back to them. So June is a

date that we need to keep in our agenda. And we need to start now preparing our meetings because quite often we are a bit late with preparation of our meetings.

But I would like now to as I see that we have the constituency day, it's 9:30 starting until 1 o'clock. And most often we don't have enough time to discuss everything. It's too short. We have so many things where we want to have a discussion on and we don't have the time any more to do it. I think this one was quite well because we had some good input from inside the ICANN things that we need to keep in our mind constantly, not every day but we need to keep an eye on. And for the next phase I think we will work. And I think that (Joan) has some comments to bring to what we need to do in the near future. And I see (Sam) also. Yes (Joan)?

Joan Kerr: Yes thank you (Rudi). (Joan) for the record. So our next phase in the membership engagement is to announce a really exciting project. And so I'm going to ask if it's okay with you Mr. Chair if (Martin) could just give us a 30 second one minute overview of - this is something that came out of how do we engage our members but making it not just for work but also performance. So here's (Martin). Thanks.

Martin Silva: Yes. The idea was born out of the feeling we had that we have an active membership list. We obviously have evidence of that. But the members weren't doing their actual work on the working group so not even any comments. It was at most answer on the list.

So we figured out how can we improve that? And we came up with the not so creative idea of some sort of initiative or program that would give us the ability to guide them into the process of doing working groups and PDPs. And we name it it's (Bell) like a fictional name but it is an ambassador initiative.

It is of trying to not only bring members to an active place but also to engage new members to improve the diversity of NPOC both in general region and background.

And the idea of the program is to select people on the basis of merits and diversity and the ability to commit. It will be mainly driven by work on the workshop on the working groups and PDPs and comments that is to have them work on that so that we also learn how that how can we engage the better. And (unintelligible) is each ambassador can have a successful program. They will become themselves a (unintelligible) in their own region and replicate.

This is mainly a draft. This is just an idea. We don't have anything written down but it is to keep it as simple as possible because the bottom idea is the thing that all had in ICANN that is we want people to do policy work and this is just another approach we have. I think we evolved from when we started and I think this is some more complex approach but it is evolving and it is to - it is going to be more complex than just send emails. I think it's inside of our scope and outreach capacity.

Rudi Vansnick: I see reactions. First (Orila).

(Orila):   I think it's a wonderful idea. I was part of the ambassador program in the (NextGen) (unintelligible) and ICANN program. So maybe we can come up with another name not to get confused with that program.

Martin Silva: That's fine because first it was a membership what we actually choose and then the pilot membership appeared so we can use ambassador. We can use membership we can - yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Martin Silva: We have to think for a name that is not confusing. I forgot that the next generation has an ambassador position, that's true.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Martin Silva: I forgot about that position.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Martin Silva: We just have to come up with the name. Tt the end of the day for us it's really not important.

(Azella Altina): Yes they're like saying something like delegate or...

Martin Silva: Delegate, believers.

(Azella Altina): Believers.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Silva: But it really...

(Azella Altina): Okay yes. It could be well we can...

Martin Silva: That's for us is just a color. It just nothing more than that.

Rudi Vansnick: If I may (Rudi) for the transcript. We are going to claim the name ambassadors for us. We are the community. It's ours. We are going to claim it. We have the strength of saying okay this is a sample project that works for us. If - they have to choose another name.

Woman: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: We keep ambassador. I'm strong on this. It's ours. Done.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Martin Silva: Okay but you're going - it your profit (unintelligible). I'm not going to give that fight. I'm willing to change the name to anything but...

Rudi Vansnick: It's not a fight it will be a collaborative approach because that model can work everywhere. And that's why I am saying this is something that the community should own, not ICANN should own that. And I think that even (Tapani) is taken by you wanted to comment on?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Actually I - yes, I like this very much and just keep on fighting and don't let others appropriate your names because they didn't (unintelligible).

Woman: I agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: But I want to comment on something you said earlier as well. Actually two things I want to say. First everybody remember there's an NCSG session starting at 2 o'clock after lunch in (Palmeri). You're welcome there. And also I would have loved to go to Panama. I can't help (unintelligible) also kind of glad it's in (Silan) instead. And I hope you will come and see because that's the one good season of the year, the only warm months in Finland so...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Yes the NCSG meeting is in (Palmeri) Room in the main conference center. (Sam) you have some comments and that I would like to have...

Sam Lanfranco: As I want to make a very brief comment about when we're thinking we're going to go to Panama and Panama is not the only place like this. Panama there's a location in Panama called the City of Knowledge. The City of Knowledge has over four dozen regional headquarters for not-for-profit

organizations located in one building. And in the other wing of the building it is 150 regional offices for IT companies.

So one of the things that we need to look when we go to locations is to say what is there outside the conference center itself? What other organizations are there? I think I believe there's one in Nairobi as well. There are these consolidated locations where we could have very high leverage when we go if we do our negotiations in advance and not just ask people to come to us.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Sam). (Rudi) for the transcript. Before I'm concluding this meeting I would like to thank everybody for participation in this meeting. It's great to hear your voices and have your presence. anyway it demonstrates that we have some interesting stuff on the table.

I would like to think the NCSG chair to assist that meeting. And I hope that you found it interesting and motivating to come back again in June to our NPOC meeting. I'm definitely try. Unless something really bad happens I'll be there.

And Edward Morris who was earlier here was thankful also. He said this is really great discussion of the - even if there is discussion going in the kind of opposite direction between two people. Anyway it helps us understanding the difficulties of our communities. And I would especially think the new comers to be here to listen to us. And I hope we will see you back in June.

If you have any need of support don't hesitate, call on us. We are there to help you getting in ICANN. It's something that we can and I'm essentially looking also to my left its NCSG needs to help bring people in. It's not just by claiming, "Hey you have to come and have work done," no. Come and visit us in meetings. We try to give some value to these meetings. And I would like to think also ICANN staff before I'm leaving. Thank you and the technical staff thanks a lot for allowing us to have this meeting so with that I would like to round up this meeting.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Just one more point, if you have anything you need concerning Helsinki meeting in particular and be in touch with me. I know the (unintelligible) are messing up with your business so I can switch that if I need to.

                   So thank you all. With that we can stop the recording and thanks for being here. See you in an hour.

                            END