Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
NCUC Meeting
Tuesday 14 October 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/#oct

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

William Drake: All right and we - do we have any remote participants? Let's see. I see three people logged onto the Adobe Connect. Oh okay good. Joy Liddicoat is with us from New Zealand, so hello Joy. Good morning everybody. This is the meeting of the constituency day meeting of the noncommercial users' constituency, NCUC. It is Tuesday, 14 October 2014, and we are in Los Angeles at ICANN 51.

I am William Drake. I am the chair of NCUC and I teach at the University of Zurich. We have a full agenda of issues to cover today, and people are wandering in late as is their wont. And the technology took a little tweaking to get it all set up, but we are slowly coming together. And Joy, I know as a remote - as a dedicated NCUC-er will understand all of this, so I'm sure she's still with us.

So let us - let's look at first can you put up the agenda, please?

David Cake: I'm trying.

William Drake: Okay. While David tries...

David Cake: It's harder than you might imagine.

William Drake: Okay. So while the agenda is being brought to the fore, I will simply give you basic highlights of what we plan to do over the next three hours, three hours and fifteen minutes to be precise. We will be having a number of visitors coming into discuss different issues, and we will also be talking about some internal matters to the NCUC.

So from 9 to 9:30 we will be doing some basic introduction stuff and information sharing about NCUC, some current developments of relevance to our internal operations. At 9:30 we will have a visit from the ICANN nominating committee for 15 minutes to come and share with us the pleasures and joys of getting engaged with the NomCom process. And Brenden Kuerbis who is here with us is our representative on the NomCom as well.

From 9:45 to 10 we will talk about cross-community processes, some of the things that are currently going on where NCUC is collaborating with other partners in larger networks within the ICANN environment, some which have raised concerns from some members, so I thought we should talk about that to be clear about it.

At 10 o'clock to 10:30 we will talk about accountability of the IANA transition and the current meaning of the bottom up multi-stakeholder model, with the participation of David Olive, the vice president of policy development at ICANN, and (Theresa Swinehart), the senior advisor to the president on global strategy.

After the coffee break, we will continue the discussion that we had in London. You will recall that in London we had an hour meeting with some people who had done a report for the council of Europe on human rights in ICANN, and we agreed with them to carry that work forward together and try to lay the

foundation for building a cross-community engagement on human rights issues.

So we will have a visit to follow up from Lee Hibbard from the Council of Europe, as well as (Monica Zellnewutee) -- I can't say her name -- from the European University Institute, and then Alessandra Pierucci from the Council of Europe to talk about human rights. And this is just the first step in an ongoing discussion over the next 48 hours. These folks will also be joining in the NCSG meeting in the afternoon and -- hello, John -- and at the same time we'll be - we will be having this meeting tomorrow at 12 - 1:15 in the Encino Room to carry these issues forward.

Then we'll talk a little bit about NCUC as a non-contracted party house, the fact that there will be an intercessional meeting coming up in Washington, D.C. that people should know about. And finally we'll end with a little discussion of the upcoming NCUC election. So as always, a full agenda. This time we stop. We're starting a new practice of stopping at 12:15 because people have never had enough time to get lunch before going to the 1 o'clock NCSG meeting, so we're going to try and compress things a little bit.

That's what we're doing today and of course if there's any other business that people want to add to it. Yes, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Just a point, one of them is maybe we should have some time to develop a strategy for the meeting tomorrow regarding what we want to achieve.

William Drake: That was the purpose of having this discussion.

Marilia Maciel: Yes but we are going to discuss with them or are we going to have a space for us to discuss? I just wanted to know if we want to raise other concerns and issues with them in the room or...?

William Drake: They're coming to be - to engage in any kind of discussion we want to have with them.

Marilia Maciel: Okay, okay. And another thing that I was going to ask just for clarification is what is the Friday-Monday roundtable discussions under the topic of cross-community processes?

William Drake: The what?

Marilia Maciel: The Friday-Monday roundtable discussion under the cross-community?

William Drake: Yes, I will get to that.

Marilia Maciel: Okay.

William Drake: All right. So all things good then. So let's start with introductions from the far end, and staff who support us are certainly welcome to introduce themselves as well. Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi, everybody, this is Mary Wong from ICANN staff, a former NCUC member and council members. So hello again.

(Nielston Over): (Nielston Over), Article 19, NCUC member.

(Roy Vyesta): (Roy Vyesta), NCUC executive committee.

(Flaga Wagner): (Flaga Wagner), member of the board of the Brazilian Internet steering committee and NCUC member.

(Faso): (Faso), member of the board and CGR.PR and NCUC member.

(Ephram Conenito): (Ephram Conenito), (unintelligible), NCUC member.

Rafik Dammak: Rafik Dammak, NCUC member and chair of the NCSG.

William Drake: Sitting next to me and madly working to try and get the agenda shown on Adobe Connect is David Cake, who's a member of NCUC and an NCSG councilor.

David Cake: And yes, chair, from electronic frontier.

William Drake: From the electronics team. Thank you, David. Okay and then turning to my right.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin, NCUC member.

Maria Farrell: Maria Farrell, NCUC member, open rights group, U.K.

(Heidi Lumasiel): (Heidi Lumasiel), Center for Technology and Society Foundation in Brazil, NCUC member. I've been in the NCUC political meeting and tomorrow I'll be talking at the GNSO council.

Brenden Kuerbis: Brenden Kuerbis here, Syracuse University Internet Governance project, NCUC member.

Milton Mueller: Milton Mueller, Syracuse University Internet Governance project.

(Kimiko Ford June):   Good morning everyone, (Kimiko Ford June) for the (unintelligible).

William Drake: And this is your first time at NCUC?

(Kimiko Ford June):   Yes it is. Yes.

William Drake: Welcome.

(Kimiko Ford June):   Thank you.

(Shu Andudigi):   Yes, (Shu Andudigi), NCUC member.

William Drake: Fantastic. People behind me could you...? Do we have a roving mic? We don't have a roaming mic? Could you maybe just...?

(Yuri Ranji):   Yes, (Yuri Ranji) for ISOC Finland and associated chair of the nominating committee through '14.

John Berard: My name is John Berard and I'm a GNSO councilor from the business constituency.

                    (Unintelligible)

William Drake: And who else has entered that we have not introduced? Introduce yourself?

(Anna Kovitch):   (Anna Kovitch), member, first time at the meeting. (Unintelligible)

(Gloria):   Good morning my name is (Gloria). I'm civil society organization.

William Drake: This is your first time also, right?

(Gloria):   Yes this is my first ICANN meeting.

William Drake: Welcome to NCUC.

(Gloria):   Thank you.

William Drake: And over on the side?

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer.

William Drake: Who needs no introduction apparently.

Wendy Seltzer: With worldwide web consortium and individual member in the NCUC.

William Drake: And former GNSO councilor and worldwide troublemaker of all sorts. So bienvenue to all. Okay so I have gone through the agenda verbally and it now being coming up on Adobe as well. So just to start until like I said we have about ten minutes and then the NomCom people will show up. Just to impart briefly some little updates on organizational information.

So first outreach issues. On - we changed it actually, sorry. That should say Saturday. Oh well. On Saturday we had a meeting, an - a civil society outreach event, that was attended by about 25 people. That was a useful discussion and also we were there together with colleagues from NPOC and NCSG to discuss generally how civil society issues are being addressed in ICANN and to provide a hopefully happy first contact and interface for anybody coming in from outside who might want to learn more about ICANN and get engaged.

We did a first one of these in London, and we will continue to do this at subsequent meetings going forward. I wanted to mention the website. The website of course was created and is maintained by volunteers. We do however now have a new part-time staff person that's just started that ICANN has provided, a very nice woman who will be trying to help us with this.

I wanted to raise the point that one possible thing we could do to add greater value to the website would be to perhaps put up some information about members on the website. If you go to our list of members at NCSG it shows you the 357 members. There are no hot links to anybody's bio or homepage or anything like that. And I would like to suggest that we might want to consider putting those links in since we don't have the social networking function like we used to on the old (unintelligible). It would however be good for people to have a greater sense of community and to know who all is engaged.

This is my suggestion. I don't know if anybody else thinks this is a good idea or it's worth taking the time. It can be simply done in an opt-in basis. Does anybody have any feedback or care either way? Any thoughts? Brenden, you're looking at me. You're shrugging. Shrugging means that it's fine or not fine.

Brenden Kuerbis: Yes, Brenden Kuerbis. So in the membership database, I'm guessing there's about 50% of the members have URLs to their organizations. So that's easy enough to incorporate very quickly but keeping it up to date...

William Drake: Right of course.

Brenden Kuerbis: ...will require an additional effort.

William Drake: And they would have to do that, and I think it should be a self-served system. If people want to have information about them linked off the website they can, and they don't, then they don't. So that's something - yes, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Just a quick comment. The first one is about the outreach meeting. I was thinking that maybe it would be interesting for us if possible to shift this meeting a day and have it on Sunday because the fellows are here. And I think it will be a particularly interesting session for fellows to attend, especially the ones that are coming for the second and third time because they already had an overview of the thing and maybe it's an opportunity for them to start being engaged. So if we can arrange this on Sunday it would be better because that the day they arrive.

And the site I think it's an excellent idea. Staff had a proposal that she put Stephanie and I to write a blog post about the activities in the policy committee and NCSG and what do we expect from the GNSO council. I think that this is a very good idea to get people interested. I don't know if you had time, I didn't, but yes let's.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Marilia Maciel: Yes, yes. But let's try to do it even to attract people to the policy committee because we will need to be replaced.

William Drake: Thank you, Marilia. Just before I call on Brenden, just to respond to the first point, scheduling these things is a big pain in the butt because -- that's the technical term -- the one we did in London was done on the Friday before which presumed that people were in town early because that was the only time available on the schedule. This time we have the problem that Sunday at that time is the NCSG policy committee and we did not want to compete with our own event because this is the time that we set aside to talk about policy matters.

So trying to find the right time to do this is always a challenge and we can certainly look at other options going forward, but it's - if we moved when the NCSG policy committee meeting was that'd be great, but those are for all the GNSO stakeholder groups all meet them. So, Mary, were you going to say something on this point? Then I go to Brenden.

Mary Wong: I was. Really quickly, following up on your point -- and this is Mary Wong from ICANN staff -- the other issues, Bill, I think we've talked about is that Sunday is the GNSO weekend working session and it's very difficult because the - each of the stakeholder groups and constituencies are expected to participate in that session. So that's why as Bill says the only time on Sunday really is the late afternoon following the normal GNSO meeting with the GAC. And that does create problems for every constituency and stakeholder group that has the same clashing problem. So I just wanted to put that on the record.

William Drake: Right. The ICANN schedules are just increasingly impossible. You know, the meetings used to go through Fridays and the board took Friday away. It then became even more condensed and there's always madness and everything

conflicts with everything. This is inherent in the proposition, but we will certainly consider what to do, and you can help us with that, okay? Brenden, do you have something?

Brenden Kuerbis: Thank you. Brenden Kuerbis. Kind of dovetailing on something Marilia said about policy information, since we have someone from the ICANN staff here I'd like to make a simple request. The policy engagement briefs that are published for the GAC I think would be enormously useful for our new members as well. And I would ask that - they're currently published on the GAC website in PDF format, I would ask that that information be published in an easily syndicated format, something like an RSS feed that could be incorporated into our website very easily.

