

**Transcription ICANN London
NPOC Meeting
Tuesday 24 June 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

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

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, good morning everyone. We're about to begin the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency meeting. Before we start, I'd just like to welcome all of you to this meeting.

We do have a packed agenda today, so I want to get right into it by some introductions around the table. And maybe we can start on my right with Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick. I'm the actual chair of the policy committee.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus Stoll. I'm on the GNSO Council.

Lori Schulman: I'm Lori Schulman. I'm an active member of NPOC, and a candidate for vice chair.

Lars Hoffman: And I'm Lars Hoffman from the ICANN staff.

Sam Lanfranco: I'm Sam Lanfranco. I'm currently the Membership chair of NPOC.

Matthew Rantanen: Matthew Rantanen, Board Chair of Native Public Media.

Loris Taylor: Loris Taylor, President and CEO of Native Public Media.

Martin Silva: Martin Silva, President of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, Foundation of Human Rights.

(Bosian Hoslinks): (Bosian Hoslinks) from the Netherlands, representing the ISOC chapter, board member. I work for the Amsterdam Internet Exchange. That's my employer. This is my first ICANN meeting, and also my first acquaintance with NPOC. So I'm curious to see what it's all about. Thank you.

Robert Castonguay: I'm Robert Castonguay from the Internet Society of Quebec City.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you very much. My name is Cintra Sooknanan. I'm the vice chair of NPOC. I am acting as moderator today, filling in for Marie-Laure Lemineur, who is unable to be here. She's the chair.

I kind of would like to get an idea of the interest of the new participants before we just go into the agenda itself. Do you want to just spend maybe a minute just saying very quickly what your interests are in particular, with regard to your organizations?

Man: This is just my first time at ICANN. Therefore I just want to better know what's going on, know about the (ONG) or NGO.

(Bosian Hoslinks): Yes, (Bosian Hoslinks). I think for me the same, and I'm probably here because Rudi did a sales pitch. And for me, as I said, it's my first ICANN meeting, you know, and to see also on behalf of ISOC Netherlands, to get a feel of what the focus points could be if we decide, you know, to put further efforts into it.

And, of course, we're here because of the ATLAS summit. And I was not aware of this particular part of the GNSO, so that could be of interest as well for us, you know, to participate in. And well I heard from Rudi that you were looking for additional volunteer, you know? So potentially if we can work together, then let's see.

Man: Just to say it's about the same for me. As people get involved, it's all about people getting involved, and involved everywhere. So to get membership is sometime maybe to (unintelligible).

Man: Can I ask you a question? What do you think about the circus so far? I'm really interested of somebody who's (unintelligible) ICANN meeting, what their first impression is, because it's important. I will make the point afterwards why it's important.

Man: I'm presently retired. I used to work for municipal government (unintelligible).

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, I just want to remind - before you speak, just state your name so we have it for the record. I guess we'll come back to that question in the other business section, but just to hear from the other two groups, and then we can go into the agenda, please.

(Harkin): Yes, my name is (Harkin). I'm from Argentina. I have a little background in business law, a researcher in Internet law at my university, that is University (Detella) and the (University of Pennsylvania). I'm also - I work with a human rights foundation that specializes in genocide and the so-called rights of truth, a creation of the rights to information, freedom of speech.

And I'm a fellow, a second-time fellow, a non-commercial stakeholder group member. I participated in the NPOC meeting in Buenos Aires. I'm interested in starting a deeper participation after a year of reflection. I hope to be a part eventually.

Loris Taylor: Good morning. A little bit about Native Public Media. I'm sorry. Loris Taylor. We're a non-profit based out of Flagstaff, Arizona. We work with the 566 American Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages in the US, primarily on communications and telecommunications issues.

We also work directly with our broadcasters. We have 53 radio stations across Indian country, a couple that are both low power and full power FM, commercial and non-commercial stations.

So I'm specifically here to learn more about how non-profits work directly with ICANN, because we have a dual role. Native Public Media is a non-profit organization, but we work directly with governments, which are the tribal nations in the US.

And so I'm hoping to learn a little bit more about the ICANN process, and I definitely need to know more about the acronyms, because that seems to be my biggest hurdle. I'm like - I have to look at my quick dictionary like, okay, NPOC, and, you know, like figure how the structure of ICANN works.

I've looked at the diagrams, but every time I feel like there's additional little sub-groups. And so eventually I hope to have that straight, and how we can be most effective in representing the Native American voice. I'm Hopi, from Arizona. And so (foreign language spoken).

Man: I just came for the circus.

(Yassir Rajeev): My name is (Yassir Rajeev). I'm from Azerbaijan. I'm part of (ALAC), a specific part. So it's my presentation - it's (unintelligible) this conference, this meeting (unintelligible). Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, thank you very much. I just note that we don't have any online remote participants at this moment. So that brings us to the end of the roll call. I'm just moving into the second item on the agenda, which is the current election, NPOC election, which is in progress.

And as a bit, I just want to talk about the deadlines. The election ballots were sent out on June 12, at the start of voting. So we're currently in the voting

period. This is going to end on June 28. And on June 28, the results will be published. The new executives' term will begin on July 10.

I just want to give out a special reminder for everyone to vote, and to do so because more than half the time period for voting has already passed. Klaus Stoll, I see your hand raised. You have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: I informed three days ago, but I still haven't received a ballot.

Man: Sorry, I haven't had a chance to follow up. I have to get a hold of Glen.

(Bosian Hoslinks): So I'm sure that will be followed up on at some point in time. Today I was made aware of that anomaly, but thank you very much for raising it, Klaus. I hope if there are any other participants or members of NPOC that are having these kinds of problems that you will promptly email us and let us know. You're also welcome to email Glen directly, or GNSO secretariat. Thank you. Lori, your hand's raised. You have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes, this is Lori. I found my ballot in my spam box, even though I had already cleared the address. So I would remind people if you haven't gotten your ballots, to check your spam.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Lori. And in fact I did send an email just reminding people just to double-check. Rudi, you'd like to say something? You have the floor.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Cintra. Rudi for the transcript. Indeed there is a problem with the email address that is used. It looks like that email address is very often coming to the spam filters for some reason. So I think it's something that we need to solve for the future also, and have maybe another mechanism that allows us to avoid having mail popping up in spam box instead of in your normal mailbox.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, thank you so much. I'd just like, at this point in time, to turn into the candidates' statements. We've had several nominations and acceptance. We've had Rudi Vansnick for the position of chair. Lori Schulman for the position of vice chair. Sam Lanfranco for the position of policy committee chair, and (Olivier Kwami) for the position of communications committee chair. I'd like to begin with Rudi, so we follow that order.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Cintra. Rudi for the transcript. The reason why I was willing to be the candidate for the chair of this organization is based on the fact that I'm actually ten years now in ICANN, so I understand a little bit how that circus works. At least I think I know.

I have been a co-founder of the at-large. In 2003 we started the discussions in Frankfurt on how to try to represent the voice of the users in this big structure. And we ended up starting the at-large in 2005, and getting the regional at-large organizational structures, the RALOs, being formed in 2007 in Lisbon. I'm also a co-founder of the EURALO, European regional at-large.

As I explained in my presentation at the at-large, I've seen a lot of very, very good advice going up to the Board from the at-large, but still advice is something that's not binding. And if you want to have response to what you're advising, you need to find a way to get it implemented.

And that's the reason I stepped over into NPOC. Don't forget that NPOC is still a very young organization, very young constituency. We are just two years old now. But we are growing, and I think we are growing in importance also.

My goal was and is, as I moved into the NPOC and the GNSO world, to be more effective in the way we can do the policy implementation, because they're the other side of - you have advisories, the ACs for the newcomers.

And you have the SOs, and specifically the GNSO is the one where there is the most activity. Don't forget that the CCNSO is the representative of the ccTLDs. They don't have a contract with ICANN, so they're a body in itself that has less responsibility within ICANN, while the GNSO is all about the gTLDs. And that's the world that is exploding now, due to the fact of the new gTLD program.

So I thought it was time that I moved into the GNSO world to start creating voice and noise for our groups, the NGOs, the not-for-profit organizations, because that's the space where we can try to defend our participation in the Internet, and try to find a way of asking for our rights -- not begging, but asking for.

I consider there's a big difference between asking and begging. Asking is you have the right. Begging, you don't have the right. So I think that's one of the first missions that I'm going to put on the table.

Being also involved in several working groups, PDP working groups, some of them I'm co-chairing, and one of the other topics that I would like to have on my agenda as the chair is to enlarge our membership, and to strengthen our membership.

We still have a lot of issues that are not solved, because we are part of the NCSG, and there is a lack of transparency in the way the membership is working. You have to register through the NCSG, and it seems that quite often there are problems with the membership, as it's not clear who is signing up for what. So that's something we really need to clear out in the next few months. So that's for me the focus of my activities in the coming year.

Klaus Stoll:

I would like to make two comments. First of all, I'm extremely grateful for the new people sitting here on the room, and I just talked to Cintra and just told her the following, that we should be flexible with the agenda, and be able to discuss a little bit of stuff which is really what you would put under any other

business, and not bore our guests to death with election ballot votes and things like that.

And following that first one, that's the official proposal. And the second point is to follow up with Rudi, since we are at a really complex, but at the same time exciting, point in Internet governance. And why are NGOs, why are all these things key, at the moment, for ICANN?

It's very, very simple. In the other transition, it's important that there is a real multi-stakeholder model. And if you really look at ICANN, that emperor doesn't have any clothes, because when you look at civil society for example, there is no real representation of the NGOs, at least not down to the masses, not down to the numbers it really requires.

And what happens is that you have a government going to the microphone and (unintelligible), and saying, look, the stakeholder model doesn't work. There is no numbers.

So we have two ways to do it. We can ignore that, or we can say let's get the numbers. And this is actually what NPOC is trying to do at the moment, where we are moving. Our plan is to, in a way, also ignore the structure and ignore the by-laws and ignore the stuff, and just simply saying, look.

NGOs, this is the point where it is relevant for you. And this is where it's beneficial for you because, for example, when you talk about human rights, the big mistake in human rights in the context of Internet governance is that you go and say, okay, I propose human rights on the Internet.

That's fine. You get my vote. The problem is that you have a situation where 99.9% of your users, your end users, don't even know what their right is on the Internet. So you have to go first that route, and then you have a powerful human rights voice on the Internet. Just because one or two human rights

groups is habitually at every ICANN meeting and screams the loudest, doesn't help you with human rights.

The same thing with first nations. We have the situation with the first nations in BC, which have also very nice programs, directions. I think you know Bev Collins. No? Okay, but they basically tried to do the same.

But what they'd forgotten to do was inform and get their own people first, and explain to them what it is all about, why this is relevant. It all comes down to that one word, relevance. And then suddenly they're realizing, hey, that's relevant for me because it puts food on my table. It guarantees my safety. And it helps us all around. So I'm talking too much. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you for that, Klaus. I just want to go back to the candidates' statements, and in the next item agenda we will have some more time to elaborate a little bit on policy when you give the GNSO council meeting report. Lori, please go ahead. Thank you. We're moving a little bit behind schedule, so I don't mean to ask you to be brief. I know...

Lori Schulman: I'll be brief. No worries.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you.

Lori Schulman: My name is Lori Schulman, and I have been an ICANN observer probably since ICANN was formed. And I've been in and out of active participation for the last three years. I'm running for vice chair of NPOC.

I was actually vice chair of NPOC two years ago, and unfortunately I had to step down for some health reasons, but I'm back and better. So I'm very interested in finishing out what I had started as a vice chair many years ago.

By way of background, I am a very unusual member of NPOC in that I have a background both in commercial trademark law and in non-profit management and organizational matters.

I'm the general counsel to a non-profit trade association in Washington, DC that focuses on K through 12 education, principal assessment, teacher evaluation and curriculum development. And we have 150,000 members in 140 jurisdictions globally. So we very much have a global presence, and are very concerned about developments in the name space and how it affects civil society in general, and certainly our organization in particular.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you so much, Lori. Just moving straight on to Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you, Cintra. I'm the candidate for the policy chair, chair of the policy committee. And after I give you my statement, some of the votes that I already got will be taken away from me.

The traditional role has been to help pull policy together from the non-profit stakeholder community, and feed it up. Attempts at influencing policy within ICANN are a myth. When I first got involved, I had to say to myself, what does this feel like? And it felt like I was being asked to join either a church or a municipal government, and I was going to be doing volunteer work.

But that part is still important. It's extremely important now given the changes that are taking place with respect to some key portions of how the Internet is governed and oversight is exercised, as a result of some decisions the US government made earlier this year.

That's half of it. The other half is the policy committee, as I see it, is increasingly going to be responsible for saying, how do the constituents learn and understand what's going on here? And how do their stakeholder interests, which may be quite different from ICANN's interest and policy, how do those get articulated and discussed among them?

All these organizations are very young. They didn't come with a rule book. They have no DNA. Everything, all the structures, have been nurtured. There's no natural structure here. The context is ICANN, and we're supposed to be stakeholder based, but most of the stakeholders don't know we're there.

And telling them we're there in a missionary strategy is not the right way. The right way is to say, okay, how do we get the stakeholder groups to become informed within their own context, and deal with their own issues?

And then come together and say, these are the issues we're facing. Some we need to go through the ICANN policy and try to influence that. In others, we need to deal with our local, municipal, state, federal, regional government. We need to deal with these international organizations. We need to create new venues.

There's a whole learning organization process that we're just moving into the middle of. And so I'm going to be looking at two things. One, how to pull policy positions together that go up. And how to work with the constituencies to increase their ability to say, these are the policy issues that we're worried about with respect to the Internet and us. And some of these go to ICANN, some of them go somewhere else.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thanks so much, Sam. I note there's a new participant at the table. I'd just like to invite you to introduce yourself. Let us know what organization you've come from, and what your interests are.

(Bill McGuttavey) Thank you. My name's (Bill McGuttavey) I come from the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, and this is actually the second time I've participated in this group. I was in Buenos Aires. I must be the newcomer. And actually my interest is mainly from the viewpoint of the municipalities. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. Okay, so moving on into the next agenda item, if there are no questions for the candidates on what they've just said, I'll ask Klaus to take the floor.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much. And following what I said first, I don't think I will give a blow by blow report about the GNSO council's meeting. Basically what happened, we are sitting together for quite a few hours, Saturdays and Sundays. And the GNSO council's role is basically to drive the - evaluate the policy making inside ICANN, and helping to organize and manage the working groups.

I think from the point of view of making policies, working the working groups and doing the things how ICANN does them, there is no better way to conduct policy making to do the business. But there are also some problems with it. Quite simply, it takes a long, long time. It takes a lot of resources.

And given now that there are so many topics and so many working groups, so many activities going on, you are really in a situation where you don't know anymore where you are.

And there are days where, for example, Rudi is spending four, five hours happily on working groups. I'm spending four, five hours happily on working groups. Glen is the one who has to organize it all. And you feel it's not moving. It's not moving. It's not going anywhere.

And the problem, one of the biggest things we've discussed, and what is the topic which really came up in Buenos Aires, and now becoming a real topic also because one very prominent councilor resigned for that reason, is quite simply how do we get people, quality people, into the working groups and avoid fatigue.

There are many, many, many ideas. One of the ideas, for example, instead of starting in working groups, start it up with the expert working group for a very

short time, and then have the working group based on that report of the expert working group. Then you've got the problem who's doing what. I mean then you've basically got the directions already before the working group starts.

Another one is can we pay people or put them together for one week in a room, and wait till they come out. I don't think - he's one of the victims, too. So what the solution there is?

And on the other hand is, there's so many duplications. One working group talks about the other one. The next working group talks about something which is slightly removed from that.

And on the other hand, there are things that are so complex. So for example, ten years we are talking now about the WHOIS. And we are getting somewhere, but you still feel there is more work to be done.

And to come back to the GNSO, I think the other most important thing is the GNSO review coming up. And this GNSO is very much in need of evolution, reforming and things like that. But think about the IANA transition again. The requirement of real stellar stakeholderism and policy making the IANA transition puts on the GNSO council, and the time available, are basically contradictions in themselves.

So it's a recipe for disaster. So what will happen is there will be some shortcuts. What will happen is there will be some people treated really badly because they don't get a voice. There will be other people who just simply say, okay, that's it and want to live with it.

What I detect in the GNSO council at the moment is that people are realizing it's important, as far as the councilors and also at ICANN. It's important. We have to concentrate - we really have to concentrate on two or three real issues, and put a few issues a little bit on the side.

And I think this way we are going forward. What I would like to see - and I'm a little bit disappointed that the GNSO council meetings are open meetings, and there is a microphone at the middle of the hallway. At the entrance of the rooms, there are two microphones for people in the audience.

And of course, my name is Marilyn Cade, and I represent the business constituency. I mean that's - we know that. We know Chuck Gomes will come up. We know everybody who will speak, from who is not in the council and so on.

But we need people like you who just simply go there and, for example, say, what is that acronym you just used? What are you talking about? Or what's going on? This is my opinion from my perspective. And that really drives the GNSO council policy making work forward.

If you want to really go into the detail of the policies, they're very, very, very important things. And in our context, let me highlight one of the working groups and one of the problems we are dealing with at the IGO/INGO debate.

This is a history which goes back now four years. And basically we're getting screwed over by the Red Cross, and getting screwed over by the Olympic committee, because they've got lawyers and got the time and got the money to do so.

One of the things we have to make sure that not only seven, 70 of the big INGOs are getting all the protection they want - and by the way, in the case of the Red Cross, if we give them the world, they will go and ask for the universe. This is their tactics. That's their job. They will ask and ask and ask, and Lori wants to say something about that.

Lori Schulman: I want to interject. There is some fundamental debate I think NPOC should be having as a constituency. And one of the comments that Klaus made,

honestly I don't know that I would agree with -- that we're being screwed by the Red Cross and the Olympics.

I would make another argument that whether or not we think they're asking for overreaching protection, the fact that they're stepping up to the plate and saying, we as non-profits, we with international reach, we who conduct business differently, deserve protection. I don't necessarily see that as a bad thing.

And I want to interject here for that exact reason. Some of the policy issues that I'll be assessing later touch on this issue. But I think as a group it's important. Maybe there is consensus that organizations as big and as protected as Red Cross and Olympics hurt or help. I don't know. But I don't know if the discussion has been fully vetted within the group. And it's an important one to have.

Man: Yes, I remember about (unintelligible) about the Red Cross. Could you summarize that? I mean the Red Cross is not going to the NPOC system or they're just taking over the NPOC system? Really, really short thing.

Lori Schulman: Right. A very, very short, brief history. The representative from Red Cross, Debbie Hughes, was instrumental in organizing NPOC. She looked at the issues as Red Cross having diverging from what NCUC and NCSG in general were proposing. So she and some other organizers, mostly from the United States, got together and said, we need a non-profit organizational concerns constituency, because we operate differently. We need different things.

On the face of it, that seemed very logical and appropriate. I would make some arguments that some of the details, in terms of our charter and how we're organized and run, have not necessarily been so helpful today. You know, I can't go back into their heads three years ago.

But that was the thinking. We were begun because of the way that the political structures work in ICANN, and interest that these particular organizations have by way of the fact that they are protected by international laws and treaties in a manner that may be different than most NGOs.

Red Cross decided, and I believe the Olympics did the same thing, on going to the GAC; going to other organizations within ICANN to lobby for what they needed. And I don't fault them for that, quite frankly. I think it's smart. Very smart.

And I think that if we're here to voice organizational concerns, that it's important to understand that our organizational concerns may at times diverge from some of the things that NCUC is expounding, in terms of their very strong positions on freedom of expression, privacy rights, speech.

How does that comport with what our organizations may be doing when they're trying to fund-raise on the Internet? When there are thousands of instances, or hundreds of thousands of instances of fraud that our organizations may be facing? That the minute you have success in the non-profit field, just like in the for-profit world, you find copycats. You find criminals. You find people who exploit your name in inappropriate ways.

And I think non-profits, it's a dual-edged sword. Because I think it's very logical to think that if someone is infringing on a worldwide commercial brand, that commercial brand is going to come down very hard on the infringer.

But that's not necessarily the case in the non-profit world, where we're looking at so-called friendly infringers -- people who think they're doing good by misusing our names, or buying our domains and setting up fundraising sites that are completely unauthorized, but they believe are helping. I mean that's, I think, very typical. And I've seen it many times in my own work.

So we do have interests that cross lines. But at the same time, understanding that we have a special mission that the funds we have, these are public funds. The money we have, it's in the public fist, the public interest, in a way that commercial entities don't have the same type of responsibility.

They're responsible to shareholders and stockholders, very true. But we hold, in my thoughts, a higher moral ground. So how does that higher moral ground comport with the commercial interests that we absolutely have? You're running TV stations. Radio stations. Publishing books. It matters.

Klaus Stoll: Just to come quickly back and to follow up on what Lori says, for example, you're representing first nation group. You're having first nation activities like art, tourism, radio stations and things like that. It is so important to open the sphere of the Internet to protect these.

And to make long things short, one of the things, for example, we have to do as NPOC, I'm really glad that they screwed us, because they made us think. They made us look into it and now suddenly realizing, hey, okay, they're going for their interests. They're going for the universe, and they will ask for more and more.

But on the other hand, they really did us a really, really good service by making us think. And one of our roles in the next year or two is to say, okay, we've got the debate with the Red Cross. We've got the debate with the Olympic committee. But what about the other ones? What about the first nations? What about these, these, these?

And this is the debate we have, and we will not get the same level of protection, I think, for everybody. But we will get some level of protection for everybody. And I think that's what we have to work for.

So to finish my report, I would like to change tack a little bit. I see my role as a GNSO councilor as somebody who is not really making policy in the sense

that I create policy. My role is to listen to you, and I always - and everybody - until now in the short time I've been GNSO councilor, I always refer back to the constituency and to the other people to tell me what they think about it.

So also I'm a little bit removed from NPOC, because I can't hold a position in NPOC as a counselor. I'm still listening and I just want to say that everybody, please, if you have any item or anything, tell me and we can discuss it. Please go to the GNSO besides. So far it's working. And look at the items, and be active in it.

The GNSO is the heart of policy making in ICANN. Even if it doesn't look like it, this is where it all happens. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Klaus. Thank you, Lori. I just wanted to mention, before we move on to the next section, that I didn't ask (Olivier Kwami) to give any statement, because he's not participating remotely this morning. So I will ask him to send a statement to the mailing list.

Rudi, you are on the next item, and as well as you had your hand raised in response to Klaus and Lori's contribution.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Cintra. Rudi for the transcript, and I would like to be the nasty guy and ask to not forget to state your name before your speech, so that after the meeting when we are going through the transcript, we know who is speaking. And it is important, especially for those that we don't know. Klaus, we know your name.

Klaus Stoll: The one who uses swear words is Klaus. So it's Klaus for the transcript.

Rudi Vansnick: And to avoid that I start doing like many others, I'm Avri Doria. I'm not. But perhaps I will become.

Picking up on the next point of the agenda, the specific policy issues that we are working on, as Klaus mentioned, there are so many working groups. Indeed, the GNSO is a way of formalizing what is discussed and worked on in the working groups. At the end, it's what the working groups are putting to the table as a recommendation that is considered in the GNSO and voted upon.

So that's the way it works. It's always treated within the working groups. It's not the GNSO doing the working group. It's people. Volunteers from the different constituencies. You don't even need to be a member to participate in the working groups.

For instance, I'm co-chairing the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group that we started in December last year. It's a working group where we discovered that the topic itself is not the only issue.

It's about what's going on on that topic -- I mean what's going on in the WHOIS domain and different other working groups, because that's impacting what we are doing. And what we are doing is impacting their work. And as we are working with (unintelligible), we have weekly calls. One hour. Every Thursday afternoon we have our working group call.

Chris Dillon is my co-chair in this, and he is a specialist in languages, which helps very well in the domain of translation and transliteration. That's a topic in itself. And we are now six months further. We are halfway, because the deadline is end of this year. We should come up with a recommendation.

Today, the process we followed was sending out questions to all the SOs and ACs in order to get input from them on what they think is important and what should be done. We have been - the two co-chairs have been working on drafting the charter even before the working group started. So we have a very amazing experience in how the process works.

And during the GNSO council meeting, it has even been discussed that there needs to be an in-depth study on how the working groups can really work in a better way, because as I said, it's all volunteers. And having conference calls every week means that in between the calls, you have to read a lot of mails, because the discussion is not just the one hour. It's more. It's between the calls that a lot is happening.

And I may -and I can say we are quite happy to have two marvelous staff members participating in our groups. It's Lars, who is sitting over there, and Julie Hedlund. They are doing a great work, because there is a lot of administrative work. There's a lot of putting documents and information together. And they are doing great work. We need them also.

And I think that's one of the issues that is also popping up in the concept of doing policy in our constituency, that aside our task and mission in the constituency, we have also a daily job. And the combination is quite hard, especially if you have to step away for a week from your job. You have to catch up when you come back.

Quite similar for when you work in the working groups. Sometimes you're digging into the topic so far that you forget that you have a daily job, because it's so interesting. You want to solve the issue, and that's where I'm not asking but begging for having more participants in our working groups, in order to be able to have more views.

Especially when I'm picking up on the question of the translation and transliteration, the question is, should that be mandatory? Should contact information be translated?

And then the follow-up question on that one is, who's going to pay that? Is it the registrant? Is it the registrar? Is it the registry? Or is it government? Because most of the cases, it will be an issue for law enforcement to track down who is behind the domain name registration.

And we are planning in Los Angeles to have a roundtable, deviating a little bit from the process, that is, the regular process in the PDP working groups. We're going to set up a roundtable discussion in Los Angeles to have the different stakeholders around the table in order to find the direction that we need to take.

Because you can imagine if we are going to put a recommendation on the table that says, well it's mandatory and the registrars will have to do the job, I will probably be killed before I leave Los Angeles by the registrars group. So we need to find a consensus that works for everyone.

So you can imagine that the policy work that we are doing, compared to what happens in at-large where it is advised, it's easier to get consensus because you are in the same group, while we are working on issues that are touching upon all the layers of what ICANN has to execute and operate in.

And to end with that, on this, let's say, overview of policy issues of interest, there are many of them. Translation and transliteration is not the only one. Actually we have Sam also being involved in, I think, two working groups. Cintra's also involved in. Lori is also in other working groups.

So you see, all of the ExCom is very active in these working groups, and we need more people to be able to participate in all of them, because as I explained, that's the way we can raise our voice. If you're not in, you will not be considered.

And that's, I think, one of the issues like you raised. There are a lot of acronyms indeed, even being, let's say, an old-standing guy in the ICANN world -- I have more than 30 meetings now -- I'm still discovering a lot of acronyms, new ones, that are popping up, and going, damn it, what was that again? And at the end, before you're tracking down what it is, decisions are taken.

I agree. There is work to do, and I think that's one of the missions that I would like to take up into my mission as the chair of the NPOC, is trying to get the better definition of what are the acronyms that you need to know about.

Rather than having just the glossary of the lexicon, highlight those that you have to have in mind every minute of the day, because that will help you to discover what direction we are going in, because sometimes acronyms are abused to deviate your attention. So if there are any questions, I am open.

Loris Taylor: In my - oh, I'm sorry. Loris Taylor. In my beautiful acronym book here, is there a relationship? And if there is, how does that work between the non-commercial stakeholders group and the NCUC and the NPOC? Because they're all non-commercial interests, and so what's the dynamic there?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Very good question. I love that question. I would like to explain it this way to make it easy to understand. For me, NCSG is the umbrella, and below the umbrella you're finding two constituencies, NCUC and NPOC.