And I think that would help the broader community. In a lot of ways it would help clear up misconceptions about different kinds of information that are coming from staff to different constituencies and ACs and SOs, as well as kind of give us a level playing field in terms of concepts, terminology with respect to different policy issues.

William Drake: Mary and Rafik.

Mary Wong: So Brenden and I have already had a previous conversation about this. So Brenden, on the RSS feed or the technical ways of making it easier to get the information out to not just the GAC but the community, we've already taken that back and that's obviously an issue for our IT folks, et cetera, and we will certainly get back to you on that.

But just a question, you're talking about the monthly briefings to the GAC and not the background briefings for each ICANN meeting? Because the - for each ICANN meeting, and I'm just, Bill, taking advantage of the fact that you have new members in the room and I think a lot of people know this, prior to every ICANN meeting the policy staff certainly for the GNSO produce a series of background briefings. It's one or two pages on each of the working groups

and topics being discussed at that particular ICANN meeting, and that is posted as well as sent to the councilors for forwarding to their respective groups. I'm assuming you're not talking about those, because those already get out to the community. Thank you.

William Drake: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: So since we are talking -- Rafik Dammak -- so since we are talking about the briefings and documentation, yesterday we had a meeting with Fadi and other people from ICANN staff and we raised the issue that we need much more kind of integrated way to get all information about working groups and growing policy. So if anytime any new member he want to join he can find easily the information that he's being asked to read this briefing and recording.

And yes, we have this background briefing before ICANN meetings but if it can be done a more regular way, I think it's quite useful. And personally I shared it with the NCSG list so if we can find this kind of briefing like every month so we know what's happening in each working group, what's needed and so on, that can be helpful.

William Drake: Okay thank you. Yes there's been a lot of discussion about the information architecture among the SGC chairs who have met several times already during this meeting, and I will report a little bit more about that later on. Just to tick off a few more other points before the NomCom people show up, so again we do have the staff to administer support. (Marion)'s very nice and she'll be working with and she'll be hopefully helping to expedite the upcoming election as well.

And so I hope that the people who have been involved in maintaining our e-platforms and so on on a voluntary basis will get to know (Marion) and will work with her going forward. And is the NomCom people showing up? Good. So just to finish off a few points, travel funding. You will have seen hopefully

announced recently on the website that the NCUC executive committee has adopted a new policy to make some of our scarce funds available to members to attend meetings beginning in Marrakesh.

We will fund up to two people up to $2,000 each. That may not be sufficient to completely cover one's costs to attend but it should help. And those funds will be allocated on the basis of an open call. We will send out a call in advance of the meetings. I think six weeks or so, maybe more, two months. I don't remember what I wrote down, and invite applications. And of course preference will be given to members who need to be at a particular meeting in order to engage fully and who have been engaged fully in NCUC's work to date.

And so hopefully with this together with the funds that NCUC receives three slots per meeting from ICANN, we'll be able to get more of our people to meetings. And these are all kinds of new people coming in behind me, including - and it's 9:30. And we have - just quickly on this point and then I will introduce the NomCom people.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes hi. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And this is a one-minute rant on usability. I'm deeply concerned that I've seen so many slides this week that have white and yellow type. I'm going to keep bringing it up but I'd like to ask Mary how do we get this message back to headquarters? This is a well know visibility problem. You don't have to be old and disabled to not be able to read white type. And secondly, I was just in the...

William Drake: We don't have any white type on the screen now.

Stephanie Perrin: No, no I'm just raising it. I think it's...

William Drake: But we've got the NomCom waiting.

Stephanie Perrin: They're not ready yet. This is a usability issue and we should care about it. And the second thing is I was just in the public responsibility session, you can't hear people and you can't decipher what they're saying. We've got to slow down so that people, particularly second - English as a second language people can follow the discourse. Otherwise they have to decipher it from the transcript. Thanks.

William Drake: Thank you very much. Okay I will save the last point on that list for our discussion afterwards. I'd like to welcome to the table the visitors from the nominating committee. The chair is Monsieur Stephane Van Gelder, former chair of the GNSO council. And - oh he even brings his own nametag, so that shows he's a very important person. We have slides here for your presentation. I will get up. (Mo), do you want to take my seat?

Woman: (Unintelligible)

William Drake: No, no it's all good.

Woman: I'm not taking your seat.

William Drake: (Unintelligible) Any NomCom people wish to come and sit.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

William Drake: Because questions should be directed to you all. So we welcome...

Woman: Oh questions? We're not opening it up for questions.

William Drake: Okay. So let me turn that off. Okay.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Bill. Bill, can we get started?

William Drake: Please. Is this on? So everyone please welcome to the room and a little rush of madness. The nominating committee we have here (Yuri)...

Man: It's early in the morning.

William Drake: I'm sorry. I have several (Yuri)s in my life. And Stephane Van Gelder and Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Ron Andruff. Okay so...

Stephane Van Gelder: Bill, thanks very much. Hi to you all. Thanks for welcoming us. It's our pleasure to be able to talk to you a bit about both what the 2014 NomCom committee has done and the way it's worked and the 2015 committee and the spots that we'll be recruiting for during that cycle. So with me - my name is Stephane Van Gelder. I am the chair of the 2015 nominating committee.

Here to my left I have (Yuri Lancy Poro) who was the chair of the 2013 nominating committee and the associate chair of the 2014 nominating committee. To my right, Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is the chair elect for 2013 -- I'll get this right -- and the 2014 chair. And to my far right, Ron Andruff, who has just been selected as chair elect for the 2015 committee. So congratulations to you, Ron.

So I don't know if we've got some slides that we - I mean we do have some slides but I don't know if someone's operating them. I'm not.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay David's doing it. Very quickly I just wanted to take you through some of what the nominating committee does and the way it works and obviously leave as much time for you to ask questions of us and for my fellow NomCommers to be able to address you as well.

As I'm sure you know, the nominating committee has a set of predefined objectives. They key one to me is that on this slide as you can see, excuse me, the NomCom is tasked with selecting key leadership positions, so the ICANN board, ALAC, the ccNSO and GNSO council. And to do this NomCom members are chosen from each of the community, the ICANN community groups. They are - they self organize, so they set up their own rules.

Each committee is free to set up its own operating procedures. If we can have the next slide, David, thank you. But the mission, the core objectives, are always the same. We are here to try and identify the highest possible quality candidates and try and put those people in those key positions that we are recruiting to. And we are also here to advance ICANN's mission, so the core values of that mission as defined by the bylaws.

Now one of the things that we've tried to do ever since I guess (Yuri)'s committee is to try and be much more open and transparent than previous NomComs might have been perceived to be. And in order to do that -- next slide please, David -- I won't go over the structure, it's hard to read anyway, and I want to go as quickly as possible. So if I can - and please stop there. Please stop on the cycle.

So in order - just to finish with the transparency, in order to do that we've done over the years a lot of - we've gone through a lot of initiatives. Some of those have been to do open meetings for example. So as you may or may not know, the nominating committee now has open meetings at every ICANN meeting and know that you are very welcome, please do attend. You will be able to see how the committee works.

The only sacrosanct thing for the committee is the candidate data is always kept confidential. So you will never see or hear anything about the actual candidates themselves, the people that are applying. For obvious reasons they are kept confidential. But the processes are very much open. And I think the last two chairs here have worked extremely hard to make sure that trend

is just on the up and up. So I think that's a very positive development for the NomCom.

One of the things that we want to be very open about is our processes. And every year we publish the cycle. This is the draft cycle. It's got no specific dates because the nominating, the 2015 nominating committee hasn't begun to work yet. But the idea, the general idea, is as you can see the committee works in phases and those phases are very important to the outcome which is to select the highest possible quality candidates.

Just one phase that I want to draw your attention to, and that's the recruitment phase. We expect to publish a call for statements of interest around December time and to end that call around April. Up until that time we are getting ready. We are doing outreach. We're coming to see groups yourselves, we're trying to answer as many questions as possible so that people understand the process of the nominating committee and they are able to participate without, you know, feeling awkward or awed by the process or they don't understand how to submit an SOI or how to recommend someone if you feel that there are people in your networks that would fit some of these positions.

David, can we go to - go on, yes. And the positions that we're recruiting for this year are these. So we are looking for three board members. Those are three-year terms. We're looking for three members of the At Large advisory committee, and those are geo diversity positions, so we're looking for region-specific people as well. So this year Africa, Asia Pac and Latin America. Two members of the GNSO council, and one of the ccNSO council.

And if I can just ask you, David, to there's - that's the link there - to - if you want to apply, you'll have to wait a little bit. As I mentioned, the call for statements of interest will be coming out in a few months. But the NomCom - the 2015 NomCom website will be up very soon. And there's a link online if you wish to suggest someone else. If you feel - once again that's a very

important part of the work that we do is to encourage people to either step up themselves or, you know, suggest would -- to others -- would you like to be part of this process.

So with that I want to leave it there. I've already taken up quite a bit of time. Perhaps if you'll indulge me, I'd like to just pass the mic over to Cheryl who chaired this year's committee, and I'm sure Cheryl you want to say a few words. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl for what I'm assuming will be a transcript record somewhere. Dave, if I could get you to go back to the what we do. There we go, thank you. No, slow down there. Thank you so much. The 2014 nominating committee I am delighted to say worked in a highly collegiate, very effective, very efficient way.

The trick of getting this all right is to have a good team on the NomCom as well as good material to choose from. And I believe that this year, as in years past, we had both of those things working well together. We achieved the following things. We've certainly made a few in some ways slightly painful changes, even to the statement of interest mechanism. It is now a very different online wiki-based application.

So if you've ever applied or looked at the applications that have been done in the past, if you've ever had the experience before last year, this year that we just finished, it will be different because we had a group look at the questions we asked, how the information should be stored, additional things are asked. It's a very, very different process.

We had some problems because it was there for piloting live and we had some people who quite literally failed to complete their applications this year in a timely manner and we had to give them - they'd started their applications but they didn't realize that they needed to follow to the next page as well. So rather than have the layer on layer that we had with the pilot we ran this year,

which we recognized it caused some problems and we gave people extra time to continue their applications, there was no down side to that, but we just went "Oh dear, didn't you realize there was another page there?"

We've redesigned it again for this year and we hope the 2015 nominating committee will look at the redesign that we're proposing that they adopt. So if you hear grumbles from anybody that some of the new system was a bit buggy and didn't work and wasn't quite right, we hope we've fixed any of those things. However, we did manage to have more than 58 people struggle through the new wiki system, and we had six final positions that we filled.

We announced those August. I believe you've all been aware or been made aware of who we have appointed to all the different positions. If you're not, if that link is live, David, I don't know, that would be a good thing. It should be a live link. There we go. Let's put faces back to names. We have - oh...

David Cake: Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: While the technology works itself out, we've done a return - Steve Crocker has been returned, (Asha) is a new face. You may not have run into her before. We've appointed or reappointed Alan Greenberg to At Large Advisory Committee. New Face, (Jimmy Schultz), who is has hit the ground running, might I just say, and is already doing a fabulous job. And we have some familiar faces I admit, but we have (Ching Gon Shu) the ccNSO council and (Carla) going to the GNSO council. So as - those faces, nothing is good to put those faces, are the current appointments we've done today, I think I'll stop and ask for any other questions or wave later.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Cheryl. I guess from the people coming in that we're about to run out of time. If I can just ask for before just if you have any question I'd just like to give Ron an opportunity to say a few works about - Ron was also a member of the 2014 committee and he'd like to say a few word. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Stephane. Good morning, everyone. Obviously we'll be looking to you to give us your direction in terms of the things that you feel that we should be bringing and we can inform our committee members and so forth. So that's another conversation. But I did want to point out that of course Brenden is your representative from the NCUC. He did an amazing job. He was a very - brought his A game if I can say it that way to all the work, and you should be very proud of his efforts.

This year we - or this past year under the leadership of the NomCom we instituted peer reviews, and you'll be seeing those reviews. If they're not out yet, I'm not sure where that stands, but you'll see a scorecard on how all of the other members of the committee felt about your representative's work.

And that - the purpose of that is as much for us all to improve where we're weak in terms of as committee members but also to allow you as the NCUC to really see what your representatives are doing, are they showing up, are they doing the work and so forth, so you can have confidence that when you get this report card back it will help you to be able to look and always send your best and brightest to the NomCom. So I just want to mention that you sent a very bright man and we're very grateful to have had him and doing the work. So thank you very much.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Ron, for that. I should just point out that that process that Ron's just described was for 2014, even though we hope to continue it. As I mentioned earlier on, each committee sets its own rules, so until they've set that rule, we can't guarantee that that will happen. Can I open it up for any questions or have we been crystal clear? Please?

(Mary Lamafiel): Hello my name's (Mary Lamafiel). I'd just like to thank you for the amazing work that you have been doing. Even before I joined ICANN I always admired the existence of the NomCom and how it make sure that we have diversity and merit and the right people in the right places.

I just would like to point out that I began participating in ICANN for the fellowship program and I participated in two times. And for the two times that I was there I didn't hear about the NomCom, and I think that is very important for the fellows since the beginning to hear about the NomCom, not only to have this idea about how things are running here but to show them that they do not only have to rely on connections and meeting the right people.

They are really concerned about that. And not so much about the work, they need to understand that doing the work and being represented in their communities and being useful is also a way to be included. So it would be nice if you could stop by there. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: That's a very important point. I believe we are talking to them, aren't we?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes in fact -- Cheryl for the record -- we have presented certainly since I was involved we've presented. (Yuri) presented in his year, I did in mine, and Stephane will be doing so in his. So we'll make sure that doesn't drop off the radar there.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Any other questions? Yes please?

Milton Mueller: Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. So I understand that there are changes afoot in the composition of the NomCom and we had some concerns about those. I think we see a - essentially - well there's always been an imbalance. The business constituencies had two or three members, whereas we only had one then.

And now we're talking about reducing the weighting I guess of the GNSO members relative to the ccNSO and the ASO, which is kind of strange given that, you know, about 80% of what the board does is related to gTLDs, and the fees paid by ICANN are almost always paid by gTLDs. The CCs sort of,

not to denigrate them in any way, obviously they're an important part of ICANN, but they're not contracted parties so they're not as invested in what the board does. So I just wondered what was the logic behind some of the exchanges?

Stephane Van Gelder: Can I just ask - Milton, thanks for the question. You're asking the wrong people in essence because...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We didn't have anything to do...

Stephane Van Gelder: But I can shed a bit more light on the way approached it. This isn't a NomCom leadership and the report -- just for everyone's benefit -- the report that you're referencing or the recommendations that you're referencing came out of a board working group, and you should really be asking them for their logic. We couldn't presume to speak for them.

However, we did in 2014 undertake -- before the board working group was known to us -- undertake some work as part of the changes that you mentioned to improve or address some of the imbalances that some people have come to notice. That work was superseded by the board working group. So I really am not in a position to answer your question, but I'm sure you can ask that of that board working group. Thank you.

With that...

Man: I've just got a question and comment from the chat if I can ask that. One is just from Joy Liddicoat in New Zealand. One is just a warm hello to Stephane and Cheryl from New Zealand, but the other is she asked about term limits. Are there are term limits for NomCom appointees?

Stephane Van Gelder: (Yuri). Maybe I can pass that (Yuri) who hasn't spoken yet. Hi, Joy, just saying hello.

(Yuri):   Thank you. At present, there is term limits for voting members is two years. The board working group proposes that actually instead of one year terms renewable once that the term will be two years, but of course that is one of the proposals of the board working group. And there is actually a session on Wednesday, a public session, on that, and I urge everybody to participate if you are interested in the - how the NomCom will look like in the future. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Bill, can I hand it back to you just to say thank you very much for having us and I'm pleased. You know, one of the points of this exercise is also to make sure you know our faces and you can come up to us in the corridors anytime and ask us any follow-up questions that you have or any other parts of, you know, any other inquiries you want to make of the NomCom. Thank you very much. Have a good day.

Man: Do you want to take your nametag too?

                   (Unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: All right. If we could reconvene please. Okay thank you. So that was the NomCom. We've got a few minutes left before, ten minutes before the visit from David Olive and (Theresa Swinehart) to try to push forward with a few other informational points that I wanted to share and get your feedback from. Also I want to point out that a number of new people have had come into the room.

                   We have a roving mic. Could the folks who joined and haven't introduced themselves yet just do so because we have people online around the world and it's good for them to know who's in the room. Just briefly say your name and which institution you're with. Did you get announced? No, so go.

(Ellen Strickland):   (Ellen Strickland), University of Queensland and Internet New Zealand.

William Drake: Thank you. And down here?

Larisa Gurnick: Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff.

(Colin Jackson):   (Colin Jackson), Westlake Governance.

William Drake: Okay.

(Matt Ashioni):   (Matt Ashioni), ICANN staff.

William Drake: Okay. So we've got all kinds of staff folks and then anybody else? Oh Carlos Afonso, a member of the executive committee, whoa.

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: You can even join the table.

Woman: Good morning. I'm (unintelligible) from Brazil Internet steering committee and (unintelligible) consumers association in Brazil.

(Hana Nidugi):   Good morning everyone, I'm (Hana Nidugi) from (unintelligible). I work in academia.

(Ashton Shears):   (Ashton Shears) for the Center for Democracy and Technology.

Carlos Afonso: Hi. Carlos Afonso from the Institution Civil Technology and Society in Rio and currently a member of the AC or EC, executive committee.

William Drake: EC.

Carlos Afonso: EC. (Unintelligible)

William Drake: And then this young lady here?

Magalay Pazello: Magalay Pazello from Brazil and (unintelligible). That is a research center in University of (unintelligible) in Rio de Janeiro.

William Drake: Thank you very much. And sorry I didn't see you.

(Patricia Sangaro):   That's okay. (Patricia Sangaro). I work at (Afernick) and I'm the corporation project development manager. Thanks.

William Drake: Okay.

(Ada Martinovich): Hi everybody. (Ada Martinovich) from Bosnia (unintelligible) working for NGO, One World Southeast Europe, dealing with human rights in Internet.

William Drake: Welcome. Is this your first ICANN meeting?

(Ada Martinovich): Yes this is my - yes a newcomer.

William Drake: Hello. We have a brochure for you.

(Ada Martinovich): Yay.

William Drake: May I hand her - we have lots of NCUC brochures here. Anybody who would like to hand them out can help me. To people who might be interested in knowing about civil society activity in ICANN, please take some of these. Okay if I can, Avri, do you want to say something?

Avri Doria: I wasn't here when you introduced everyone.

William Drake: You're right you were not.

Avri Doria: I'm Avri Doria. I'm a free floating text worker.

William Drake: Okay. And with that, you didn't say itinerate.

Avri Doria: No (unintelligible).

William Drake: Actually okay. Itinerate and free floating. So just a return to some points I just wanted to quickly go through before the next visit. So NCSG representation, we need to put two people on the policy committee of the NCSG as representatives of NCUC. We're in the process of trying to recruit. I believe we have found one who is online with us from New Zealand. I'm hoping to receive from here confirmation of that. And we have another in the room that I've talked, who I'm hoping will also be able to confirm soon for that.

So hopefully we will be getting that together, and that will help the NCSG PC move forward in reorganizing itself and electing new leadership and doing all the rest of the things it needs to get started on this next phase on the schedule. The annual process as well, we have the NCSG representatives who are currently Robin Gross and Milton. And we have to decided as well whether they should continue in those positions if they want to and so on. So I will put out a notice around the time of the election in finding applications for that as well.

Turning to other points then, just what I listed under cross community just to sort of inform people. This has come up a number of times on the NCUC and NCSG mail list and some people have asked about it and been a little bit unclear. So I just wanted to say there is now a process that has been started over the past few years which is seeming to take on a little bit more of a role in some respects of convening the chairs of the stakeholders, the advisory committees and the SO and the constituencies actually. It should be SO, AC, SGC to be honest, but with Fadi and the senior staff.

And we spent three hours on Friday talking about ways in which we could try to enhance the process of getting things done, quote, unquote, within ICANN. This is - and had a dinner to continue that conversation. And then had a roundtable discussion just Monday yesterday of all - with the same senior staff of all the chairs from the GNSO constituencies, the stakeholder groups.

The purpose of these meetings are information sharing. They're not adopting policy. Nevertheless people have expressed concerns about how transparent they are and so on and so forth. There is a mail list. I have asked the people on the mail list why we can't have this publicly archived three times and I've found no support from other participants in the process. So I don't know what the status of that is right now. I can tell you that the discussions on the SO, AC list are not exactly scintillating and you're not really missing much, but nevertheless I do think it would good if they were hoping and hopefully we will move on that in the future.

Nevertheless it is also true, and I have sent the links in the past to people that the monthly conference calls that we do among the leaders are transcribed, recorded and made available on the conference website so you can read those. Some of them have been rather eventful and it has been a process -- dudes. Could you solve this in another way?

The - but anyway, so one thing I guess would be we have asked not only that the process be a little bit more transparent but that agendas be announced in advance so that we can share with people in our respective groups what it is we're talking about so that they know in advance and we can come into the meetings and be able to represent more effectively the views of our members on any given issue.

So Rafik and I and all the other chairs participate in these things and I just wanted to know if there are - some people have in advance raised questions about this on the list and I thought since we're having a meeting now if there's

anything that people would like to ask about what this is and why it happens and what we're doing, then this would be an opportunity.

I will also add that on the Friday meeting what we decided to do was to break down into some working groups to try to tackle some tasks. A group of people, a group of chairs are going to be working together on trying to encourage the staff to improve the information architecture of ICANN. So all these things are things that have been debated forever, the fact that you can't find anything on the website, the fact that you can't figure out if you're newbie what's going on with the working group and what status is its work process and whether you should jump into it, how close is it to being done, what has been decided so far, et cetera.

These things would like the staff to improve the information resources that are available to the community and so the chairs that are working on that will try to put forward some recommendations. We have had as I said this conversation with staff a number of times over the years and nothing's happened. There has been also a discussion about - sorry, there is a group being created that will deal with engagement of stakeholders and trying to bring new blood into the leadership and so forth. And I'm participating in that one.

This is good in a way because as you may know if you've been around awhile it was civil society people who for many years were jumping up and down about outreach and bringing in new people because ICANN often can feel like it's the same little group of people making decisions on a long-term basis. And those initiatives were later taken over by a large staff expansion, which then rather that doing it on a community basis, community-driven basis, started to do it in a more top down way. We're hoping that we will work towards a new balanced and cooperative relationship around that.

And then the third one, the third working group, Rafik, help me out. What was the other one that we decided to organize a group on? Huh? You were not in

the meeting, that's true because he hadn't arrived yet. There's one other and I'm just blanking it on it completely.