NCUC is the non-commercial users constituency, which is focusing on users. Each individual can be a member of that group. While for NPOC, we are the organization that is standing there for the not-for-profit world. An individual cannot be a not-for-profit. But an individual can be in the not-for-profit, and that's where indeed there is a little bit of confusion on the importance and, let's say, the interests between those two groups.

But I can guarantee you that from the part of what NPOC is willing to do and is doing, it's more than just the Internet user. It's also the representation of the not-for-profit world, who actually is losing in the game that I call ICANN.

Why are we, or why are NGOs losing? Because they don't very most often have the money, like Lori was saying, Red Cross, IOC, to have so much

money they can create their own ICANN if they want. What I'm looking at is the NGOs that don't have that much money, that cannot spend a lot of volunteers in sitting around the tables and discussing the matters that are of concern.

They don't have the money to protect their brand. And as I explained earlier this morning during the presentation at the at-large, we are going to work on a possible solution starting next week already, to find a way to help NGOs to protect their brand.

As you know, there's this new gTLD program. And one of the services that have been installed in that program is the trademark clearing house. So if we want to give NGOs a possibility to have some protection of their name, their brand, that's a cheaper way to do it.

Still we have to work out the way it can be done. Be we already discussed with the trademark clearing house guys this week, and they were very happy that we were standing up saying, hey, we have to negotiate together a way of having our not-for-profit organizations being able to have their own domain name, because don't forget, still today Internet is a cheap, even without cost, marketing tool for everybody.

And that's what NGOs should use, especially use, to communicate to their members. Having their members participating, they need their own domain name so there is no confusion. And that's one of the goals that we have, to try to stand more for that part of the world that needs a voice, rather than standing for the users.

I'm personally a member of NCUC, and I know that several of us are members of the NCUC to create volume, because that's also important. It's also about numbers, like Klaus was mentioning. The more numbers you can present, or the higher number of participants you can present, the more value

you get, because then they will say, oh, that should be an interesting structure, because many people are speaking through that channel.

So that's the reason why I would like to have more and more people involved. I'm not asking you to be at every call, every week. But if you have time to share with us and be a member of NPOC, please, you're welcome.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, so I see a couple hands raised. Yes, (Adnenko). And then after that, I'd like the new participants at the table just to give us some introductions. Thank you.

(Adnenko): Thank you for the kindness. Two things. First one, maybe the question is wrong, but I as a non-commercial stakeholder participant, am not really inside the non-commercial user. I'm not officially inside NPOC. So if the non-commercial stakeholder group is an umbrella, why are there gaps in the middle of participants that are not - you know what I mean?

I mean there was supposed to be two places of discussion, you're either a user or you're a non-profit. Why does this middle group, this gap, where people are not in one thing - that's unrealistic for me, because I receive the emails. I answer them sometimes. I vote. I try to comment. I'm not that much active, but I do try. I read almost all of them.

But it's not NPOC. It's really - I don't understand why that's out there. Is it on purpose? Is it accidental? Or am I mistaken and actually it doesn't exist? It's something that - I'm the one that is not understanding the process. So that's the first question if you want.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, well I'm sorry you feel like that. All I can say is you're not alone. Sam Lanfranco. There are a number of issues that need to be sorted out, organizational issues, organizational growth issues. And in some cases, they get left behind. People get so interested as they come in either to be a

volunteer or they come in with their own private agenda, and this is a good place to do it, and those are two different issues.

And so you've got the non-commercial stakeholders group. You've got non-commercial user - you have to excuse me. I have trouble with the acronyms. And then you've got NPOC, okay?

Well Rudi says these two are under that umbrella, but there's a lot of confusion. You can belong to the umbrella and not to the groups.

(Adnenko): That's what I'm saying.

Sam Lanfranco: When you apply, the application process is extremely confusing. We're trying to sort that out.

(Adnenko): But wait. You can be part of umbrella and not be part of the other group? That's what's really confusing me, what the role...

Cintra Sooknanan: Lori, you have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes, this is my personal opinion. I'm on the executive committee of NCSG, and basically we're responsible for vetting membership applications. And we have agreed to redo the membership form to alleviate some of the confusion. To be perfectly blunt about it, I think this was an exercise in very poor planning, when NPOC was formed.

Going back to what I said, I don't know what was going on in the mind of the people who formed NPOC three years ago, actually now I guess it'll be almost four years ago. But the idea is they wanted to carve out space for organizational concerns. The logical place to put it, it seemed at the time, was NCSG.

NCUC, the user group, had already existed. Which again, that was confusing by just way of construction. And that happened long before I was ever involved, so I can't go to that. But there's always been an NCSG, NCUC divergence here. I mean, I believe so, right? Because I joined NCUC years ago, but I was also a member of NCSG.

It's just how - because you have the stakeholder group, so you need the group. So the group is non-commercial. The constituencies underneath originally was one constituency, NCUC. And it comprised organizations and individuals. And today...

Man: GNSO, Not-For-Profit operational concerns constituency, team suites, ICANN London 50.

Lori Schulman: ...NCUC still accepts organizational members as well as individual members. So you as an organization when you come into the group, and you don't know and haven't been part of the discussions, it's extraordinarily confusing because NCUC will take an organization or an individual, and POC only takes organizations.

The membership form says, "Well, you know, I'm part of a non-profit group but I don't really want to go through all the administrative hassle, so I'll be an individual member and NCUC." I think there's a question that basically says that.

So that requires clarity. The execute committee understands that it requires clarity.

But I'll be frank with you. I was responsible for rewriting some part of the form by this meeting and I didn't do it yet. And I mean part of that is just volunteer overloading, and you know, how much time we work on different issues and examples.

I'm sorry. Someone else wanted the floor.

Cintra Sooknanan: I just want to mention one thing to you. Tomorrow morning we have an NCSG Executive Meeting at 8:30. So (Sydney), all of the NPOC executive will be there, but it will be also good for you to raise that concern. You know, and to really express from your point of view the confusion and the fact that you don't feel that you can effectively contribute.

Man 1: I don't want to take more time of this, so okay.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori again. This is a very important issue. I think it goes to the heart of things that Klaus is talking about. That if the system inside ICANN is confusing, that there - we can go beyond ICANN for outreach. I mean the whole idea is to go beyond ICANN for outreach.

Man 1: Usually it's confusing because it's complex in this case and it's confusing because there are contradictories overlapping unnecessarily, and it's inefficiency but with complex or bad complex.

Klaus Stoll: Okay this is Klaus again. First of all, it doesn't matter because what it's all about is to be able to participate in the policy-making process. And how you do it, through whom you do it, it doesn't matter as long as you do it.

The second thing is think about the Internet, think about how old ICANN is. These things were developed five years ago. And five years ago I was sitting in the room and these things were discussed and it made perfect sense. Today it's absolutely (out of certain).

Now we have a GNSO review. We will change it all again, yes, and in five years we will sit in the same room talking about the same thing and saying we need to reform it.

Likewise simply that things that Internet, that animal, that monster, is growing so quickly we can't keep up with it. It's as simple as that.

Coming back again doesn't matter; ignore it. As long as you participate in the policy-making process and as long as you've got a voice and as long as you're guaranteed that voice, and as long as you can make policies, it doesn't matter.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, some of you have had a comment and then we're going to introductions; reintroductions.

Sam Lanfranco: Yesterday - let me - two things here. Stay in the game, working in the policy issues and all of that, but at the same time, keep saying, "Something isn't working, something isn't working." A learning organization, especially a young one like this in a context that is a dramatically changing context, is not like dealing with the weather or gravity. You know, gravity is pretty constant.

The context is changing so we have to respond to the changing context. You will be given a lot of logical reasons why things are as they are, but that doesn't mean that they're right.

So on the one hand you say, "Okay, here are the policy issues we're working on, but let's change the engine, let's change the way this thing works." And just keep asking the questions. You'll know you've gotten through when they take credit for the idea.

Alejandro Pisanty: Before introductions, Rudi said he was going to introduce at least some of the policy issues. Is that on the agenda? I mean what are the policy issues that NPOC is right now concerned to take to the GNSO? Do we have that? Is it on the agenda or is it something not we discuss now?

Klaus Stoll: Straightforward, you've seen - first of all, we are participating in the discussion of all the different policy issues around the GNSO agenda.

Secondly of course, we've got our model number one IGO/NGO protection of the NGO world basically in that cyberspace.

Second model is a huge model. It's called we are engaged process. And you will see something which is happening over in the next month. Basically what it's all about is - and I'm boring people to death but it's the best analogy.

Internet Governance is like a country where there are basically 0.1% represent the other 99.9% and the 99.9% don't even know that the 1% exist. And that brings me, by the way, back with you to your radio station and to your communication stuff.

Please, please let's talk about how we can inform the grassroots people, the people - the end choosers - about what's going on in Internet Governance, why it's important, and how we can deal with it.

To give you another concrete example on that one what NPOC's (unintelligible), that doesn't mean that NPOC is very good in communicating. NPOC has a very strong program, for example gTLD for development. A lot of people were complaining in Africa, why did Africa only have 16 applications for gTLD programs. Very simple, because Africans are not stupid.

Because if you don't have a business plan, if you don't have something, why should I spend millions of dollars on something which I don't have a business plan, how would I get the money back.

So what we did in NPOC as a policy thing is to look at how we can create business models for gTLDs as a second round. And then we found out there are actually business models which we don't need a second round for. It's called community building around domain names and gTLDs.

We have approaches; we have events and everything for it. So these things are there, these things are there to be picked up, but you see what happens.

We have these things and we are - these things happen and then something somebody comes out of the White House and says, "IANA transition" or forgotten, yes.

It's all there. And there's more people we've got. And the more you ask for it, for example, you come to me or to Rudi and say, "Help us with outreach here, I've got some television or radio station here, use my airwaves and let's do a program for my people." We are there, we will do it.

If somebody comes and says, "Come on, I need business plans for gTLDs and community based domain names." Here they are, let's do it. That's how it works.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you very much Klaus.

Lori Schulman: Hi, it's Lori. I just wanted to say that's what we're striving towards. That's where we see the future; providing services as well as policy-making at some level.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript.

To answer your initial question while it's critical with all the topics that we need to address, while I would try to make it simple.

What for me is the most important one today is it's all about the Whois because that's going to change and most probably going to change in the way that will quite new for everybody. You probably know about the expert working group working on the new registration data system that will replace in the future the Whois.

As you know, Whois is where you can find out who is behind the domain name. At least you should be able to find out. And when we start talking about that already, there is the proxy working group which is working on a

PDP, and I think it's Cintra who is in that and Sam who is in that working group.

I'm working on the Translation and Transliteration is also going to impact that one. Those are the ones that are actually asking the most resources.

But I know that there are others that are also important but are not on the actual agenda of working groups. So we need to pop up and raise those that are important for our community and that's the reason why we are here. It's trying to find a way to bring up those issues that are not handled today in the ongoing working groups and the ongoing discussions.

We try to find a way to get a better way of working together with all of the communities, and that's a discussion that we had yesterday. There's a cross-community working group that is focusing on how to establish a cross-community working group in the south.

So going through the whole process because one of the issues is when you start working on it, you also need to know how does a working group work. And that's one of the first issues that we see people not understanding, how does that working group operate. And that's one of the aspects that I think is going to be clarified in the near future in that cross-community working group.

And also there we need representatives to be able to speak up and say, "Hey, from our community, that's not the way we think it would work," and allows us to be good participants.

So you see there are so many issues on the table that I can go on for at least 24 hours.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, so I know that there are quite a few new participants at the table. I would just like to invite you to say your name, your organization and what you hope to get out of this meeting. (Unintelligible).

(Gomo Shina): Good morning everyone. So my name is (Gomo Shina), an ICANN fellow. This is my first meeting for the non-profit and I just was invited by Rudi to just come and see what issues are discussed and maybe whether I can contribute and also participate. Thank you.

(Vanishu Scopeway): Good morning everybody. My name is (Vanishu Scopeway) from (Unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Now you have to have a lot of air with your microphone.

(Vanishu Scopeway): My name is (Vanishu Scopeway) from (Horight) Nigeria, a member of NPOC.

(Keisha Taylor): Good morning, my name is (Keisha Taylor) and I work for (Texas Global) which helps non-profits around the world get technology and use technology efficiently. And so Cintra invited me and I'd like to learn more about how a non-profits are being included and decision-making around the kind of domains.

(Naomi Harry): My name is (Naomi Harry), I'm on the execute of (Isel Transit Beoff). This is my first ICANN meeting so I'm more or less here to learn about different communities and how things work essentially.

(Alexander Richarcar): Good morning. My name is (Alexander Richarcar) coming from (Scopje) Macedonia. I'm a practicing lawyer. Our office is representing domain name and trademark portfolio for our clients, basically foreign clients.

And I was provoked by your presentation this morning in the fellowship session just to see if I can somehow fit in my idea already discussed with European original organization about formation of non-government Not-For-Profit regional organization based, for example, in West Balkans. That should be I think gTLD above the national structures of our countries. Thank you.

Alejandro Pisanty: Good morning, my name is Alejandro Pisanty. I am representing the Internet Society Chapter in Mexico, ISOC Mexico; former board member in the first elected board.

And I've been in several working group with experience I would gladly also submit to this group. I've recently consulted with the Board of ISOC Mexico about members of the Board of ISOC Mexico, and we intend to join the NPOC in the near future, so thank you for allowing us to be here.

And I would like to ask the previous speaker from (Skopje), what's the non-commercial side of your participation because you only mentioned your representation of commercial interest.

(Alexander Richarcar): Besides the commercial interests, we, as I said, there is an emerging idea of creating non-governmental and non-for-profit organization that would try to protect and to bring on light problems of the local Internet society and end users. And help to improve the awareness of the importance of ICANN's work.

And as one of the main goals of ICANN is to bring the voice of ICANN to the local societies, and as well vice-versa; to return this voice from local societies to ICANN.

(Asel Hogal Anfrantano): My name is (Asel Hogal Anfrantano). This is the first time I come to non-profit commercial constituency and also interesting its purpose. I have similar concerns.

I don't know whether there are non-profit operations concerning the computer stage, have some (unintelligible) and policies.

In (Tano), I don't know, some non-profit organizations also do some (constituencies).

If non-profit organization can provide us some registered domain name, registrations, surveys, if they're non-profit organizations, (Policay) is (unintelligible) those policy led to their commercialization, how to deal with their situation. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick for the transcript.

Very interesting question you have. As I'm involved in several Not-For-Profit organizations not only in national level but also in international level, every Not-For-Profit wants to stay on, keep alive, you need to do some business, you need some income. You need some revenue. So you probably will have some activities that looks like being commercial.

But it depends on what is written in your bylaws being the mission and objections that you have as an organization. That's primer.

If you're recognized in your country, being a Not-For-Profit means that you're considered that you're doing initially things that are not seen as being commercial work and then there is no issue.

And I think that is one of things that we're looking to when we get new membership, new candidates for the membership, we look to the organization to see if they are really an NGO or a Not-For-Profit organization to avoid at the end, we end up having more commercial protection discussion than the protection of what the Not-For-Profit organization is doing.

So you see it's - each NGO or especially Not-For-Profit organization needs a revenue, otherwise you cannot survey. That revenue can be, let's say, selling books, selling publications, whatever.

Your membership, selling domains...

Man: Donations.

Rudi Vansnick: Donations, yes. That's a revenue. So it's quite clear.

And that's the reason why you need a domain name to allow you to be identified in this bigger commercial world and have a space in it. That's what the new gTLD program should have been doing.

It's not doing that. In 2009 in the first summit in Mexico, when we had this big discussion on the new gTLDs, which ones would be the first to be launched, we had been staking very strongly.

And I remember Alejandro being from Mexico and we had been arguing to the public discussions there for almost two hours, that the community wants should be the first wants because there is less commercial conflict by implementing those ones. And once you have discovered that ones, you can do the commercial ones.

It has been turned down in the other direction and you see where they are; a lot of misery. When you see that at the end, they have to do auctions and applications.

Where is that going to end up? Look at, for instance, the dot health. Just a take a case where a lot of NGOs and Not-For-Profit organizations are going to be affected. The Dot Health should be a domain space that is reserved for the medical world. Point, not for the commercial world. It's going to end up to be the space for the commercial world and the medical world will be kept behind again.

So you see it's all on the effort that you can put on the table, and we need to be clear when we stand up that we are not representing the commercial.

There is a commercial constituency. That's the space where they can have their debate. We have to stand up, and as Klaus was mentioning earlier, when there is a GNSO public meeting, please come and raise your voice so that there is a demonstration that not only the business can talk about business, but we also can talk about business sometimes even better than they can.

Cintra Sooknanan: I see Alejandro. No? Okay, Lori, you have the (unintelligible).

Lori Schulman: This is Lori for the record.

I just want to clarify something Rudi said and that is most of the people here who are working for organizations that do some means of fundraising whether it's grassroots or through a business model, you can certainly fund non-commercial missions by commercial means. That's what we're all doing and I think that's where the confusion in. What's commercial?

We're talking about the end game here. I think we're talking more about what happens with funds as they're collected whether it's collected through a for-profit business venture or a non-profit venture. There's still commercial activity involved, and I think that's where some of the rhetoric gets lost.

We are non-profits, we have missions. They're served via commercial means; it's reality. And I think that's where there is much more communication needed in terms of how do we bridge interests within ICANN.

Right now, there's an unbelievable divisiveness between non-commercial, business interests, IP interests, when in fact all of these interests converge at some point. And it's the (filose) and the isolation.

We often could be working in isolation on so many issues, and I know that ICANN is really moving forward with a lot of cross-constituency teams; sort of

the ccWGs, the cross-community working group. And the idea of these cross-community working groups is to breakdown some of these (filose).

So it's happening but it's probably not happening fast enough. Because certainly the non-commercial community could use the business expertise of a commercial community. To me there's no question about that.

But I also think that the issues the non-commercial community bring to the table regarding privacy, freedom of speech, freedom of expression, they are legitimate issues that certainly should be considered by businesses as well as non-profits.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you for that, Lori. And in fact you were very right in saying that Not-For-Profit doesn't mean no profit.

With that in mind, I think this is a good segue in talking about (Unintelligible), that topic (unintelligible) and what PIR is doing as well as the criteria that they have on the table.

Lori Schulman: Yes, we'll go to my items on the agenda. I haven't seen PIRs criteria. I don't know, maybe somebody in this room knows if they publish criteria (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: I would like to take this item quite simply off the agenda. For the reason it is none of our business what Dot (Unintelligible) is doing with the NGO and RNG as long as we don't know exactly what their plans are.

There are a lot of rumors about it and I don't think it's good form to talk about rumors.

Lori Schulman: I want to clarify something on the agenda. What's on the agenda is not about the criteria. I'm not actually prepared to talk about that.

What's on the agenda is there was a call for comments that are due July 6th, okay. The call for comments due not discuss criteria. It's a very technical issue that's being addressed having read the correspondence.

For those who don't know, the Public Interest Registry, PIR, was awarded the new domain dot NGO, which we all recognize in English to mean non-governmental organization. And Dot ONG which would be the romance version in Italian, Spanish, French acronym meaning basically the same thing.

What's happening in the space right now is if you apply for either one of these, Dot NGO or Dot ONG, you will be sold both. So if I apply for (Lori Dot Org) - I'm sorry, I mean (Lori Dot NGO), I'm going to be getting (Lori Dot ONG) as well.

This was determined to be the best way to manage identity confusion as there are many organizations that operate in multiple jurisdictions over multiple languages. And particularly the more well-known international organizations, this could become a real issue if you had, for instance, a Doctors Without Borders Dot NGO and Doctors Without Borders ONG and they were different groups.

There's too much potential confusion. The community recognized that, PIR recognized that, so now there's an understanding that when you buy one you buy two.

The comment period is calling for comments on technical specifications. PIR has submitted to ICANN a proposal that they provide what they call bundled support. That when you put all of your contact information in for one name, it automatically replicates in the second name.

That was submitted to an ICANN technical group that determined there could be issues with security and stability. What those technical issues are were not

explained in any of the correspondence that I've read. If there's a technical report attached to this, I haven't found it yet on the ICANN Web site.

So the only thing that's being asked for now are comments as to whether or not this would affect security and stability.

I would think it probably is prudent on the part of NPOC to submit some comments. But my suggested substantive comment would be we agree. That if there is a technical way to work this out so that there's less chance for error, that if you put data in once, it gets replicated twice and it's secure, then we would support that.

That's the way I would go. I don't really see any other substantive comment that we could make at this point except spiritually, I believe that this group believes that having these two names bundled makes sense.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Lori. And I actually support that proposal, but I guess as well it's a matter of costing intrusive how restrictive is it really for an organization to pay for two domains under one (unintelligible) and what their business model is.

Lori Schulman: This particular call for comment doesn't go into the issue of pricing. It simply goes into the technical specifications behind replicating the information that's input for one domain into the directory system for the other domain.

So again, because of the technical nature of this, I'm not inclined to really speak to anything technical because we're not a technical group. Unless there's a technologist in the group who would be happy to volunteer to explain the technical issues to those of us who are not technologists in the group.

That would be my only plea for help, that if someone has a technical background here, to look at the correspondence and maybe help me outline

what sort of technical issues would be issues that would have a policy
empass the Not-For-Profit community.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. Sam, you have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, Sam Lanfranco; just very brief.

If the objections are coming from somebody, they should state what the
problems are.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori. I haven't seen the objections. I've seen letters from ICANN
saying there is a group within ICANN that has determined there may be -
there may be issues. So I think what they're asking for now is okay, what are
the issues.

So unless somebody here can volunteer time to help us identify what those
issues are, I'm certainly not qualified to do that.

(Sam Lanfranco): No, I think they need to be more specific. You know, I worry about astronauts
or...

That's my problem. No, I mean...

Lori Schulman: That's not the issue. I just think that as a group it's important for us to support
the bundling. And the best comment we could make is, "We support the
bundling so do what you need to do to make it work."

(Sam Lanfranco): Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi speaking. I think it's important that, as we know, that it's not so easy for
an NGO, a Not-For-Profit Organization, to have a clear view on what a
domain name is and who to be able to register it and in addition to
(unintelligible) and be protected at all levels.

We have to insist having this bundle. It should be a requirement because otherwise you will end up having an organization having Dot NGO and a similar organization with maybe the same time ending up having DOT ONG. That's the most confusing thing you can have. That's what we have to avoid.

Lori Schulman: Well Rudi, if they apply for one, they automatically get the other. So they'll have it; that I don't think is the issue.

The issue is what's behind it. Do you input information twice? Would you input information once? And what happens technically to that information after its input.

That's how I read this particular comment to address in terms of the issue.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi again. From a technical point of view being also with another hat on, a kind of reseller of domains, it all depends on what the registry is defining because they are the structure that are in fact setting up and having the Whois data managed.

Lori Schulman: Right but they are tied to the Registry Agreement, all right. They are contractually bound to collect certain information, and they are collecting the information, right.

And again, the issue is purely technical in the sense, again, do you type the names in once, do you type the names in twice.

The applicant is getting the dual domains. It's how the information is processed on the backend that's being discussed.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Lori. I see Alejandro who is (unintelligible).

Alejandro Pisanty: Alejandro Pisanty.

This issue has been remanded for now to the - well not remanded, it has been submitted to a process called RSTEP. RSTEP means Registry Services Technical Evaluation.

There are two processes with the new gTLDs at this stage. One of them is just called RSEP, R-S-E-P, the other one is R-S-T-E-P. So RSEP basically reviews whether there are a number of issues that are not necessarily technical with the new gTLD proposal.

And RSTEP looks at the technical, if there are technical issues with this matter. So this is in discussion there.

For full disclosure, the RSTEP reviewers are pre-selected in a large pool and then they are assigned according to the specific proposal because they may be required to respond very quickly.

I am on that list and I opted not to take up the ONG/NGO issue because I am also a participant in ISOC and would rather not be perceived in conflict.

I was told that my membership within ISOC if far enough removed from PIR that it wouldn't be a profit or commercial issue. But I still prefer to keep it clean so I cannot report from the process. And it has only been started.

That will find out whether there are anything (unintelligible).

Cintra Sooknanan: thank you very much Alejandro. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, very quickly. Rudi again.

It demonstrates again that one topic, one issue, can be dealt with in different groups. And you see how important it is that we keep in mind on what's going on also outside of our community discussions in order to avoid that some

policy is produced in a side way and is impacting us. So it's a good sample of how important it is to have our eyes open all the time 24 hours a day.

Cintra Sooknanan: Lori, I know you spoke at length about the INGO/IGO issue. I want to know if you have anything to add at this point or if you want to just proceed to your next item agenda.

Lori Schulman: I actually don't recall speaking about INGO/IGO. I spoke about it in meeting two days ago. Today? In terms of the general protections. Oh okay, I was just confused.

All right, hi, I'll just quickly go through what the issue is. Very recently, the INTA - sorry, wrong words.

The ICANN Board adopted a resolution that would allow for limited protections of intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations under the protections that are being considered for trademark owners in the new gTLD system. Those same protections are now being considered for IGOs and INGOs who may or may not be trademark owners.

This is a very controversial issue. It goes to the Red Cross and Olympics and that the Red Cross and the Olympics were big advocates for these types of protections.

It also goes to now an inclusion of organizations that have been included on the United Nations Echo (Sock) List of consultative agencies. It's over 3000 organizations.

There are a couple of simultaneous projects going on related to this. One is a preliminary board report on these issues. The comment period for that closed in May. NPOC did not comment at that time, and POC I don't think is prepared to comment and to leave at these issues further.

A second issue that's going on that we've been working on this week is that the GNSO is going to be asked to vote on a charter for a working group to discuss the implementation of protection mechanisms to IGOs and INGOs and where these mechanisms should start or stop if they're needed at all.

So as part of the NCSG Policy Group, we have made proposed revisions to the working group charter that would look at whether or not these organizations already have trademark protections that they can use, whether or not there are issues of free speech and fair use being considered within allowing the use of these mechanisms.

I think that's particularly relevant to the non-profit community because so many non-profit community names would fall in trademark (unintelligible) into a descriptive miss-category; American Heart Association, American Lung Association. And these are organizations that are well known through a long period of use and so on and so on.

But what would that mean globally? The concepts behind trademark protection that these organizations are asking for are really I think beyond what was being considered initially for how we would look at protection in the name space.

But I also think it's important because it goes back to my earlier point. That there are enforcement issues with non-profits that I don't think were ever fully considered when looking at this new gTLD program. That's about all I'll say on it for the moment.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. Any questions or comments for Lori on this issue?
No?

Okay, with regard to the next item agenda, (unintelligible) for participation in the NCSGPC. I just want to confirm that on the agenda is membership

issues, so I do welcome everybody whoever has issues on that to attend that meeting. I think it's in BR2 tomorrow morning at 8:30.

And yes, I just want to turn it over to Rudi to talk about participation in the NCSGPC. That meeting actually already took place, so he would be able to give us a short report.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Cintra. Rudi for the transcript.

We had our meeting yesterday - no, the day before. With the NCSGPC which is the policy committee inside the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

In fact, one of the topics that we were discussing and is very important to us anyway is about the Seat 14 on the Board. Actually, the Seat 14 is open for new candidate. The previous candidate was Bill Graham who in fact is there from what we named the Non-Contracted Party House. Again, a lot of - NCPH - a lot of acronyms.

There was a round of election - voting, sorry - on two candidates being from our side, from NCSG, Avri Doria and from their side it was still Bill Graham. We ended up in a deadlock because you need on (turning) votes, you need eight to win and we didn't end up having eight for Avri so we are in a deadlock.

And we have to go - we decided in Buenos Aires to go - in Singapore, sorry - to go for a compromise candidate which is our colleague Sam Lanfranco.