Oh it was on prioritization of work. So as I - these are not as I said the most exciting things, but I do want you to know it's not a secret cabal and we certainly willing - I certainly willing to do everything I can to make my participation and Rafik's participation in this process transparent and to take onboard any concerns that you have and then reflect back to you what goes on in those meetings.

Okay. Yes, Marilia, please?

Marilia Maciel: The meetings are to discuss issues related to ICANN organization only or if you want to propose for instance the idea of the cross-community effort on human rights, this would be the right place to do it? What do you think?

William Drake: It's not - these are more operational management of the organization kinds of discussions. I did however in the meeting yesterday raise to Fadi and the other senior staff at some length my concern about the inability or the unwillingness of the staff to post the human rights meeting tomorrow on the agenda and pressed the point of why that is so and also raised the concern about the fact that the cross-community working group on Internet governance had expected to play a greater role in shaping the agenda of the IG update sessions that are held each time, and yet at the end of the day, staff went ahead and did it without us.

And so we - I talked to the staff after that meeting and they said that going forward there will be more of staff community collaboration in planning those IG sessions. And Fadi expressed surprise about the human rights meeting. I don't know that anything is being done. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri. I think it's funny that Fadi expressed surprise because in a meeting earlier that day the meeting had been -- and he was in the room --

the meeting had bee discussed in one of those open range meetings, and the whole issue of the necessity for more focus on human rights. This was during that so called high level SOAC, sporting organization AC, issues meeting.

And Fadi had been there, Fadi heard it. Fadi actually did a double take at the time when it was spoken, so to hear that he thought it was a surprise -- although it doesn't matter, the person I'm talking to isn't listening -- but to hear that he was surprised is really rather startling and disingenuous.

Man: Can you say that again, Madam Avri?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) transcript.

Man: I mean the part about the person you're talking to not listening.

Avri Doria: Yes well.

William Drake: Okay. There seems to be some confusion here, so something was just shown on the screen which was a surprise. We had a discussion briefly back and forth with the folks organizing the GNSO review about whether they would come and make a presentation here and we decided that since they were presenting at NCSG this afternoon there was no need to do it twice.

And yet somehow the slide just appeared on the screen showing that they were here and they're here in the room. So I am sorry about it, but actually you're not on the agenda because the people I talked to who are coordinating your process agreed with me that you would not be. And so we are supposed to be having a visit now from David Olive and (Theresa), who are late.

So - but they do know that they're coming and they will SMS (Theresa) if I don't see her in the next minute or so. But we will see you in the afternoon, and I don't know why that happened. Yes?

Woman: Just to let you know that David and I believe (Theresa) too are on their way. They did know they were on the agenda but because of the confusion with this they thought that this meeting was running a little bit late. And so they are here. They're coming.

William Drake: Okay that's good to know that they're making that judgment. So - and the other thing that I wanted to point out to you simply Wednesday morning, tomorrow 8:30, there is the cross-community working group on Internet governance, and a number of us do participate in this.

And I do think it's an important one for those who have an interest in the broader range of Internet governance issues and I would certainly encourage more participation from NCUC and NCSG in that process, as well as the many other wonderful cross-community groups being born now, the ones pertaining to accountability and the IANA transition. We need to have civil society voices well represented in all of these processes.

While we await David and (Theresa) bursting through the door, any comments on the cross-community work that's going on? Or Steph were you waving at me? Did you have a...?

Woman: Yes, just a question and it may be related to the fact that the GAC has moved out of the tent and into the house. But I thought there was a 9:30 discussion on human rights that the GAC was doing and now I can't find it on the agenda.

Avri Doria: It's ongoing and it's yes it's ongoing now.

William Drake: And we will talk more about that meeting and the larger human rights initiative. And here's David. Please, sir. And do you have (Theresa) in your pocket or somewhere arriving?

David Olive: Am I (Theresa)'s keeper? No I'm not. But let me see where she is.

William Drake: Okay. There are slides for (Theresa) to go through.

Man: Do you want me to put them up now?

William Drake: You might as well put them up, yes. So what we wanted to talk about in this segment was the rather lively discussions that have gone on in ICANN since London in particular around accountability and the IANA transition and the ways in which the frameworks had been - for taking these issues forward have been suggested by staff and then revised in light of input from the community.

                   There has been, as you know, some I don't want to say controversy but differences in view perhaps between some members of the community and staff over how all of this was teed up with the feeling that some of what the staff was putting forward was not adequately reflective of community views. And there were a number of -- this goes to when people ask what the SOAC think, there are a number of letters sent by the SOAC chairs to senior staff expressing concerns about the management of these processes and particularly the accountability one.

                   And we had in Istanbul at the IGF a very productive and useful town hall meeting that David was the moderator of where I think we were able to come together to a much higher level of mutual understanding about what we are all doing here in this space.

                   So I think we are now at a point where after some months of mild contention and back and forth over exactly how the accountability process should be structured and how that will interface with the IANA steward - management to the stewardship transition, I think we are now, at least with the accountability stuff, in a happier space. And I'm very happy that the staff has taken onboard the views expressed by the community as well.

So I'm now joined by (Theresa Swinehart), Senior Advisor to the president on global strategy at ICANN, who's been the point person for many of these issues and as well David Olive, the Vice President of Policy Development for ICANN. David manages all of the policy staff including Mary over there, you lucky man. And (Theresa) gave a presentation to the GNSO the other day covering some of these points. And I suggested to her that maybe just a few of those slides she could go through again to reset the discussion and then open up some time for civil society people to express their particular views on this.

And I thought it would be helpful to have David as a (maestro) of any of the policy discussions along side as well.

We can go to ten thirty or whenever you guys have to run away. There's a coffee break that goes on for a half hour but we can cut into it if you're willing; it all depends on your schedules.

So with all that said, I turn it over to (Theresa). And again, thank you very much for being here.

(Theresa Swinehart): Thank you and my apologies that I was late. It was - anyway. It is what it is.

So first, thanks a lot for having us here. I know that everybody has a busy program and you're covering a lot of issues, so thanks for the opportunity to be here.

Some of the issues and topics that I'm going to address, we covered yesterday in the open session, but I really wanted to be able to go through it here and have a dialogue and conversation if there's any additional questions or things you want to talk about.

How are we managing - oh, there we go; perfect.

So this is a bit awkward because Milton, who is here, is actually on the ICG. So Milton, I don't know, maybe you want to run through this or we can tag team on it. I'll give a quick overview but you have Milton here as well.

So just as context, ICG was formed...

William Drake: What is ICG?

(Theresa Swinehart): Sorry. The IANA Coordination Group which is the group that is responsible for addressing the proposal that needs to be prepared to go to NTIA in the context of the IANA Stewardship Transition, was formed on the 3rd of July and it was formed community consultations and public consultations.

It has 30 community representatives on it with two liaisons; one from the IANA and one from the ICANN Board. Based on a request from the Governmental Advisory Committee, they had requested rather than having two representatives having five, and so the ICG and its dialogues decided to accept the request for the five.

They've selected their leadership; Elisa Cooper from the IETF and two Vice-Chairs, Patrick Falstrom and Mohamed El Bashir. And they've established their modes of operation and held two in-person meetings and five virtual meetings.

So the premise here really is that the group formed itself but then was responsible for identifying its working methodologies and how it was going to be engaging in the community in an open and transparent manner. And that includes establishing its charter and then next steps. Next slide.

So through quite a bit of work online through the summer, so nobody got an August vacation that lives in the Northern Hemisphere at least, they adopted their charter at the end of August.

They also put out a request for proposals to the communities -- that is the operational communities of the IANA function -- in order to get the proposals and the protocol perimeter space, the naming space and the IP addressing space.

They also suggested a timeline and put that forward in order to meet an objective to achieve a proposal in time to allow the contract to lapse in September 2015. That is includes a timeline that allows for NTIA review, operational testing, and building in time for community dialogue and consensus on the proposal.

They've also outlined guidelines for decision-making and put out FAQs. Next slide.

One of the areas the ITF has quite a system in getting themselves organized to address their proposal in the context of the protocol perimeter space and the regional Internet registries as well.

For the naming related functions, there's a cross-community working group that was formed co-chaired by Jonathan Robinson. They've gone through their cross-community working group mechanisms and guidelines of establishing a charter being open to all. And had a first meeting yesterday on how they're going to move forward in operationalizing their work. And so this is to achieve a proposal from the naming community in the context of context of the submission to the RFP that the IANA Coordination Group has put out. Next slide, next slide.

So in the context of the accountability for those who haven't been following this as closely, one of the topics that came up with the announcement of

NTIA of its intention to transition the stewardship role was how is ICANN going to be accountable if there's not an IANA contract to use as a leveraging point if the US no longer has a historical contractual relationship or anything else that is being perceived as a real or existing or perceived backstop role that the US plays.

In that dialogue though also came up questions about ICANN accountability that may be completely unrelated to or have a touch point in relation to the transition itself.

So through those discussions and extensive community dialogue through the first consultation period of the 8th of May through the 27th of June dialogue with the SO/AC and SG leadership, an initial proposed process was put forward on the 14th of August that looked towards having an open and inclusive cross-community group and then something such as a coordination group, similar to what was being used in the IANA process.

Through community consultation, through community dialogue, especially community dialogue also at the IGF Istanbul Meeting, communications that we received from the community with regards to additional questions that they had, and then a request for additional time to have in order to review the proposal, we put out the original 14 August proposal again for community comment for another 21 day period.

And this has been a very useful exchange. It's been trying to reach a process that helps a deal with this accountability issue in the context of the changing relationship and something that is quite visible to the global community that may not be participating in the day-to-day activities of ICANN itself, or may not be familiar with ICANN but familiar with multi-stakeholder models as they evolve.

The dialogue that we've had staff community board on, what is the right mechanism to do this, what is the right process that lends comfort to all the

interested parties involved, has been challenging at points but I think also very useful as we all work together to try to find the right mechanism going forward.

So the additional comment period came in with 17 comments including a joint SO/AC/SG&C statement - and I assume everybody knows what all those acronyms stand for - which was very thoughtful, provided an opportunity, had comments about how to do modifications to the originally proposed process or suggested using a cross-community working group model for this.

Additional comments came in from other areas that reinforced the importance of the openness and inclusiveness of any process that would exist. And also raised points about ensuring that one interest any existing or perceived self-review aspect; Brazil in particular had raised that point. Next slide.

So with that, in looking at all the comments received and trying to think through how one might move forward to address all the concerns and all the points that have been existing in the discussions, the suggestion was to go with using a cross-community working group model and in that kind of framework, but to incorporate into that the following items.

One was the up to seven advisors that are appointed by the originally proposed four experts. The reason for the use of the four experts is to ensure that it's not ICANN Staff or Board or the CEO actually identifying the advisors. This is in order to ensure or augment any existing expertise in the community with additional expertise that may be relevant for this kind of addressing of accountability.

A Board liaison that would be selected by the Board, an ICANN Staff person that would be knowledgeable in the area of existing review mechanisms and other accountability aspects of ICANN to help just inform the discussion when questions come up.

An ATRT expert who is selected among the participants of ATRT 1 or 2 and working with the leadership of the ATRT process in order to address that.

Some sort of linkage to the INS Stewardship Transition Coordination group; how that linkage is achieved is up to the community to decide.

Participation open to all, so that is also for open to all for people who may not be a member of a SO/AC/SGRC.