But during the process, it ended up in having a negative response from the Non-Contracted Party House that they are not really interested in having our candidate, which I can't understand somehow. But that blocks it again.

They came up with another candidate from their side. And the discussion now is, as all is quite new and not everything has been inside the houses being

worked out in a clear way, there are no clear procedures on how to go forward. So you imagine how difficult it is to get an outcome that is acceptable for everybody. We could have voting rounds and end up in deadlocks and that could take ten years, 15 years, 20 years.

We need a solution and we are looking into a possibility that allows us to step out of that deadlock. Our proposal today is that we go for another round of voting with the two new candidates because it's not because a representative of a group of people say that, "No, we will not accept him, the individual voters would not vote for him."

So we are going to insist on having another round of voting because that's the only thing that is written in the procedures.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, I'd like to make a comment. It has nothing to do with me being a candidate; it has to do with those of you, especially the fellows who are new to the organization.

ICANN is young. The Internet has changed very rapidly. Lots of things get lost in the process.

The regulations for how a vote is to be conducted in this particular area never got written; they don't exist. There's a reference in the charter to an appendix which does not exist. This is the consequence of rapid growth and rapid change and so forth.

So if all that sounded fairly confusing to you, it's because this came without a rule book and it came without a user's manual; the Internet. It just stormed out into reality. So we're doing a lot of catch up here, and in the meantime it causes some pain and grief as we try to sort things out.

So when you've got a good question, you've probably got a good question. It's probably something we haven't sorted out yet.

Klaus Stoll: Just to repeat really what Sam said and that's your role. You sitting there sometimes and you're saying, "Okay, that was my first ICANN meeting, I don't understand anything."

Because often there is no logic; there is no rule book. You are here to make it up and help build it. And that's why some of the confusion - I mean it will keep coming back to your acronyms, yes.

I mean let's just find acronym and make it up and ask 100 people downstairs. I think we're coming up with 120 explanations of what that means.

And then when you explain to the people at the end, "By the way, we made it up, it's not really an acronym." Nobody will confess that they understand actually what's going on.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, seeing no further comments on that topic, (unintelligible) it's inactive, that we are close to being looking into and hopefully we'll have some tangible results soon. It's something that we will continue monitoring.

I just want to go into the next item agenda which users of NomCom (unintelligible). As many of you know, our constituency does not have a representative on NomCom. And in the latest correspondence from the Board, we were informed that a new Board NomCom Committee would be constituent to deal with the specific problem.

We've responded to them directly and have also copied the chair of the current NomCom as well as ICANN's General Council essentially stating that this is not an appropriate forum in dealing with the immediate issue of their not being a NomCom representative from the NPOC on the current 2014 NomCom. That's basically the status of that item.

Klaus Stoll: Cintra, another example where it just simple the system didn't work; we got stuck. Klaus for the record.

Cintra Sooknanan: Quite frankly, what the board is doing is they are lumping our issues with many - all the other changes to the NomCom. So essentially we are suffering for a holistic change to be done.

Okay, now I'll turn to Sam to talk a little bit about membership outreach which many of you will know about since your participants based on...

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, I was just chair of the Membership Committee for the last few months.

Membership outreach has historically been going to organizations and saying, "You have a stake in what we're doing. You're a stakeholder, you should get interested in what ICANN is doing. You should come in through NPOC."

We're still doing that, but whether I stay on as membership chair, my concern now is how we turn this process around a little bit and begin to service the constituency. In other words, what is the accountability to the constituency on the part of their representatives who represent them as members here, do they actually go back and provide information to their organization so their organization has a view as opposed to them being the individual in the organization that has a view.

There's a whole lot of this organizational development and learning that we still have to do. NPOC itself is basically two years old. So I won't say anymore there but I would take some questions from you about how the processes are or aren't working now and what you think should be done. And one way or the other, we will be querying you in a lot more depth over the next few months.

Nothing more to say on that.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Sam. And (Unintelligible) has asked a question into the room or Chat room. He's asked if there has been any agreement with regard to going to second voting round which Rudi had previously described with regard to the Board seat that Sam is the candidate.

So Rudi, I'll let you answer that.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Cintra. Rudi for the transcript.

Actually there's no concerns because the other party was not in the meeting with us, so we still have to go back to them through writing - through mail.

And I think tomorrow morning there is a breakfast session scheduled but it's not clear, it's not really confirmed.

Anyhow from our side, we will continue to go in the direction to present Sam. Although I have to say that inside the NCSGPC, there was no consensus neither on the way forward. We have been discussing back-and-forth on the procedures and we all discovered that there is an issue as we don't have the real procedures. Something that is clear that we were able to clarify is that as we are already behind the schedule of entering a candidate.

In the bylaws of ICANN, we found an Article (unintelligible) that stipulates that the Board Director will stay on until he is replaced which means that it could be a tricky deadlock that they play to keep Bill in that seat. If there's no candidate proposed, he has to stand as long as there is no replacement; that's what is written in the bylaws. That's one thing we know for sure.

And that's where we have to discover is this the way they want to go. And deadlock is still at the moment that the Board will say, "Okay, in Los Angeles there will be the General Assembly Meeting," and that they take up the

existing ten-date and continue with him. And then we are deadlocked again for a longer time.

It could take on for years. There's no specification about how long that term will last.

So you see, it's not only about policy, it's about policy insiders or sections of so that we need to have procedures, clear policy on what works, what doesn't work and what do we think that is needed for us to be able to function.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, thank you for that Rudi. Since there are no further questions in this area, I know it was discussed previously some cross-constituency collaboration by Rudi.

I specifically would like to turn to Rudi to discuss the work of the cross-community working group from the perspective of community working group operational procedures. That meeting was yesterday and we both attended.

So the outcome of that working group really is going to set the tone of more cross-community collaboration and the quick collaboration as well as in terms of setting up of charters as well as how the group generally operates to ensure success.

So I'll turn it to Rudi now to speak.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Cintra. Rudi for the transcript.

To be clear for those who don't know, the cross-community is across the different SOs and ACs; it's not just about the constituencies. It's a larger scope and it's trying to consensus in an earlier stage on some topics that are some concern of everybody.

And that's really important because it will help us to go in solving problems, (unintelligible), it happened before.

Just to say for example, when I started in the beginning with At Large, when there was a good advice going up to the Board that already took some time; sometimes a year or two before good advice was produced. And then it had to bounce back into the GNSO world to be handled over there and tracked down into an eventual good policy proposition.

So at the end when it comes back to the board, the issue was probably already gone because it took so many years before you had a solution.

With the cross-constituency and cross-community collaboration, we will open up the discussion at earlier stages on specific domains where there is a concern for everybody and where we need the input from everybody.

As you already understood, there is a lot of procedural aspects that have not been covered due to the fact that we are growing and becoming a large organization very quickly.

It is important that we have clear rules. And the meeting we had yesterday is all about the clear rules, how are we going to work on it. Who will be able to vote? What are the participants? How many participants we are allowing from each constituency or from each community?

So all these rules have to be defined in order to avoid ending up in discussions on, "Yes but you have four votes and we have only two votes and that's not right." So we want to clear that out from the beginning, have a clear description on the whole process, initiation of the working group, the formation of the working group, produce the reports and the proposals and the closure of the session which is also very important.

So you see, it's again time we have to sacrifice to be part of that working group in order to be representative for our group and to have a decent way of working that allows us also to participate in the whole concept.

If it's going to take us, again, two calls a week, I would say, "Well go, but that's not what we can do." It's impossible for us to spend another week, another two calls or three calls a week on issues that are in fact should be solved up from and not at the moment that it pops up.

So it's very important that we have a quick solution for how these working groups are set up and how they will function.

But we are already - Cintra is participating in a cross-community working group that already exists.

Cintra Sooknanan: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, so maybe you can explain a little bit of that one also.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, I see Alejandro has a question. You have the floor.

Alejandro Pisanty: Alejandro Pisanty, and thank you for letting me insert it before you speak because I think you may address that question very directly.

I have questioned the whole concept of cross-community working group. I think it requires a very serious justification.

The cross-community working group is called ICANN. That already exists. That already exists; there already exists the process by which each constituency comes up with using its own well-established, clear processes, and come up with an opinion that gathers every opinion from that constituency, reaches consensus. And then when you have all the consensus

from the different constituency, you come together through the supporting organizations for advice or council.

So explain, you know, why do we have to have this cross-constituency working groups? It needs a very clear explanation. As Rudi said, it adds to the effort, it may very (unintelligible) detract from the orderly process where you are sure of the consensus. It may actually have a representative - let's say a member of the cross-constituency working group from every constituency, may be less bound by the rules that make these people represent the people in the constituency and the consensus within the constituency,

It's a shortcut in that sense, and as Rudi said, it does lots of work. And the pressure of that work and the sheer overload of work on that representative and on that constituency may actually be making this a short (unintelligible).

And there is a possibility that cross-constituency working groups have been created in the past when there's only been one in order for one small (soft) group or even in the (unintelligible), to find a wedge into the final decision that he or she is not finding through the normal process.

So I would like to understand the justifications of make very sure that each time anyone decides to get into cross-constituency working groups, you know why you are doing that, what you are doing, what the price is, and what the accountability mechanisms are without creating even more (unintelligible) and more simplified process.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, thank you for that Alejandro. I will just try to answer just briefly before passing to Klaus.

There have been several cross-community working groups in the past. The (JEG) has been one, the JAS has been another. The (JEG) was a group

involved in critical integration, and the JAS was joint applicant support which does with community support for the new gTLD program.

I was involved in the JAS, and maybe that seen as the benchmark failure of what can happen in cross-community working groups, simple because there were no rules as to how constituencies engage as well as what happens when a constituency pulls out of the process.

My personal understanding of these benefits of cross-community working groups is that you get to engage with the advisory committee such as the GAC, the ccNSO as well as the ALAC at the policy writing stage to help us ensure that when it gets to the point in the reporting stage, that it's pretty much going to pass their critical phase of evaluation. And in the case especially with the GAC it has been important in the past to involve the GAC as well as on some issues with regard to the GNSO and the CCNSO together to mutually work out an understanding.

You will know the CCNSO is pretty independent in terms of ICANN as well as they don't have the same contractual obligations as the GNSO and the registrar. Klaus do you want to chat?

Klaus Stoll: Just in very practical terms let's talk about more working groups and especially cross-constituency working groups. We have to be aware that we have - that we are George Orwell's Animal Farm and there are some animals who are very all equal but some are more equal than others.

And let's talk about the professional ICANNers. We're having a group of people which I actually don't condemn at all - I love them to bits -- which are basically making their living by being in ICANN.

They derive their income in one way or another from being part of working groups by monitoring the process, things like that. There's nothing wrong with that.

But these people have actually the financial and intellectual means to participate in everything which comes. And there are other people who have to actually earn an honest trust.

And can't go to their employer or anybody else and say okay, please allow me to spend 24 hours, 30 hours a week in participating in ICANN and by the way I'm going off three times a year to - on a weeks' conference and I've got about 12 IGFs to participate in the planning potantary and things like that. So and that also gives me a huge bellyache when I'm thinking about who's actually getting to speak and who's actually being in the multi-stakeholder process.

The multi-stakeholder process of those who happen to be privileged. And these are basic questions in there.

And I don't think it is - although, question that the ICANN board or that shadow thing is creating more and more groups to make things complicated and to divert people from the real subject. I think what quite simply happens is you are in a working group and you know how it works and you've got the time.

Of course you create another one and then you create another one and you create another one. And because you forget that there are normal people around you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes you have the floor. Please state your name.

(Lori Taylor): Thank you. (Lori Taylor). I just want to thank you for this wonderful session.

We have another session that we're going to. And my big takeaway comes from actually Klaus, which you immediately - also it's like a balloon and it's deflated a little -- not too much.

But you basically said it doesn't matter where you participate as long as you engage in policy. And I think that was good.

It helps to diffuse a lot of the concerns I had on how to get involved or where to get involved in this huge dynamic organization. And so perhaps the next time when we have a conversation if a chart for us the trail -- that policy trail of these issues, what are the important working groups or committees that we need to carry our voice to?

Like Whois or gTLD business or even the bundle support that was talked about a little bit. You know, and help us navigate that.

That might be the way to go and say, you know, take our issue from here to here to here. And they'll eventually get to GNSO, you know.

That might be one way to help us navigate the murky waters. But we thank you so much.

Klaus Stoll: Just one plea. You've got access to - and the means to access a large number of people and users of the internet.

And maybe that we could think about and talk about actually how we could trying to find the capacity building outreach program to these people to explain to them actually what we are doing here and why it's important and why it's relevant for them. That would be something I would be more than interested in.

(Lori Taylor): To that regard I'm not sure if we can reach all 5 million or 6 million of our American Indian individuals. But we can certainly try to work with the 566 native nations that represent their constituents.

And that's Matthew's area there.

Matthew Rantanen: So both Lars and I have many, many, many hats that we wear. And joining ICANN is a layer on top of a very large stacked cake.

One of the situations that we belong to is the national congress of American Indians. And we co-chair their tech and telecom subcommittee.

I also co-chair their technology task force. And a lot of this is relevant to both of those groups.

But additionally I am on the Native Nations Broadband task force of the Federal Communications Commission for the United States. And have an opportunity to influence policy making and help bridge the divide between policy and government and the 566 tribes.

So we'll definitely make efforts to tie those together and bring knowledge to these people.

Klaus Stoll: When can we meet? When can we meet in the U.S.?

Matthew Rantanen: I'm actually based in San Diego area. My office is on the (Palla) reservation.

But ICANN is meeting in LA in October, yes. So I can probably be at that.

Man: Thanks anyway for your participation. It's good to have new voices in the discussions and we are looking forward to see you in Los Angeles.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. I just want to note - would you like to also.

Robert Castonguay: Robert Castonguay - just because I'm going to another meeting, too. So but I was really interested to listen to everything that has been said -- pretty enlightening.

Cintra Sooknanan: Would you like to share anything that particularly resonated with you or...

Robert Castonguay: No just the way that it's going to better understand now the whole ICANN thing is working. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay so...

Klaus Stoll: Maybe for those sitting in the back rows there is space at the table where you can join us at the table.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. So the next item agenda is the CROPP; we are currently in the FY '15 CROPP; FY '14 CROPP is gone. There are several new rules regarding the CROPP application process as well as the restrictions on it.

One of them is that there's a very fixed hard rule that the application must be updated on the Wiki and approved by the VP regional manager six weeks prior to the actual meeting. The other new development that I found out about is that in the case that there's a regional manager they should also be given the opportunity to approve the application.

We've had two recent requests -- one has come from Poncelet Illeleji who is also online. And it's with regard to the African IGS.

Unfortunately due to the late organization of the (G8) we're not able to apply for that request because it falls short of that six weeks. And we've really tried to discuss this with ICANN staff to see what kind of flexibility they have.

But apparently this is a directive from ICANN constituency travel as well as general council that they cannot go shorter than that six week deadline. The other request comes from me personally with regards to the Caribbean iChair which is to be held on the 8th and 9th of August.

So we're just within that six week period. So I've requested the executive committee to evaluate that request and maybe come to a decision within the next day or so so that I can apply if possible.

I'm sorry we've had some new participants join the table. May I just ask you to introduce yourself?

(Suzy Hargreaves): My name is (Suzy Hargreaves). I'm from the Internet Watch Foundation. So which is a not-for-profit based in the U.K., U.K. hotline for reporting criminal content and a multi-stakeholder organization. So I was just really interested in hearing sort of not-for-profit concerns because it's an area that I work in. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Do you have any particular focus in attending this meeting or just general? I also want to recognize our remote participants.

(Javier Rodriguez), Poncelet Illeleji and (Ritemay Sotero). We recognize you and welcome to our meeting.

If any of you do have access to your audio we will welcome you to introduce yourselves. IN the meantime Rudi you have the floor.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Cintra. Rudi for the transcript.

Just to pick up on the CROPP for those who don't know it's a mechanism that has been put in place to allow representatives from in the constituencies to have the ability to travel to important events where it's possible to participate. There is a quite limit budget -- it's two nights hotel and travel.

Am I wrong Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: No just sorry to butt in. This is Klaus.

As one of the person who is responsible for the CROPPP program from the (unintelligible) side the Gateway people -- and also as somebody who's used the CROPPP program just two weeks ago to go to the Eurotik in Berline please, please, please be aware about two things which are absolutely vital. The CROPPP rules can't be bent.

There is not for example -- I'll give you an example. There is a two day meeting.

You need to go to meeting. You're supposed to participate in the two day meeting.

But you only get two nights approved. There is no way that CROPPP will pay you the third night.

So you have to pay the third night. Also with the dates -- it's six weeks.

If you are one day underneath the six weeks they won't process your application. And there is absolutely no flexibility in the process.

And there will be a re-evaluation of the CROPPP thing and hopefully some of the messages go through. So for example the message I sent to CROPPP is they ask you for a meeting report.

I sent my meeting report and I cut it two thirds of the page off because they only pay two thirds of the meeting so I only sent them two thirds of the page. And this is the kind of message we have to get through.

So maybe they think about paying the two thirds (unintelligible) in the next round. All I'm trying to say - don't think you can have any flexibility in that model.

There is none.

Man: (unintelligible)

Rudi Vansnick: Maybe to pick up on a positive note of what the CROPPP is -- it didn't exist before. So we were - if we wanted to go to events outside of the ICANN events and meetings we had to pay it anyway from our own pocket.

So it's good to have already the opportunity to be able to travel to interesting meetings outside of the ICANN perspective. I think it's a positive direction but it needs to be adapted anyway.

But it's good. At least we have an opportunity to be able to pop up in meetings that are not the ICANN shows and meetings.

And as you said it's important that you know that there are some restrictions. Maybe that we need and that's a proposal that I'm doing still being the policy committee chair.

Maybe that's a recommendation or a comment we have to send to ICANN as an input for improvement. I'm just submitting this to our group is that it's an action point that we want to take up for our next meeting and - or maybe before and send a report back to ICANN explaining what our expectations are for the future CROPP.

Is that a way to go?

Cintra Sooknanan: Rudi I agree with it -- that way forward. I just want to say that it's not that there has been no flexibility within this new FY '15 in that registration fees were never actually contemplated in the FY '14 CROPP program.

So those you would have been paid out of pocket rather than funded by ICANN. There is some flexibility now in terms of registration fees for events.

But the amount have not been defined. So there's still quite a bit of vagueness within the actual process.

And I mean we're working with staff in trying to remove those so that we can have more of our participants attend and take some use of this CROPP program. So nothing, any other comment son that?

Klaus I'd like to move to you for any upcoming events that you'd like to kind of bring our focus to whether it be on the NPOC side or I endage or otherwise that you may think are important for (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: I give the word to Rudi. This is Klaus. Sorry Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus. Rudi for the transcript.

While there are a lot of things that we want to explore as evenets that are in the context of our mission but are not inside the ICANN events process as Klaus already mentioned we are trying to help the NGO world in better understanding the real internet governance and the - and open up doors for multi stakeholderism for them too. That's done through a program that we call the iEngage.

And you can find the website with some information on it on going to i-engage.me. That's easiest way you can get a view on what it is.

And it's indeed about engaging yourself in the process of internet governance and the debates that are going on. As you heard Cindra is going to the Caribbean IGF, Klaus went to the Eurotik which is the European Dialog on Internet Governance which is the European IGF.

That's a way we can also pop up as representatives of our community in the national and regional debates on IGF. So that's something we're going to try to plan a bit more in the process of in between the ICANN meetings.

We need to be in other places. The CROPP is a way to cover a little bit the expenses of travel and going to that event.

But we need other ways also to get some solutions for enabling people from our community to go to those events also aside those of let's say the xcom. By the way the CROPP is not only for the xcom.

It's for the members of the community. So if you have an event that you're thinking about please raise it and we will see how we can manage to get you in it.

With the upcoming even that is for us quite important as we are going to allow members to be more representative in our own meeting for Los Angeles we are planning to have another format of this constituency day meeting. We are going to try to discuss less about what happened at administration.

But we want to talk more about what's going on and what are directions that you want us to take rather than telling you what we are doing and what we did. You can find that anyway on that emailing list.

But I think it's important that in Los Angeles we will try to set up a meeting that allows a lot of input and debate. And we will invite you to propose topics for that agenda so that we can prepare eventually speakers that are required to give you answers.

Actually we are already happy that we are expanding and growing and having more people around the table than we had before. And we have a lot of interesting discussions going on.

But I think we need to go now, we exist three years. We need to pop up in another format and allow to talk about the more critical things with eventually ICANN board people.

If we have good questions, good topics I'm convinced that we can ask for presence of a board member to explain why this is happening in having people from the noncom for instance popping up. I would like to have more interaction with the other structures during this meeting.

Because it's the only moment in the year that we have the time to have the face to face. At least I want and I'm a fan of body language.

Because body language shows immediately if somebody is interested or not. And if you are picking a [point up that harms them you will see it on that efface.

That's why I want to have them here. I have weekly calls with a lot of people in ICANN.

But I don't see them. And I'm not sure that I'm really talking to them in the way that they are listening to me.

They can be looking at the soccer game for instance at the same time. So I would like to create the new format for next constituency day in Los Angeles.

And open up the door for a little bit more debate on things that are of your concerns less than ours. If you want to know what we are doing we have our monthly calls where we explain -- where we do the same as we are doing today except we do it in two hours instead of two and a half or three.

And it allows us probably to better understand where we have adapt our processes. Because that's still questions that I have in front of me -- what are the processes that you feel we didn't accomplish.

Cintra Sooknanan: Klaus I know (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Yes very quickly to follow-up as you know the in-engage project basically when you go to the website it's actually already out of date. Because we are going now for the conceptual phase into the implementation phase.

And you will see quite some new stuff going on. And as I said at the beginning of the meeting our role now is to reach out to the grassroots, to all the NGO worldwide.

So what I can tell you is that we are - it's a moment working about setting up regional meetings around one of them will be from the 3rd to the 6th of May in Windsor which is a smaller event...

Cintra Sooknanan: (unintelligible)

Klaus Stoll: As - no, November, sorry. 3rd to 6th of - I'm sorry.

I hereby apologize. November in Windsor.

Then we are planning at the moment tentatively an event before the end of the year in (unintelligible). We have been involved in asking at the moment for some meetings in Guadalajara and Mexico City.

We are thinking and working also about events in Europe under the guidance of Rudi. And the only thing where we are fairly unclear but that will change in the next two weeks is about which events we will organize in Asia.

These events are really set up as events to reach the NGOs and to inform them about what's going on, capacity building and to engage them. It's - and it's really events who unashamingly looking for big numbers and impact.
Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thanks for that Klaus. I just also want to mention the NCPH intercessional meeting.

It's proposed as January 2015 in Washington, DC. And the proposal is that we have an increase in participants per constituency from previous amount to 10 participants.

So we're still awaiting approval. AT this stage we're just making sure that we have the correct dates in place.

But this is a tentative meeting. But funding has been provisionally approved.

There's also the next ICANN meeting which is in February 2015 which is going to be in Marrakesh. And Rudi you had - I see Rudi you have a...

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Cintra. Rudi for the transcript.

Well looking a bit in longer time perspective indeed there is in February Marrakesh ICANN meeting. Before that I've seen yesterday an invitation -- a doodle that I had to responds to.

Early January there will be also an inter sessional meeting. Glen had a - there is the (unintelligible) that is coming up.

But before that one there is something that - there is a lot of noise going around that one. And it's a very important one.

It's the IANA stewardship committee that is going to be created very soon now. I think it's next week that they are going to end up with all the candidates and put them together in that committee.

There is invitation for our group -- and I'm saying group, not constituency -- to deliver one candidate. I think the GNSO in itself can provide one candidate.

And that's it. So we - again we have to fight for a place to be there.

That stewardship committee will be very intensive. Being also an ISOC board trustee we have our meetings at the end of this week here in London.

ISOC has two participants that are allowed to be in that committee. And we have been yesterday joining the ISOC chapter's meeting.

Exploring ways to see what are the critical items, what is something that needs to happen, what is something we want to avoid that happens. I think that from that perspective in NPOC itself we have to open up a session and kind of ad hoc working group that keeps looking into those discussions in order to be able to interfere at an early stage and not wait until. Things goes wrong and goes in the wrong direction.

So I would propose that we try to create an ad hoc working group that will look into all these aspect in order to be able to respond in a decent way. As you know there is only one seat for GNSO.

So we don't know what that person will be -- who that person will be and what will be the perspective of that person. So I'm looking forward to have a clear view on what's going to happen over there.

WE hope in ISOC that we will have two good candidates and we have to select them this weekend anyway. But it's a very intensive job.

I think it's about 15 hours that you have to be available to participate in that meeting. So in those meetings.

So it's a hard job. But again it's touching upon the future of ICANN anyway.

My personal perception of this action of coming from the U.S. government is that ICANN has been saying the last couple of years that they are really multi stakeholder. I have the impression that the government decided to say well, you say you are.

Prove it. Do it. Look here. This is a contract you can take over -- prove now that you're able to be multi stakeholder.

AT all levels. And I'm not convinced that after the 18 months the U.S. government will say well go now.

Here it is. I'm rather thinking that it will say well we have seen that you're not able to produce a real good brand, a real good action plan for multi stakeholder level.

So we keep it in our hands and we go on. That's a personal perception.

I think that Alejandro yesterday was also making a lot of (unintelligible) on that. I don't know if you want to speak to that one.

Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you Rudi. I don't know if there's anyone else in the queue first.

Thank you. I completely disagree with your perception.

And I think that starting from that perception is the way to make sure it doesn't happen. I don't - I am not inside the mind of anybody in the U.S. government so I cannot judge whether they really mean it or whether it's a setup or as you mention it.

I would recommend that everybody reads words that were spoken here yesterday in the government meeting, high level government meeting by

Larry Strickling from the NTIA of the Department of Commerce of the U.S. government. So that it's pretty blunt and pretty clear.

It's not clear that this will be released -- the function will be released or let's say the NTIA intervention will be released just like that. It is very blunt about the conditions that will have to be met in their eye.

They have to believe these conditions have met - have been met and they are very hard. They are very blunt.

It has to be a mechanism that is not governmental or inter-governmental and that is not dominated or susceptible - easy susceptible to domination by governments. Has to have a strong consensus from that community.

I think we should be very skeptical about some games that are being played around this. For example taking this to a brother community instead of only the community of the ICANN can - not only the ICANN community but the community that's ICANN can convene.

I think that a lot of speeches in the sense that, you know, the whole world should really take part in this. And before you do - you have the whole world you shouldn't even start.

Those are delay tactics or negotiating tactics from some governments specifically. And other parties.

I think that the strong consensus is achievable. But the proposal has to convince everybody of several key issues.

And I think there's I would say two key issues. And I will try to focus first on only one.

The key issue is that this is a completely novel process in many ways in that at least in the history of ICANN and internet governance. Because the management of a critical resource -- ICANN is about the only internet governance organization that actually makes decisions which change the fate of something.

Like the root or the holding of protocol parameters which is a critical function as well or IP address. So it would be the first time that something like this stands on its own feet without having the backstop of either a government or an inter-governmental organization.

This is completely original. There will be many questions on the authority and legitimacy of whatever emerges.

So it has to be very solid. Many people in the world will believe that it's better to have a state or legal background for this.

And you have to make sure that that doesn't lead to an institutional design that has the U.N. as the real - as the only backstop. Because it will be an invitation for an earlier takeover.

I would add in parentheses here that I do not like something that happens very often especially in the United States it is taken by some parties and (unintelligible) sorry for the redundancy which is pitching things as the U.N. versus the world or the U.N. takeover. It is very disrespectful to the U.N. itself that this is a good side, a non-bureaucratic, nonpartisan side and operation of the U.N.