Of note is that the advisors, the board liaison and the staff do not participate in the votes or calls for consensus. And this is to address any concerns that existed that these parties would have a role in any vote or anything of that so to be clear on that.

There was also quite a few comments around the role of the Board in relation to the acceptance of recommendations from the process. The Board is looking at this and is aware of all the comments and will be responsive to that point.

And then on the scope, the suggestion is given the interest to look at both ICANN accountability in the context of the changing relationship with the US Administration and other ICANN accountability issues, that when looks at two work streams. Next slide please, thanks.

And these two work streams can run in parallel if the community chooses to do that. They can run sequentially, they can tag team; it's really up to the community how they wish to address that in the context of how they're going to work.

The first work stream looks at accountability on the more immediate issue of the changing relationship with the US Administration. As I think many heard yesterday, when NTI receives its proposal from the IANA Coordination Group, it also expects that ICANN will have delivered, in the context of that,

how any concerns or issues around ICANN accountability more broadly in the changing relationship would be addressed.

So that is specifically not accountability of the operational parties with the IANA function, that's individual with those groups. For example, the IATF and their SLAs or the RARs with their MOU with ICANN or the naming space. But it's more broadly the accountability of ICANN in the context of the changing relationship.

Then the second track would look at any other issues in regards to accountability, and that can be a work stream that can continue on well after the transition as well.

The objective of housing the two work streams within this cross-community working group were to ensure that there was a mechanism, to already address them, and that the continuation of that work would then continue after the work stream had been completed.

So this is just a quick overview but I'm sure people have questions, so I'm more than happy to respond - or if they want to hear from David already.

William Drake: Thank you very much (Theresa), that was a good overview.

David, do you want to add anything real quick or shall we just go to Q&A? Okay, that's fine.

So, you know, as you know, during the windup of this process there was a lot of concern expressed by different parts of the community including civil society over how these things were being set up. And so we thought that some people may have heard you go through this already at the GNSO Meeting yesterday or Sunday, but for those who did not or did not get a chance to ask a question, here now is a good opportunity to raise any further questions/concerns we have either on substance or process from here.

Milton.

Milton Mueller: So both as a NCUC member and somebody who is involved in both of these working groups, I was relieved to see the separation of the two tracks in the cross-community - the accountability - what is the official name of that? They're both CWGs but it's CWG Accountability?

Man: CWG.

Man: Accountability (unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: We'll use this as an example of the kind of really important things we get stuck on I'm guess.

Man: Yes well, there was an issue.

Milton Mueller: So anyway, I was relieved to see the separation of the two tracks because, as a member of the ICG, I was becoming increasingly concerned about whether the whole ball of wax of accountability issues could be handled in the timeframe of the transition.

But I heard two different descriptions of what the two tracks were yesterday. And I think one of them has to be wrong and one of them I hope is right.

So one of the discussions said basically - and it sounded like it was coming from Strickling. And he says, "Track 1 is all about the IANA relationship and IANA accountability relationship, things related to the IANA."

And that sounds an awful lot like the mandate of the IANA Stewardship Cross-Community Working Group. Indeed, it sounds almost exactly the same as it.

So you know, you don't want them to come up with separate plans. And there's no reason to create a coordination issue when you don't have too. So it seemed to me that the proper way to describe the two tracks would be the before and after distinction.

That is to say what can we - what accountability enhancements do we need to do before the transition and what ones can wait to be worked on longer term after the transition?

Which ones would be sufficient to eliminate people's concerns about ICANN being independent and on the loose and on the rampage versus which ones would be nice to have, longer term, or might be so complicated as to not even be thinkable within the timeframe of the transition?

Would that strike you as a proper definition? Okay.

(Theresa Swinehart):   Yes, that would be intuitively how I would look at it as well. I don't have the transcript in front of me, but in yesterday's presentation and dialogue, Larry had also then elaborated on, for example, you know, in the context of the changing aspect, you know, are there recourse mechanisms also with the Board? Are there other things that are of concern to the community that need to be address?

But it specifically with regards to, I think, what do people feel has to be in place if the USG was not there. And I think that's a good way to look at, so I like how you framed that Milton.

William Drake: If I could add to this, one of the questions that was raised immediately when Friday, you shared this framework, was normally with cross-community working groups, it's up to the communities to define their charter, and what's in scope and what's out, etcetera, etcetera.

And in a way, because you're coming forth with a model based on the input that you've received from the community, you're sort of basically saying, "This is how it could be done." But what you're saying there is not, "This is how it must be done," this is a suggestion for the people who will be developing the charter.

So the hope would be then that the members who get engaged in the charter will take onboard the question of how to define an effective division of labor and co-facilitation relationship between the two cross-community groups. And so I think it's important that people, you know, recognize this is not something the staff is going to tell us, "This is how it has to be done," so it's up to us then to work out a model along with other stakeholders as to how those two processes will divide things up (unintelligible).

(Theresa Swinehart): Right.

William Drake: So we need people thinking about that.

(Theresa Swinehart): Can I just - not to dominate the mic, in the end result, the end result has to be able to stand up to the feedback from the global community. And so the points that are raised in the proposed incorporations into this process are points that have been raised throughout the comment periods and points that have been raised overall, that will in the end produce that comes out will be looked at also in that context.

So for example, the feedback from Brazil and a few others about - concerns about perceived self-review. You know, how does one ensure that's addressed, concerns about or points raised about inclusiveness and openness.

So whatever the end product is, those kinds of questions that have come up throughout the comment period, how does one stress-test against those, how does one answer to those or aspects?

So those were put out there just as suggestions to incorporate into the chartering work including in the context of this, the two work streams, to ensure that the scoping aspect can also be dealt with in a way that feedback was received on.

William Drake: Brenden, do you have a question?

Brenden Kuerbis: Thanks; Brenden Kuerbis. Thanks (Theresa) for the very helpful presentation.

You had mentioned that the Board was contemplating its role in the submission of the proposal and it would come back with some information?

(Theresa Swinehart): Oh sorry.

Brenden Kuerbis: And it's my understanding that the ICG specified that it would transmit the proposal to the department. That's in its charter I believe.

So can you give me a better sense of what exactly the Board is contemplating?

(Theresa Swinehart): Sorry; I wasn't fully caffeinated yet.

So there's a few elements. The ICG in the preparing its proposal, so the Track 1 Proposal, is being prepared by the ICG, but together they will do the consultations with the community, get the input. Their proposal actually needs to be transmitted to ICANN and then transmits to NTIA.

That's a procedural issue because NTIA had requested that ICANN facilitate the process, so it actually has to handle the transmission. This does not mean editing or anything of that sort, it just means a form of communication. So that is in the Track 1.

What I was referring to when I made the comments about the Board - if you can go back - I'm sorry. There we go. The role of the Board in relation to accepting the recommendations from the Accountability Process, so that is the second track.

Some comments that came in expressed wanting to have addressed how - what would happen if the Board were to not accept the recommendations that came out of the accountability process? And they wanted to ensure that there was a way to address those concerns.

The Board is aware of those comments, is looking at it, and I anticipate that they will respond to that this week on how they would ensure that they're engaging with the community and have a process in place should there be a situation where recommendations coming out of the accountability process may not be able to be adopted in full or in part in how they would work with the community on that in order to reach resolution.

But the expectation out of both of these processes is that the community dialogue and the mechanisms of reaching a concrete proposal that is being forward are done in such a manner that they are on full consensus. So there is never a need for any mechanisms to address any concerns of disagreement. But one wants to be prepared obviously should there not be the case.

William Drake: Before I turn to Stephanie, David did you want to add anything at this point?

David: No (unintelligible).

William Drake: Okay fine. Stephanie and then Robin.

Stephanie: This is probably a very naïve question; I'm just trying to understand these processes as a learner.

And I sat through the Accountability meeting yesterday morning, and it seems to me, if I were trying to measure the success of these two separate initiatives, the purpose isn't quite clear enough.

Now I understand that the charter bears the burden of establishing the purpose. The problem, it seems to me, is that you also have an iterative multi-stakeholder process loaded onto that during which time the purpose can kind of expand. We also have what I think was a well-identified problem that the two parallel processes may be duplicative, right.

How are we going to measure whether this is successful at the end of the day? What are the metrics for this? And how soon can you establish your purpose in metrics in these processes? Or do you?

(Theresa Swinehart): It's a good question.

The end objective for the first track on the transition is to have a proposal to address NTIA stewardship in the IANA functions area that meets the criteria set out by NTIA. So that is the end objective, correct?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Theresa Swinehart): That's crystal clear.

Stephanie: To be clear for one slide, yes.

(Theresa Swinehart): Correct. Okay, on the accountability process, the primary objective, so the first work stream the one with the shorter timeframe, is to address, as Milton had articulated, the accountability in the context of the changing relationship with the US Administration; what is needed to ensure that when the US is out of the contract, right, that ICANN is completely accountable to the community, right.

And that also has a short timeframe because if that is going to be part of what is being provided in the context of the transition, it also has a timeframe of ensuring that it's in time for the lapse of the contract in September 2015, if that's what the community decides it wants to be working towards, right.

The other work stream has a wide range of other accountability issues that have been raised very thoughtful, very good ideas and suggestions and concerns that came up throughout the comment period and the enabling and opportunity to have those addressed whether through existing processes or through other processes.

So if you want to have a matrix, you've got a deliverable by September 2015 that has the ICG work and addressing ICANN accountability in the context of the changing relationship; that's that. And then the other one would be the broader areas.

I don't know if that helps, but how that is captured in the charter is for the community to be putting together.

Stephanie: I guess that's what I'm worried about because it seems to me, at a very high global level, you're trying to get ICANN as a multi-stakeholder community to be as trusted as the US Commerce Department. That's a big ask.

And so it seems to me that the Accountability group is going to have to focus on precisely which accountability mechanisms that are trusted in the US Commerce Department, can we ensure are present in ICANN to ensure a transition.

And if you don't do that, then there is a risk, a significant risk I would say, that you're going to be lost in space trying to figure out how to get ICANN to meet standards of ethics and global multi-stakeholders. And wow; that's a big list.

William Drake: There are many big asks here.

Milton is wiggling his fingers at me in desperation so I guess that means...

(Theresa Swinehart): (Unintelligible).

William Drake: No, he does like...

(Theresa Swinehart): (Unintelligible).

William Drake: Yes, Robin was in line. Milton is wiggling very emphatically and we wouldn't want to frustrate him.

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: So Milton, you get ten seconds and then we go to Robin.

And then also, if there are any of the new folks who are here, have any questions. Again, you know, I know that you may feel like you are walking into the middle of a long-running conversation, but there's no question that's too entry level, and certainly we would love to hear from anybody else as well.

So Milton, quickly.

Milton Mueller: Yes, the point was just a quick follow-on to what Stephanie and (Theresa) were saying.

And the point is it may be possible that the IANA Coordination Group Proposal actually solves the immediate Accountability problems in the way that it handles the IANA, and that the Track 1 doesn't need to do anything. That is conceivable to me.

(Theresa Swinehart): I can't respond to that, but it could be; I don't know.

William Drake: Okay. As (extensile) questions that cannot be answered in the - use the spade that is in your entry hand. Okay so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can I answer that? That's okay.

William Drake: Exactly. So, Robin.

Robin Gross: Thank you. This is Robin Gross for the record.

First, I wanted to thank you guys for the significant changes that have been made in the last version of the proposal. And I went up to the microphone yesterday to say this, but the queue had already closed so I wasn't able to, so I'm glad I get this opportunity to now.