And to the positive view of the U.N. that exists outside the United States. Developing countries, places like South Africa where the U.N. was instrumental in defeating apartheid, you know, there's a lot of respect for the U.N.

And it's stupid to pitch this against the U.N. because you are automatically alienate a number of people. But it has indeed to be a mechanism that is not inviting, you know, a next takeover by the blue helmet.

That's one thing. And the other is that one has to really understand the IANA function in order to see what the supervision -- so the oversight role of the NCA is.

And in order then to design the mechanism it's very small. It's very small.

It's ten people operating these. There are some of the operations, some of - if you make the list of the databases that are kept some of them don't even need a full time person.

They are highly automated. They are run at an extremely professional level.

Another smoke cloud that we have to cut through is the one of policy operation separation. The policy and - the policy operation separation already exist and is very strong.

It's under the (unintelligible) of commitments and it was there even before ICANN was created. ICANN is the policy operation separation.

ICANN, GNSO, et cetera take part of the - take the load of the policy development for IANA and then IANA operate. So one would have to be very clear and very clean about the things.

And then really focus efforts. And the one last point is some of us are of the view that the - whatever emerges from this must be in that direction of keeping IANA whole instead of creating an incentive to splitting it into different operations.

At present the IANA operates differently for each of the registries. It's not the same people who are talking with the IUTP for the protocol parameters or the people who are talking for ccTLD.

And that is okay. But one has to be careful that by not instituting separate oversight mechanisms one is creating an incentive to splinter the IANA in the future.

And finally one has to really think long-term 10 to 15 years to see what large powers which are staying silent for the moment will actually do in a very long game for either taking over the roots or splitting the root for half the population of the world just de facto without consulting with ICANN. Just coming up with, you know, we have given an executive - a government order or a law through managed parliament that orders every ISP in their country to use the region's roots.

So one has to be really cognizant of these long-term issues.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you - this is Klaus. Thank you for that...

Cintra Sooknanan: I'm sorry do you mind if (Lori) goes first? Ladies first?

Klaus Stoll: No, no, go. Yes ladies first.

(Lori Schulman): I was just going to say maybe the only American in the room at the moment. That's I think possible.

That being - you're Canadian. You're American. You're both. All right.

I agree - yes. I agree with Mr. Lisanty that's right - Pisanty. Mr. Pisanty that it is much more complication than the original communique ever suggested.

I also think that there was a tendency not to really look beneath the surface of the communique. Because if you really look at even the first communique it was very clear that there was a bigger agenda at play than what was originally communicated.

I would also add that those who follow the American press will note that there's been an enormous backlash to this suggestion in the press. To close, I'm sorry.

There was enormous backlash in the press. And the U.N. issue aside -- and I have a tendency to agree that in the United States itself the perception of the United Nations is extremely negative.

Whether it's earned or not is another issue. But that is how it's perceived.

And right now because the function is in U.S. control I think we have to live with the perception in that sense. But I also say that there are members of Congress who are determined to have this transition never happen.

And so then the issue becomes would a change in leadership during the U.S. elections affect any of this? It may or may not.

So there's much more at play than even what's going on in ICANN in the internet community itself. There's huge political issues that are really fully American based that are at play here as well.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay Klaus you have the floor and then actually I'd like to get the perspectives of a new participant on this topic because this kind of touches all of us.

Klaus Stoll: I'm extremely grateful for both of the contributions. And that one was really good one and I wish we could print it.

Let me try to bring it down to very, very simple level. So simple level is that ICANN wants to have the function.

And ICANN has a tendency to do outreach in a way that is basically ICANN goes and opens the door and waits other people to come in. But doesn't explain to them that it opened the door, what's inside the door and why they should come in.

So one of our role as NPOC I see straightforward that we are trying to make all these meetings happening globally is to simply go out and explain what's going on and what's happening. There are complexities which are very straightforward.

And that is for example what I call the wishful thinking of ICANN. What (Lori) said -- there are very, very clear conditions from the U.S. government.

And one of the conditions from the U.S. government is has to be broadly based and supported. And ICANN translates that okay, we open the door, maybe one or two comes in and then that is then broad support.

No. The - any American government -- even a republican will see that trick. And say no that is not a broad based.

So and the other thing quite simply we're looking at the IANA function and ICANN is doing it. I think we also have to get used to the idea that we have to do something and we have to play our role to make these things happen.

And not only oversight and not only following. We also have to get in actively engaged.

Maybe not in the negotiation. Maybe not in the group but in the background, in creating the condition that's the best thing can happen.

Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you for that Klaus. Are there any perspectives on this side?

Martin Sutton: Yes Martin here. I won't take a specific position regarding what Rudi said.

I also think that's a strong possibility. I do believe that the U.S. government usually plays more than one game at a time I would say.

They never play one game at a time. So of course this initiative has more than one level -- far more levels than I can imagine.

So that being said I also agree with Klaus said. ICANN is a wishful thinking.

I would also could said self-proclaim, you know, I am multi stakeholder for - I am multi stakeholder. That happens a lot.

You define and then you communicate everyone else what you are. And you begin to be perceived.

And that's a trick that ICANN doesn't have to buy. I mean it has to be honest - not to everyone else but to itself.

Because if it's truly not multi stakeholder then not only would the IANA transition it's going to suffer not so long-term because as we have seen the world wants to discuss a different governance. And they are having really strong initiatives.

And in the forgoing years I think ICANN is going to be - is going to have a fight against the world alternatives. And if ICANN is snot up to the fight in a good term, you know, fighting for the best model, the best place if ICANN is not up to it it's eventually going to lose.

Not - I think it's in the best position to grow and to make a sustainable and honest and real environment. I couldn't comment exactly about the specifications of the IANA transitions because I'm not a technic.

I'm a person - 'm from a law background. It would be negligent for me to comment about what's the best characteristic of this new provider of this new contractor.

So actually I think I will have to learn a lot more to say well the new IANA administrator would have to be like this or like that. I think that what the U.S. proposed is reasonable.

I think it's in accordance with what everyone thinks it should be. Nevertheless I always assume that of course that's not just goodwill.

Maybe if I will apply a (unintelligible) of good faith for the U.S. government I could say that they are thinking that well these things - this thing is going to be out of our hands. It better be in a place where no one else is going to control it also.

That there could be our interpretation of goodwill. You know, this is going to be out of hands.

We can't control this for much longer. We better give up control now in our own terms than being taking it away.

You could say that commercially it is better to have a stable and confident place to develop. So that's my piece of that.

Cintra Sooknanan: I appreciate that. I have Alejandro and Sam in the queue.

Alejandro Pisanty: No. I'm going to try to make this very brief but it can't be in one second. The use of the word stakeholder and Sam (unintelligible) will correct me because he's a better expert than I am.

Began to appear in language that we hear more often in the - at the end of the 1970s or in the 1980s in books and papers on the theory of the enterprise. At that time it was realized by many students of the firm or the company or the enterprise that the theories that emphasized adding value for the owners of the company were insufficient.

The owners of the company were either single individuals or families. Or when the companies are publicly traded when the shares are in the share market in the stock market then these people are called -- the owners are the shareholders or maybe you could also call them the stockholders.

And the theory went that you couldn't do - run a company well, sustainably and into the future if you are only adding value for the shareholders. You have to add value for all the stakeholders.

And stakeholders in English means people who have something at stake. People for whom something will happen -- good or bad depending on how the company goes.

So the stakeholders of the company are not only the shareholders but also for example the employees, middle management, people in the environment. If your company has a chemical plant then your stakeholders are people who are downstream whose water you pollute and upstream whose water you utilize.

And so forth, you know, that whole country may be a stakeholder in a company. For example if you have the flagship airline of your country -- what country are you from?

From Argentina. You have Airlinias Argentias.

If Airlinias Argentinas does well Argentina is proud of its airline. And if it doesn't do well it doesn't affect like the economy that much because you can fly with other cheaper companies.

But it affects the image of the economy in the country. So you are a stakeholder even if you are a peasant that never flies.

So that's a stakeholder concept. Then - and we have to go back that much to really appreciate something that I find throughout the (unintelligible).

The multi stakeholder mechanisms for governance have been around for decades if not centuries. The management of the commons for example have usually been multi stakeholder.

You have the shepherds, you have the people who want transit through the grazing lands and so forth. So or you have, you know, in Argentina you have the shepherds and you have the cattle raisers.

And they are colliding for the same prairie. Or at least for the same road into the mountains where the sheep will go.

And you have stakeholders there, okay. And you have multi stakeholder management there.

So when the U.S. government decides to institute a new mechanism to substitute for the IANA function as ran by them without a contract from the Department of Commerce they bring - they decide to bring together the people who actually run the system, the people who have a direct stake in it and all other stakeholders, registers, registrars, et cetera, plus, you know, the general users. It wasn't called multi stakeholder.

It was just allied bringing together the stakeholders of the domain name system and the other registries. In 2003, 2005 governments especially in the (unintelligible) in the World Summit for - on the Information Society began to demand a place at that same table.

They felt excluded from internet governance. And this is one of the first times that their governments formally acknowledged that they are being excluded from something without sending in the army and just taking it over.

And that's when the name multi stakeholder appears. Actually multi stakeholder does not appear in the (unintelligible) document.

It appears - the only word that appears is stakeholders. And it says with the participation of all stakeholders or even the participation of all stakeholders on an equal footing.

So that tells you that that was already recognizing ICANN as a primary example of a very elaborate and well-constructed multi stakeholder organization. When I add the adjectives mature, well established, well-functioning it means that it's not only a meeting but actually has mechanisms to make decisions and has mechanisms to correct wrong decisions.

Has mechanisms for someone claiming, you know, this decision affect me negatively and I want it reverted. And mechanism 60 actually reverse those decisions which is very elaborate.

So I would be very, very cold footed in your place when you say that no ICANN is not really multi stakeholder. There's nothing like it.

In a paper I presented recently in the Hague Institute for Global Justice I have gone back to see also the empowerment factor for multi stakeholder - for different stakeholders. There's nothing like what's happening in internet governance for empowering non-government electives.

And this means NGOs, business, academia, the technical community, they were engaged in a multi-stakeholder fashion long before the government started even looking at this stuff. The one place where the empowerment grew and went back is the noncommercial space within ICANN which was - when the agenda was concentrated on northern let's say privacy the - privacy is a global interest.

But the northern version of privacy interest. That actually excluded the developing countries and many others from the noncommercial constituency.

And that's very easy to follow if you follow the numbers and the type of participation (unintelligible). So have to be very careful when you say well, no first we have proven that ICANN is multi stakeholder.

No sir,. ICANN is the primary example.

It's imperfect but there is nothing like it. So those are from that.

And there the second point -- I don't think that anyone should feel that they have to exclude themselves from this process for example as you mentioned for being a lawyer because there are serious legal issues. But there are, you know, large scale international relations, global law - global rule of law issues.

And if you are an expert on that I'm not a technical expert. That knowledge is still necessary.

And following the process -- not only getting a seat on the commission is equally important.

Man: Just to make a quick follow-up yes of course what (unintelligible) ICANN has to prove it is multi stakeholder. I was actually saying as a strategy of ICANN,

ICANN has to always seek - always make sure he's doing his best to be a multi-stakeholder, not that it wasn't the best case. I agree with you.

If we have to search - as an example, ICANN is great, it's...

Alejandro Pisanty: Let me interrupt you if I may. I have created several years ago in the (Wissis) process I created a small table which I call the (Wissisometer) where I use the criteria from (Wissis) about, you know, democratic, user center, participation of all stakeholders.

ICANN gets a four out of five. And almost any other organization you look at barely reaches a two.

Man: Yes. I can see that and I wanted to make that clear yes I agree with you. The other thing is what I tried not to comment too far about IANA -- it has to just - because I don't want to speak in the air.

I would prefer if we would have that topic in a specific topic as IANA. And then I could, you know, bite the thing with my specific not so profound law knowledge.

And maybe comment a little bit of something. But just this broad I'm not prepared to make a broad exposition of the law consequences of the (unintelligible).

Yes maybe. I am not - not so far.

I mean I would have something right now, I don't.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I'd just like to propose that you join us and work in our ad hoc working group on this issue. You know, we do need minds like yours to really flesh out the issues.

(Sam) I just want to turn the floor to you. I know you had a...

(Sam): Okay I have several levels of comment since the discussion went on and it got more complicated. So I'm going to try and compress them and make them very brief.

You can be a stakeholder in a process without participating in the process. I think that's the case in football, right Alejandro?

You don't have to be on the field to have a stake in it. Okay. I think that's generally recognized.

There are a couple of comments I'd like to make that are very specific and very general. The very general one is under appreciated

And that's that the rollout of the internet is the first time in the history of the globe and humanity other than the creation of gravity by somebody else where something was rolled out globally where everybody ends up being a stakeholder. NO matter where you are and what you are doing it will have a consequence for how you live, how your children live, what you do, period.

So it has that property in terms of everybody becoming a stakeholder. The next stage is becoming aware as a stakeholder to represent your interest and to participate in things.

Some of that will be funneled into ICANN, into what ICANN does. But the stakeholder issues are much broader than that.

There will be dozens, thousands of venues in which that takes place. That's the first point.

It is a global commons in the traditional sense -- the classic sense of a commons. And there are people trying to own parts of it and people trying to protect part of it.

So that's the bigger issue. Everybody ends up being a stakeholder.

Okay. Coming down to ICANN, ICANN is one of the better examples of a working multi stakeholder process.

I privately say it's too thin and it's too anemic. But it's the model we have.

When I was younger I used to drink a beer called 102. It was called 102 because that's how many times they redid the recipe before they got it good enough to sell.

It still wasn't good beer. So we're in an iterative process of trying to get there.

Now you talked about strategy. You went to strategy.

I listen very carefully to how the language changes by the participants. And there are two things that I've picked up in the last six months -- well actually less for the IANA transition.

The U.S. was talking about a multi-stakeholder model not a multilateral organization. It's now talking about a multi-stakeholder model that can work with multilateral organizations.

I don't find that surprising. That's what I expected because that's the model that is used by the universal declaration of human rights.

That's the model that has been used for 95 years by the international labor organization. This blended model is probably - we're probably where the

world was in 1945 when it finally understood it needed something like the U.N.

We're now at a point where we have - we're beginning to understand we have to have something like what's being talked about here. Even though we don't exactly know what it is yet or how it's going to work.

But this is the frontier we're sitting on. And you can't go to the library and get a rulebook or a user's guide.

We have to build it.

Woman: Thank you very much. That's very interesting.

I have a specific perspective which is I work in the field of child safety online. So and I think that the...

Man: For the webcast can you come closer to the microphone?

Woman: Sorry?

Man: For the webcast can you come closer to the microphone.

Woman: Okay. Is that better? Yes okay. So I work in child online safety.

And it's an area where the multi stakeholder model is very, very successful. And I spend a lot of time on internet governance meetings or the IGS, IGU, wherever actually talking about how the people involved in child internet safety tend to be in meetings about child internet safety.

And actually we've got a model that really is incredibly successful and works very, very well. And involves all the biggest stakeholders.

So the stakeholder model that I run is one that - where not just civil society is involved but also government at the highest level, the police, the public and industry. And often we go - we have meetings and we come back to the board of things and we report back.

And we say you know, when we sit in a room on child internet safety we're not sitting there with, you know, we are sitting there with senior people in government. WE are sitting there with the biggest internet companies in the world.

We are sitting there with credible civil society organizations who provide a legitimate broker between industry and government and the public and the police. And actually we have got a wonderful model to share.

And I really don't understand why this isn't picked up and shared and put on a, you know, that we're not on the platform more often. Because we're low hanging fruit in terms of the way, you know, people will work together, they will cooperate internationally on child safety.

Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay so thank you so much for that lively discussion. We want to go into (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yes Rudi for the transcript. We have something like 24 minutes left in our meeting.

And we even didn't use the break. So probably for next meeting we need too much -- a bit more time to for other discussions like this one because this is really interesting for us to know what is the guidance you are giving us, what is the direction that we need to take up in order to represent you in an honest and correct way.

I've seen also two people joining in the back that I know very well that know me and you covering the ISCO staff and...

(Fernando): (Fernando).

Rudi Vansnick: ...(Fernando) exactly (unintelligible) checking off the names in my mind I forgot it that and that (Monte) is from the ISOC staff representing the activities in the membership.

Maybe you can have a quick overview of - you see probably faces that you recognize.

(Monte): That's true, hi Rudi and thank you and thank you for inviting me to this meeting. Some of you may know my role as the senior director for membership and services to members within the Internet society. We've been very fortunate this week to participate with a number of our chapters who are also at large constituencies for ICANN. And that's been a very gratifying experience and what I'm actually here to do is to maybe learn and engage in a few conversations myself to see what the opportunities are for not only working with our (chapter) ALS' but for a number of the non-profit organizations who are aligned with ICANN.

To see where the opportunities are to leverage our common interests into some substantive action. So I appreciate the opportunity to be here and looking forward to any comments or questions you might have for what the Internet society is doing today in this respect and any other comments about that, thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (unintelligible) and we just ended this discussion about the IANA transition where we try to cover a lot of views as we had yesterday a very good discussion also on what is the purpose of this mission in the stewardship and we heard a lot of good input how we are going to create an

ad hoc working group on the IANA transition in our community and (unintelligible) in order to allow us to bring more input to the whole discussion.

And as you know you see several ISOC chapters being present in this meeting too. That's the other way that ISOC chapters can be active in what's happening in the global Internet world not being just only the Internet governors in itself but also the main space and what's going around that space.

And we had a lot of good input today and we probably will extend some meetings and have cross community meetings with ISOC and ICANN like we did yesterday with ISOC members.

But I would like to see in the future having some mixture during these type of meetings that we have here with (NPOC) where we are representing NGO's not for profits, every ISOC chapter is a not for profit operation in itself already. So we need to extend a little bit more.

Man: From my point of view we have to learn the lessons and work together. If it's ISOC, if it's (NPOC) (unintelligible) to which we all have the same interests just different aspects of it.

And on my point of view what Rudi tries to say I think we have to stop being - thinking about it and creating the rationale and logical framework about it and start working together and looking at the things from the place of win-win situation.

What does ISOC want to achieve, what does (NPOC) want to achieve, where are the overlap, where they are let's go for it that's what I would recommend simple and straightforward.

And as I said maybe I'm a little bit impatient but I think the time of conceptualization is well let's do something.

Man: If any of you have heard our new CEO and I suppose I can still call the CEO Connie Brown, one of the things that she has mentioned to staff is that we need to act not just to speak.

And we do a lot of talking, we do a lot of trying to converge our thinking on certain issues and I think that is important because we are multi-stakeholder and we represent a lot of different perspectives.

So the (parvel) -- as they say in French -- is not useless at all. However I could not agree more that we have to come to the point where we understand where we have those points of convergence.

And around those points of convergence act, formulate action plans and do things. I think those convergences are more clear these days certainly in my mind than they have been perhaps in the past.

And that gives us great opportunity around also the key events and initiatives that are already taking place.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay so next step (unintelligible) with record. Where do we meet, when do we meet here online, let's make a date, let's make a draft agenda and get it done.

Klaus Stoll: Rudi for the transcript that's the impatient class.

(Monte): So I've been getting out our calendars right now everybody and seeing when we can do this. I think perhaps some suggestions I think some exchanges of emails with some suggested times and places and venues would be appropriate and I'm happy to start to do that before the end of business today.

And from my perspective my agenda is fairly short and sweet but I think I need to get together with some people here to see what's on their minds for an agenda.

We have our ideas I know some people I want from the Internet society to be sure are involved in this conversation and I'm having come to the meeting late for which I apologize it took me a while to find it I didn't realize it started at 8:30 otherwise I would have been here sooner.

But in any case to really know what the issues are where we do have that convergence right now and start moving forward on them. So yes I'll suggest some times and dates as I said before the end of today.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay so in wrapping up this session I'd just like to - I know some of our attendees have already left but for those of you who are here I'd like to know if it is okay for us to publish the attendee list.

If you're fine with it then we could kind of circulate it in that spirit of cross organizational collaboration and we look forward to meeting with you (Ted).

(Ted): And not just me.

Man: I apologize I know that you are really adjourned but do you have any specific plans for the meeting with the board?

Rudi Vansnick: We didn't get the joint meeting we have - we are on the point AOB all other business. We have the this afternoon the NCSG meeting executive meeting where we will discuss the meetings we are going to have still with the board and discuss on the agenda of that meeting.

So what are the questions we are going to put forward is something we are going to decide this afternoon with the NCSG. These are any ideas of things that you want us to bring to the table as an agenda point or a question for the

board please raise it and we will pick it up for the discussion this afternoon and have it posted for them.

Lori Schulman: So just...

Man: Where's the meeting at?

Lori Schulman: This is Lori, this is anticipation of that meeting there is an NCSG planning meeting at 1 o'clock and these issues are going to be raised. I encourage all of you to go to the meeting. I know it's right back here in an hourish.

Cintra Sooknanan: And as well so it's a (maybe) NomCom issue that was discussed will be part of that meeting with the board because that is something that directly has been affecting and talked for quite a while and it does need to be resolved soonest.

Rudi Vansnick: Any other questions, business from around the table. I would like to go around the table and see if there are any other questions that you want to raise, comments, proposals, (assets).

In Los Angeles we will try to open up this form up of meeting in such a way that we have participants from inside the ICANN structure that we need to have some thoughtful discussions on it and the direction we've gone.

And probably we'll have an ISOC representation in that meeting too and create a kind of roundtable and to have several inputs from several minds.

Man: Just to add to that I'm a big proponent of getting work done between meetings so if you've got ideas, you've got questions so forth fire them at us. Any - from any direction and any quantity at any time and we'll respond to keep the dialogue going so we can - so together we know where we're going and we can get there quicker.

Cintra Sooknanan: So not hearing anything I see there is a...

Rudi Vansnick: Sorry Rudi for the transcript. It - I think it's (unintelligible) and you have been long time involved in child protection also and part of the in safe and safer Internet project of the European commission and the one of the experts for Belgium too.

In fact it's good to have you here because we have one item on our proposed activities for the IGF in Istanbul where we proposed from the (NPOC) to have a session on child phone line protection.

And we are going to ask why that proposal has been rejected. We need to know the reasons of that. It looks like content is not on the agenda for ICANN but at the end if you want to be moved to stakeholder you have to listen to everything.

You cannot say I don't hear the other problems anymore you have to be open. So we are going to put it on the table and maybe it's good to have some input from you in order to highlight something that we may be forgot to highlight as a request to speak up at the IGF.

Cintra Sooknanan: So I just want to - that's basically a comment in the same vein as Poncelet's question to the (unintelligible) three on the adult connect. He asked that his proposal be that we see how we can get back a session approved for the IGF next year.

And what he's really talking about is ICANN approval. I think the issue with the proposal that was made to ICANN this year was they found it was a bit to promotional, you know, highlighting or advertising dot kids rather than being very neutral and more ICANN and generically domain focused.

So I think that was the issue with it, we've asked for specific guidelines from ICANN staff and we expect to get those soon.

Man: I would add that the Asian request to - was turned down as well.

(Yandi): Hello this is (Yandi) from Bangladesh actually I am not told about (unintelligible) more deeply about this but I am thinking how (unintelligible) but not in most of them probably are not only in ISOC are they - acting a couple of the stakeholder organization I was involved within (both) member.

So if we need to (unintelligible) not level so I (unintelligible) select on that good manner to ICANN. So I think we can make out the good (unintelligible) that line (unintelligible) comments out of the guidebook I am talking about to increase the membership with national level.

So it is very helpful for I think (NPOC) to begin a strength in future, thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you for that proposal and indeed it is something that is on our mind to review, the leaflets and the fliers that we have for (NPOC). As I explained earlier we are still a very, very young constituency.

We are the oldest one we only exist since 2011. And we have been through a difficult period for reasons that are out of discussion. We lost twice in the two past years our chair before the end of the mandate and that's not so easy to pick up and then steer it in a good direction.

But (unintelligible) good year they say we will probably come up with a proposal with a document that will be more adapted to what you are asking for and we would love to have your input.

We will draft something, we will send it around and ask your input and corrections and add ons so that at the end we will have something that is going into the grass roots that we want to take up.

Cintra Sooknanan: And this is just to confirm that we do have a very generic and proper (shell), which is used for outreach but we do need help in making those framed better per region.

So perhaps your input will be useful in terms of the Asia Pacific region, (Klaus).

Klaus Stoll: Very quickly I am not sure - Klaus for the record. I'm not sure if you were in the room when I said there will be regional outreach meetings to NGO's and we're having a plan for Asia especially India (unintelligible).

When you see these things happening please tell us, okay you're going to India and we want to look at - we want you to come to Bangladesh and so on. The only - but be prepared that we come back and say yes we are coming. You know, it means work.

(Yandi): It's okay actually it's no problem because it seems - and (Yandi) from Bangladesh. Actually it seems we have a community or it's the community we can spin and we can become available to ICANN and other stakeholders.

So I think and in (unintelligible) there are lots of (unintelligible) in here and there is (unintelligible) but they don't know it is so important I cannot hear everything.

So if we make it some little bit guideline or a little bit (unintelligible) program of our example of some information (unintelligible) are doing so you are becoming member part of the rule and express what they are expressing.

So I think it is really helpful in the future for (unintelligible) to present them, thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Rudi for the transcript, well indeed it's something that we need to explore and how to help from the ground not from us. We can have a vision but we need several visions on what works and what doesn't work.

And especially by region and I would propose you as we have a program committee that it's set up in regional division that you pick up the - and you become the representative for the Asian participation that program committee, the door is open.

(Yandi): Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much I really have to leave now because I must appear to some other meeting - session. Just want to be sure how can I join communications with the group?

Rudi Vansnick: Did you sign up on the list of...

Man: Yes I did.

Rudi Vansnick: ...participants? Okay then you will be on the list of communication.

Man: Thank you, so many important questions were open now from transfer of IANA functions to (unintelligible) protection regional approach. So thank you very much I would like to stay in contact.

Cintra Sooknanan: Before we close I would just like to get some perspectives from the participants at the end of the table. We haven't really heard much from you it would be nice to hear your perspective from this meeting.

Man: Thank you very much, being my first time of being in the meeting I really heard all you people's words and in my own constituency by the time I go back I will tell them exactly what's happened, thank you.

Woman: I was really glad that I came and for me the meeting was really informative. And I hope to hear a lot more about how the processes that going on here will actually affect the end user NGO's because I guess a lot of the stuff that we do focus on the NGO's and we have very good insight into what they actually want and what they need.

So it's just important to not get like not get distracted and always consider that too.

Klaus Stoll: Just in the short answer to that one please have a look at the materials of the I engage Web site. They - can somebody type the URL in there? You have some materials for example how it really affects the NGO's directly.

And also we will revise in the next two weeks that Web site and there will be more material and better stuff coming in there. That's what is already there it's a little bit old but also about the regional meetings where the NGO's are invited and where we really want mass participation of NGO's that's coming up watch that space.

And also you will see anyway once the revision is done there will be an announcement on the (NPOC) mailing list saying (NPOC) was - okay look the Web pages up.

Woman: Okay thanks.

Klaus Stoll: Yes so there is things going on but as usual you plan to do it for the middle of the year and then it happens in September.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay so thank you all for a very productive meeting. I'd just like to stop the recording and close this meeting. I hope you enjoy the rest of your ICANN London. Lori you have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I want to be recognized for the final comment I want to thank you Cintra for stepping in and chairing the meeting. As Rudi mentioned our chair was

unable to attend and I think you've done really an excellent job today,
facilitating, thank you.

END