So I'm very thankful for listening to many of the community concerns. We didn't get everything we wanted, certainly, but a number of very significant changes were in this last version. So thank you.

And then I have a question, and it's really more practicality homework. What's our homework?

So do we now need to be focusing on appointing people to drafting teams that will create these groups, or can you give us some real specific short-term homework?

(Theresa Swinehart): Yes, but it's not a yes from me.

My understanding, also from the conversations yesterday, the session that we had on the Accountability, was that the view from the SO/AC and SG&C, if that's correct...

William Drake: (Unintelligible).

(Theresa Swinehart): ...okay, good - is to bring together the community to figure out how to get a drafting group together and then start working on the charter.

But how that is being done, I know that I've had some conversations with Jonathan and Byron who were trying to figure out how to bring everybody together.

But yes, the next steps is for the community to be coming together and to start operationalizing what needs to happen next including bringing together members for the drafting team is my understanding that that's how that process...

Robin Gross: And that should be the first thing we should be focusing on you think?

(Theresa Swinehart): Yes, I would think so.

The proposed process is there in the context of the CWG and elements to be incorporated into that. Now I think it's time for the CWG to start convening itself through the processes that it uses to do that including, my understanding is, the establishment of the charter as it does to a drafting team and start to do that.

And from a staff standpoint, we are happy to provide any support that's needed. You know, whatever is logistical or whatever it might be, in the work that needs to be undertaken. I mean we know that everybody is busy and it's a volunteer community, and in time there's a lot of things going on in a short timeframe.

So from that standpoint, we are more than happy to provide any support that is needed. But it's for the community also, so working with you to do that.

William Drake: So we started late and we are now ten minutes into the coffee break. I don't know how much longer you would like...

(Theresa Swinehart): As long as you want.

William Drake: You're okay?

David: Let me just - yes.

William Drake: If people - if anyone is desperate to go get coffee, you could just go ahead and cycle out and we will continue for another five to ten if it's okay.

David: (Unintelligible).

William Drake: There are several people in line to ask questions. Did you want to say something now David because I...

David: Why don't we finish this topic and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: Okay well alright then. Let me just say that we have remote participation questions and I come to the rest of you, from Joy Liddicoat who's joining us from New Zealand.

And she says, "Can you advise on the revised timelines for appointments such as advisors and board liaison?"

(Theresa Swinehart): Yes, so the experts had done a call for names.

They have also and had the opportunity to meet and look at their next steps. And that is, the call that they had, has been recorded and is being

transcribed, so that will be publicly available. So they're proceeding on identifying the criteria that they'll be looking for and the priorities of areas of expertise.

The Board itself will be selecting its liaison, so as soon as the cross-community working group is ready to be active, the Board should have its liaison ready to appoint and the experts should be in the process of identifying the up-to seven; whether they go for seven or not I don't know.

So those works are underway, so whenever the group is formed and ready, the liaisons and the advisors would be ready to be appointed or selected and put there.

William Drake: Okay, so we have questions now from Avri, Matt and me unless Matt asks the question that I wanted to ask, which he might. Avri.

Avri Doria: Mine is not a question but it's a statement. It's more of an answer to Robin's question.

We demand it that we be allowed to do this our own selves. So I'm actually kind of amazed at the moment that three days into it or four days into it, we're already asking for homework.

What I want to do is also thank you for your graciousness in being willing to still help us even though we, you know, told you to butt out. So thank you.

William Drake: We tell you that because we love you.

(Theresa Swinehart):   No, no. I just want to - the support is there and available. But as you say, it's for the community to organize. We're all in this together in the end, right, and so we all have different roles and can help each other out; that's my main point.

William Drake: Matthew, do you have a mic? There's a roaming mic. Where is it?

Man: Right here.

Matthew Shears: Yes, thanks. Matthew Shears; Center for Democracy and Technology.

So one of the issues that has come up and kind of bedeviled us all along is how do those who are not part of the ICANN community participate? In the prior process, it was relatively clear that you signed up the CCG and there was a role and the process was identified.

Now that it's reverted to more of an ICANN model, if I can say that in the working group, how are we going to ensure that that openness is there and continues? Because we've called for it, Brazil has called for it, in fact Brazil has made a very strong statement about ensuring that this process is open all the way through.

So I really hope that the opportunity for those who are beyond this community to participate remains, and we really need to safeguard that. Thanks.

William Drake: And if I could just add before you answer, and this is just a structural question here, right. Because when you compose these cross-community groups, normally speaking you're going to draw from the members of the community and they go through their whole nominating process. And the people who are outside of it, they don't have that process.

And so it's kind of hard to say to them, you know, "You're only a participant, but you don't get to be a part of the consensus call," or something like that. But yet at the same time, tell the people who actually went through the whole thing of finding it out to get, you know, appointed as representatives, that they are (equal). So you know, there's a challenge at both sides, right, and I'm not sure how to bench that.

(Theresa Swinehart): It's actually a challenge that it's going to have to be figured out as the cross-community working group is formulated and chartered. Does one enable the chartering by groups that are not SO/ACs? How does one address the comments that came in in the context of the openness so that when the process is underway and the work begins, there is a response. There's a demonstration that it is open and inclusive and anybody can participate.

And you know, the comments, well they came from Brazil and they came from CDT, had also come from comments in the first round as well. So that aspect is not going to go away and will need to be addressed in how the work comes together and works together.

And there might have to be some creative thinking around that and creative modifications to what might have been the traditional model used in other areas of the cross-community working group.

But I think through good work, one could find a good solution hopefully. But I would suggest reaching out to Matthew in CDT and to Brazil in formulating the process to ensure that that's being addressed in a way that meets also their concerns.

David: I think that's a great segue into a few minutes before I have to block your coffee break of being further reduced. And that's to thank Bill for inviting me here.

You may have seen me in other capacities mostly camped out in the room with the Board when the various constituency and stakeholder groups would meet. That's normally where I would be and so I would see many of you when you would be coming in for the Board consultations at that point. And of course you do see me and my staff in supporting the GNSO policy development work.

So in many ways, the principles to Matthew's question and maybe to Avri's comment is that some of the principles that we use in the policy development process, working groups are open to all; let's have all the voices, various comments and iterative processes. It can be a model for how this works.

And even though the cross-community working group is a hybrid if you will, or a variation of that, those basic principles of trying to hear all the voices, hear all the opinions, and move that forward into a consensus, is something that we do obviously in the policy development process with the support of the staff. And we're also working closely with (Theresa) and her team in that regard.

So to that extent, I think there are similarities and patterns you can use, and those principles of the PDPs and your GNSO work should be helpful as well.

Quickly, just another point that we're working on with various supporting organizations and advisory councils, the Policy Development team supports seven of them; the three of the SOs and four of the advisor committees in their work in policy development or advisory development processes.

And that is to address the issue of workload, priorities, because all of our policy development teams do support these groups, and we are trying to be as helpful and as facilitative as we can for the work of these groups.

But we're having a discussion with the various chairs to exchange ideas and to figure out better ways to manage a public comment process as well as how to make sure that everyone is informed and is working effectively with the tools that we have including to improve some of those tools for your better working and organization.

So that's what I just wanted to say. Thanks for this and thanks for inviting me.

Bill asked me why I hadn't come before. Part of it was, you know, I didn't want to bother your busy days on Tuesdays, but you can always come and talk to me through Mary Wong or (Benny) or anyone else. So thank you very much.

William Drake: I should say these are two very accessible members of the Senior Staff where you can always bring concerns too. So I'm very glad that we exposed - put them here in front of you in case you haven't met them before.

I would like to take more questions but we have only 12 minutes before the Council people come to talk about human rights and I suspect some of you may want to grab coffee.

So did you have something quick Wendy that you wanted to ask? You had nothing; I thought you were waving at me.

So in that case, curiously the left side of the room has been very silent but that's all right. We'll try to engage you in the next stage.

So thank you very much you guys for coming to visit us. And everybody, please try to really be back on time at 11:00 because of the Council (Euro) people come and we're not here, it's kind of rude. Okay, thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

William Drake: Okay, could we begin to reconvene, if people could take their seats. I know that there's popcorn going around the room, people are still wondering around with their coffee as expected. The speakers are late as expected, so it's chaos all around.

Man: Do you want to let me know when you want to start recording?

William Drake: I will, but in the meanwhile they can still hear me abroad, right, the remote people?

Man: No, they won't.

William Drake: Okay, can you turn that mic back on?

Man: Yes.

William Drake: Thank you. Yes, and the remote people are reconnected.

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: It's a little zoo-like.

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: Here they are, speakers are arriving. Okay, so everyone, I think there's room. Some people have left.

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: Okay, I sit here and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: Very good to meet you. And will we also be joined by (Monica) or no?

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: (Monica) is not here.

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: I just saw Heather and (Unintelligible). And Heather expects willingness to come (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

William Drake: All right, we are starting if the colleagues who are standing around and chatting could please take your seats that would be very helpful. And we can begin the recording again as well.

And welcome back for the second part after - everything is running ten minutes late today for various reasons, but (unintelligible). So welcome back to the people who are listening in from abroad. And again, if you have any questions, please be sure to put them into the remote chat so that we can take them onboard.

We have with us here two people that we invited to come and join, not to give a presentation per se, but actually to just be part of our conversation and provide their input.

Those of you, again, who were here last in London will know that we had a very interesting hour-long discussion with Lee Hibbard from the Council of Europe, and Thomas Schneider from the government of Switzerland who is currently waiting to find out if he is elected to the new chair of the GAC, about a paper that Thomas and another colleague, Monica, had done on human rights in ICANN, which then began sort of a process of trying to crystallize the various initiatives that have been in the wind for some time around human rights and how to bring human rights more fully into the ICANN environment.

And we will be discussing this quite a lot both right now, we've got a bit of time, and there will also be a visit during the NCST meeting this afternoon. And then again, as we've talked about, there will be a cross-community or at least open meeting tomorrow at 1:15 in the afternoon in the (Inseno) room

which is not listed on the schedule of the ICANN meeting for reasons that I am not happy with and which should have been conveyed to Fadi.

That said, so welcome to Alessandra and to Lee again; good to see you. Let's just pick up a little bit - I was talking with Heather Dryden the Chair of the GAC in the hallway just before I came in. The GAC had had a half hour discussion of this question in the morning.

There seems to be some confusion about the whole process. There's a lot of different players with interest in bringing human rights into the ICANN environment in a more direct way, but it seems perhaps, they have different formulations in their mind about exactly how that would be initiated and who would be leading it and so on and so forth.

And there also seems to be differences of perspective as to exactly what kind of human rights issues we're talking about. Are we talking about only the conformity of private firms with human rights that have been agreed to by states, or are we also talking about human right commitments that states have made themselves and are obliged to follow. And so there are a lot of - we're in a sort of interesting ferment period and there's a lot of confusion and so on.

You guys were at the GAC meeting this morning; there was a short half hour meeting. I understand it was quite lively and that other - there was discussions of Ukraine and geopolitical human right differences and all that which is maybe what happens when you bring human rights into ICANN; I don't know. And perhaps is something that raises some concerns in some quarters.

Lee, could you just briefly give us your whatever kind of gloss you might want to offer on what happened at that meeting from an observer's standpoint?

Lee Hibbard: Thank you Bill and thank you again for the invitation.

I mean it was very positive and it was surprisingly positive. There was no one saying that they didn't like it, they didn't want this to continue. And I think in summary (unintelligible) the summary of the chair was that, you know, there is a lot of interest, it should continue.

They don't know how to move forward necessarily. They will discuss that after the cross-community open discussion tomorrow. So with that in mind, they will decide on what they can do.

There was a reference to perhaps having a GAC working group on that as well as possibly a cross-community initiative in the future, so they clarified that point. There was a question of legal advice being sought.

There wasn't very too much as usual discussion about substance of course. There was a reference to communities and their protection with of course the new gTLDs.

So substantially, there wasn't very much but there were many countries which spoke and thought it was useful and helpful and it needed to continue.

Peru's proposal for the bylaws to be updated and revised was briefly discussed. Again, it seems to be maybe too early to tell; we'll see. But still, you know, the horse has bolted, the discussion is moving, it will carry on, that's for sure. And it's a question of how it carries on really; it's a question of (unintelligible) really.

So you know, it's lighter start and it will continue. And I don't know, you know, what timeframe you're wanting to look at for any revision of any bylaws or, you know, (unintelligible) of commitments, discussions or anything else for that matter.

There was a hint at, you know, compliance issues and private entities and the role of governments of course. These are things which are in the report too. There were hints of those things, but I mean there's a lot of stuff in that report in this area which needs to be looked at.

You know, it's not just one specific area, one single issue, it's several issues at the same time. So it takes - it's quite challenging to absorb and understand all of the issues so it needs more time and thought and more discussion. That's why (unintelligible), but it was a very positive outcome.

William Drake: Thank you Lee, that's what I would have expected.

Alessandra has never been with us before, we're very pleased to have the Vice-Chair of the Consultative Committee on Data Protection Convention of the Council of Europe with us.

Would you like to share any initial thoughts on what you've seen? This is your first ICANN meeting right?

Alessandra Pierucci: Yes.

William Drake: So it's a bizarre little world you've entered into. And human rights fits here in a way that probably is not very familiar to you coming from the Council of Europe. So just your impressions on where we are.

Alessandra Pierucci: Thank you very much. I must admit that I was a little bit shocked yesterday when I arrived; not very familiar with the contacts let's say.

But I had quite a positive impression today after the discussion Lee was reporting briefly. Yes, it was good to have an impression that at least the human rights perspective should be tickets for account in this framework.

Of course we have to discuss about the modalities. I think even at this stage it is very important to focus on some initial key messages we should keep.

First of all, that we should think about shared responsibilities which means that there's the single bodies involved in the various processes should be somehow responsible, of course in accordance with institutional or not institutional role everybody has.

In respect of ICANN, of course, it cannot be asked - I mean it's not a state so it cannot be asked to comply with the sort of obligation - positive obligation - to respect human rights. But at the same time, it has accountability, transparency compliance, which are actually two elements which have been quite often mentioned in the last few days.

So I think - and it was actually even considered in the United Nation Guideline Principles on business and human rights. I think that, you know, business too has certain responsibility in considering human rights. Governments of course have to have an obligation in complying human rights perspective.

The other thing I wanted to add that I like is that, okay, here I'm representing the Council of Europe but we're not speaking about purely European perspective. This is very important because as the work of the United Nations works has shown in the last few years, I'm now referring specifically to the theme I'm more interested in; privacy and the protection. There has been a growing attention, a growing sensitivity, towards the right to privacy which should be duly considered I think.

And the last message, a key message, I would like to give, I think that - and again, I'm going back to my favorite thing, that of protection and privacy. We are very much used to accept of the fact that safeguards for fundamental rights should be duly respected in the offline world.

And even in the, let's say, more traditional communication environment, think about for instance the wire tapping. I think it is time to transpose all those safeguards in respect to fundamental rights or some in the relatively new scenario of the Internet. Thank you.

William Drake: Thank you very much.

Okay, so I think there's quite a number of threads we could pick here. I am curious personally, and then I will open it to discussion, and again it's just a collaborative dialogue. The discussion within the GAC about them creating a group.

Do you have any sense how they see that interfacing with a community discussion? Because this was supposed to have been, when it started out, something that would be leading towards hopefully the development of a cross-community group.

And I'm wondering if the GAC sounds like they're leaning towards their own kind of process which might be disjoint from what the rest of us are doing. That was one concern I had just from when I was kind of picking up about that meeting.

And then the other question of course, as I said before, the question whether we're talking just about ICANN the organization and its conformity with human right standards or are we talking about the obligations of states. And whether everybody in that room that we weren't in is understanding this in the same way.

These are two kinds of mega concerns I have. You don't have to address - I mean I put them on the table because they're things I'm worrying about.

But in any event, we do have this meeting tomorrow. The question becomes strategically how can we optimize this given that ICANN did not put it on the

agenda, so a lot of the membership, the attendees at this conference, will not know about it.

I don't know what kind of outreach we could be doing besides some tweeting. We can't really put posters all over the ICANN venue. I'm sure the meeting staff would take them down because that's not an allowed process. I don't know how to sort of catalyze this.

So, you know, this let's try to get some dialogue going about how we can move this forward. And I'd like to call somebody behind me because it's not always easy to see people who are sitting behind me, and then others please raise your hand.

Okay, go ahead Valentina.

Valentina Pavel Burloiu: My name is Valentina, I'm from Romania. I work for an NGO focused on civil individual rights, I'm an ICANN fellow.

I have a suggestion about a possible outreach solution for tomorrow's session. You know, every morning we receive this newsletter from ICANN. Maybe they can put it in the morning newsletter.

William Drake: I've thought about that. I'm not sure who in the staff is coordinating that. Do we know?

((Crosstalk))

Lee Hibbard: I think David (unintelligible) sent out information about the people who are handling that, so just we need to find (unintelligible).

William Drake: Is Mary still in the room? I can't see down.

Woman: No.

William Drake: She's gone? All right, we should look into that. They may already have that formulated for tomorrow but maybe we can press them. But yes, that's a good point.

Valentina Pavel Burloiu: Front page.

William Drake: I'm sorry?

Valentina Pavel Burloiu: Front page to amend their mistake about not putting it in the program.

William Drake: Valentina, your voice was floating above me. I didn't know where the (unintelligible) was coming from.

So okay, so we have one issue of just getting the word out. Of course we should all try to be there.

I think that we want the governments involved to know that civil society has been raising these issues for a long time in ICANN, before they got involved actually, and is deeply invested in this process and wants to be a partner in taking it forward. So I hope that we can get the word out amongst all of our respective people to do that.

Beyond that, the questions are what to do. We have (Neils) and then Rafik, and then (Marillo).

(Neils):   So I asked (Jon Jon Schahel) to put it on the newsletter, but he didn't come back on that, so I think it's indeed someone else that we should ping. And around noon, I will receive 150 flyers for this meeting and we should then distribute.

But I would say that especially distribute it not among civil society and the GAC since they will now pretty much already know about it. If we really want to start a cross-community process, then we need to have the other constituencies there as well. And that's my greatest concern actually at the moment.

William Drake: One technique may be to go to Music Night, and when everybody's drunk and...

(Neils): (Unintelligible).

William Drake: ...getting on stage ready to sing, you know, Hey Jude, we just press them into their hands is one possibility.

Okay, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, just to respond quickly that, as first comment, there are two people from the ICANN staff handling the social media and who are the contact for the newsletter so we can do that.

I just have a question to the - we submitted a comment that we have for NCH about the report. But just I'm wondering how - I mean what will - I mean what's the reaction from the Council - I mean from your side and what was included in the (revised) report?

Lee Hibbard: Thank you Rafik. I mean there were not that many comments which came in. There was some informal comments on the commission and there was - in Milton that is very good blog posted on this end. There were a few other comments from you, Rafik, and also from (Maryann Franklin). And (unintelligible), yes - and (Maryann Franklin) and one or two others.

The report more or less stayed that same, but I think with some additions to - more references to UN level documents to make it a global issue rather than

to keep it to European. There was (consent) about it being to European in approach. And there was some consent about the word illegal referring to PNR and the (Swift) Agreement, these sorts of issues, and so the word was tweaked/changed.

And there may be some more tweaking this week by Thomas, and I just wanted to go with this.

So I think - I have a feeling that there's a need, perhaps that, but that remains for the authors to decide to update even further on the base of the discussion this week. So I would expect that maybe there would be a bit more tweaking to be done so that we include all the comments. I think it's key to get all the comments on board and that they try to address them so this reflects, you know, the whole thing.

But to be honest, there were no many comments Rafik. I mean there was not a wave of comments which came in. I mean we did do a lot of average. We had a good meeting in IGF. There was some board members there, some GAC members there, there were others there too, I think it was generally well received.

It bring (unintelligible) a lot of issues and it puts in one space really what the key concerns are. Now of course they can be debated and of course people are not going to be happy about this or that, but it's on ongoing process.

So I don't know whether that answers your question. But Bill, I want to just say that I do think the GAC are taking it seriously, I do think they understand they have role and responsibilities to protect human rights; that's what's in (Mondale).

And (Mondale) was referred to this morning too, so they said that very seriously. Brazil mentioned it, the UK mentioned it, so I think that's what they mean by perhaps a working group. And that doesn't conflict with the cross-

community; I think they're both mutually reinforcing. They're just doing their job, that's all.

So that's what I expect. Thank you.

William Drake: Okay, fantastic.

So we have a number of questions and time runs short as always so let's try to be concise please.

Marilia, I think you were first and then Stephanie and - okay.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Bill, this is Marilia for the record.

In terms of outreach, another thing that we can do is to bring this in the cross-community working group and Internet Governance tomorrow because there will be more people there that we can speak too.

Another thing that I was thinking about is to put it on screen. If they're willing to put it on the flyer that will circulate to everybody in the morning, maybe they can put it on the screen visible for everyone to see; it's not on the agenda on the Web site. It's something that will be showing only for participants, so I think it has a different status from the agenda.

Maybe you can ask if Fadi was so sorry that the meeting was not in the agenda, maybe he can give an authorization for that.

One thing that is concerning me about the meeting tomorrow is what we are going to discuss in terms of next steps. I know that we have some substantive questions. I believe we have been through them on the last meeting during the IGF. There's another group here so it's worth it to go through the questions again.

But what concerns me is how much we are to propose some of the things that we have been floating inside this group such as a charter for the working group such as the Human Rights Advisory Committee.

In your evaluation, do we think that we are mature enough even to float and to circulate these ideas out there? I believe so, but I like to hear from others too and to take the opportunity to ask Rafik and Bill and you from the Council of Europe, have you reached out to other SO/ACs? What is the motivation to be at the meeting tomorrow? Did people confirm?

And how can we share tasks in a more coherent way to push this forward because I believe that before this meeting it was not clear what were the responsibilities between the Council of Europe and this constituency here. And we do want to work together and to collaborate, but we want to have clarity on what is our role in terms of pushing this and what you see our role being too. Thank you.

William Drake: I can answer briefly the last part; we had no role. We initiated the discussion but then it was moved into another space and others were taking it forward.

All right, so be brief Stephanie, Kathy, Avri.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record.

I'd just like to suggest that those who are interested in figuring out how to promote this, maybe we can have a little offline discussion and group formed after the meeting.

In terms of substance, it does seem to me that there are significant risks in dropping human rights into ICANN. Partly, and let me innumerate a few of them.

And believe me, I totally understand the part of our Whois problems stem from a failure to acknowledge human rights and existing data protection law and existing constitutional protections.

However, many governments will immediately say, "Human rights, that's us, not ICANN." Right, that's one risk.

Second risk is that we will go off into other areas of human rights. And I think if we stay focused on what was tabled in the UN in (unintelligible) of the - what's that document called, the digital rights? Yes, privacy in a digital age. I think that's very helpful because it keeps it narrowed to the information context.

Now I understand that many of our privacy laws back home have a lot to do with intrusion as well. But I think there is significant risk in getting into intrusion in this crowd given that ICANN is not a treaty-making organization and there are governments don't necessarily have to acknowledge their own constitutions and their protections against intrusion.

So I would just like to emphasize keeping the scope narrow because heaven knows we have enough issues just with freedom of expression and protection of personal information to get going on. Thanks.

William Drake: Yes, we certainly don't want Russia and Ukraine fighting in the GAC over what's happening in the Ukraine for example. That is just not helpful to the situation.

So okay, Kathy, were you next?

Kathy Kleiman: Hi. Kathy Kleiman and I've been non-commercial for many, many years. And I wanted to ask about the freedom of expression issues.

And forgive me; I've got the report, I've read parts of it. But for those of us who aren't, this is an area we've fighting off in the loan in the ICANN contracts. And you know, obviously the Internet is used by human rights groups and dissenting opinions whether they're religious or political or ethnic.

How is that reflected and what can we do to help you in this area? Reflected in the report that is.

Lee Hibbard: How are - which groups?

Kathy Kleiman: Freedom of expression issues.

Lee Hibbard: Well they're fully reflected in the report, first of all, in the sense that, you know, gTLDs and sensitive strings and the question of how wide is the margin of appreciation. You know, can you really decline a dot sucks or these other applicants for example?

And so from a purely point of view from, you know, human rights and (unintelligible) and case (unintelligible) and whatever, you know, there's a wide margin of appreciation that pretty much should be protected. And so censoring these sorts of things for whatever reason would be against human rights law if you like in terms of coming down hard on dot sucks and other things for that matter.

Kathy Kleiman: Would that apply to the second level as well? Second level domain names and some of - there are always issues of registering dissenting domain names if you're in a region that doesn't like (unintelligible).

Lee Hibbard: Yes. I mean there's no inclusive case law on these issues. But the general principles of human rights and freedom of expression would say that, you know, you have to earn this on the freedom as opposed to the other way. So even at second level for me (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Lee Hibbard: Sorry, sorry. Excuse me, there's no conclusive jurisprudence on these issues because it's new. But I mean when you just take basic international human rights law and what freedom of expression is, then, you know, (want you to earn the tide) of freedom. And whether that be the top level or the second level, and to be too, you know - not to be too hard in trying to sensor and come down heavy on top level domains or second level.

You know, even if the freedom of expression includes putting into shock, defend or disturb. There's a particular phrase here of shock, defend or disturb. So we must be very careful with ensuring that this is protected.

But it's contained in the report. And you know, there's a lot of food for thought there, also with regard to communities and the particularities of communities which need to be understood there too and that's very well documented. Thank you.

William Drake: Thank you. The report I think we can discuss more in the NCSG visit. I think that you had that on the agenda to do that.

What we wanted to do was strategize a little bit more about how we can optimize the thing tomorrow and what we want to be pushing for and how we want to work together.

Now normally, we were going to end this conversation to do this because this is a half hour conversation.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

William Drake: You are because I'm about to say why don't we extend the discussion and cut into some of the other topics that we had for later.

And Avri, I wanted to turn to you next for your thoughts about how we might go forward in terms of doing this strategically.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking.

First of all, I want to backtrack on some of this stuff. I think we have to let go of our bunker mentality about the human rights we care about versus the human rights someone else may care about.

And I think that one of the things that ICANN needs is to have genuine open conversations about the tussle of all the rights that are coming into these issues and not keep saying, "Well gee, I'm afraid if we talk about, you know, this kind of right, then somehow or other my focus on privacy rights might have a mitigation that I'm going to have to discuss."

So one of my hopes for this cross-community working group on human rights is that it's a place where all of the constituencies with all of the various human rights concerns can actually sit and get into really discussing them and discussing them in a fulsome way mostly, you know, among us all.

I actually think that we know to go beyond that and that's why I've sort of been floating this idea which is premature I understand, the idea that was put forward by (Roy) originally that what ICANN really needs is a group of experts, you know of human rights similar to the experts at security and stability that can give a very complete picture of what are the competing rights in a particular situation.

What are the situations regarding rights. Obviously we're not talking about developing treaties, we're not talking about you know creating new rights and I believe that that's actually a piece of (fud) that keeps being fed into this discussion, the fear, uncertainty and doubt that you know we're somehow going to be trying to create new rights.

Now I think that the point is that we really need to understand rights in respect to the stuff that we're doing because we don't understand them. We have various of us that are champions; you know I'm championing freedom of association you know well that interferes with freedom of expression. Well you know so how do we balance those things? Those are the issues that we need to look at.

In terms of this progress the first thing we need to do is try and see if we can create a cross community working group on human rights and their perspective you know in relation to ICANN's issues. Almost every ICANN Policy issue has the human rights dimension and we keep making all these decisions without ever looking at the full impact. We need to have that impact and it'll deal with the various rights that are a concern.

So first we need a drafting team to put together a charter for the group that can do the substantive work that comes out of the council of Europe and other you know inputs. And then hopefully that group can also take up the issue of do we need something more? Do we need experts giving advice to the board on that? So I see that as progression.

Unfortunately I can't go to the meeting because it got scheduled against the council meeting which is you know the thing that they pay for me to come here for so I better do that. But I have asked for any other business slot at the end of that meeting so hopefully somebody will be able to feed me news of we are putting together a drafting team and we need the GNSO to contribute people to that so that you know I'll be able to do that. So technically that's what I'm hoping comes out of that.

A substantive discussion of the issues, they obviously won't be resolved within an hour or so you know and the creation of the drafting team. Once we have the drafting team then we have to sell the charter to at least three of the you know and I've gotten people in the CCNSO, the (country) code would say yes we think we're interesting. I think the GNSO could be interested though

that may be a little tougher. I think (ALACK) is interested. You know we saw from the meeting, I was following the transcript from the (GAC) meeting that they may be interested though they're a little confused about how many cross-community working groups they are and how they affect each other.

But you know so I think we can get at least three of the SOAC willing to participate so that would be my tactical view of the meeting and my view of you know let's stop having a bunker mentality, defend my right against your right.

Man: Okay so I'm going to say I think we should take up on (Stephanie)'s suggestion that after this meeting ends those that want to get together I'm trying to figure out how to promote this and get some further community engagements should meet directly after the meeting to do a little strategizing. And I don't know if you want to be part of that or not but it be certainly good to have your engagement as well. I know Milton had his hand up but did you have something you wanted to respond to just briefly?

Man: I just wanted to say that I have been tasked with moderating tomorrow's cross open discussion and I'll do so more to the mic and more slowly. But my job will be to listen to you guys and to make sure there's a full discussion. And I mean you know this is not about any particular (act) it should really be about mobilization of all the (acts) together like you're saying (unintelligible). And you know I would really like to have that - put that - I'd really like to come out with some very concrete next steps to have some clarity.

I need - it's not very clear for me how these communities interact. I mean maybe you're more clear - I'm not so clear, maybe I'm more new to the thing. So I would like your help in terms of, and other to make sure that we come out with clarity for the different communities who are in that room. And I'll do my best to try and make sure there is clarity. So if I don't make it, help me please because when it comes to the final round I want to find a way for next

steps going forward and who wants to put their hand up and to do things thereafter.

So I mean I have my own ideas but it's not for me, it's for you. And I really will not be pushing an agenda I mean I'm not here to defend the (unintelligible). Anything like that it was just an input and you know I want to step back a bit, I would like the communities to come forward and it's really for you and for the (GAC) so you know that's the way I see it. Tell me what you want and I hope it's going to be a good meeting.

Man: And can be begin to move as (Jonathan Robin) would say towards drawing a line under this? Or do we have a few more - okay so Milton and then (Stephanie), and then we'll start to move.

Man: So I'm trying to understand what's being discussed in terms of a concrete proposal but I believe that Avri is promoting the idea of a cross community working group on human rights, is that correct?

Man: Yes and I'm actually going to speak against that. I think we need to think more carefully you know you can be for human rights without having a cross community working group about human rights.

And the question is what is the best mechanisms for protecting and preserving human rights within the ICANN context. And what I see happening with a separate working group is kind of the solemnization of the human rights discourse into an environment where there's all kinds of conflicting ideas about what the human rights are. It's good to have those discussions but I would just rather say here's a policy issue who is effects privacy, privacy is a human right, let's bring to bear all of our resources and activities on fixing the policy. That's what we're supposed to be doing here.

Here's another policy issue, top level (unintelligible) or objection procedures. Raises freedom of expression issues, attack it on that basis. We should have

a general discourse about human rights and how they apply to ICANN issues which is what the - the COE did a great job of contributing to. But then we just have to take that mental framework into the working groups to deal with specific policy issues and apply them, that's my view.

Man: Well I - can I just ask why would farming across community group to sort of clarify thinking and consolidate focused discussion around this not serve that purpose.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Haven't we been through this before? We'll have our little group over there coming out with wonderful pronouncements about everything needs to be done and then the actual working groups where the policy gets made - first of all half of us will be in that other one and not in that working group and secondly we won't be you know operationalizing the human rights. We will be talking about them and talking about principles.

Man: I understand your point, I don't mean to turn it into a bilateral but just to say when in council, when I was on council when we did try to do that and say this specific policy raises human rights dimension because people from the business community were so not bought into even beginning to think in human rights terms, it was just like we were coming from Mars. And the point - you've gone beyond that. Have the ISP's gone beyond that? Have the intellectual - I mean this is the question.

If we no longer need to do that to bring a group together to foster that awareness than maybe everything has really progressed much further than some of us realize. I'm not personally convinced that that's the case but - okay now, and I'd like to have Avri respond to what you said but first (Stephanie) and then also did you have another one (Cathy)?

Woman: I'd like to respond to what Avri said because I kind of think I'd like to clarify. When I'm trying to focus on this issue it is in the context of council of the Europe report. I think Avri's talking about the human rights advisory council and the development of a charter for that - yes, and that is separate in my view.

I think the same risk applies that we're going to go helter skelter because there are so many rights that are under the human rights pat and that includes food and water and you know you name it, the right to medical care, education, development.

I'm concerned that we have a current discussion that the council of Europe has raised in an excellent way in their paper which focused on the key rights that are impacted by information at the moment. Not that information society, all the other rights aren't impacted but those are the ones that rise to the surface and I'd like to focus on those in the current discussion and not be dragged off into not addressing information rights because there's these other issues about hunger and war.

Man: I think certainly we would all want to avoid hunger and war. Valentina and then I'll circle back this way and then we should start to move towards the (unintelligible).

Valentina Pavel Burloiu: Thank you, Valentina from Romania. I'm so happy that Milton and (Stephanie) spoke before I do because they put forward some of my ideas and this makes me seem more less radical. But - yes, yes, okay, I actually think that if we discuss human rights we cannot just have an advisory committee saying that oh I can (unintelligible) you should take this and this into consideration. I think this should be by default their reason of thinking when they make decisions. You cannot just have an advice focused on human rights and then that can board just rejecting it because I don't know whatever reasons.

I don't think this - the human rights issues are negotiable or debatable. They simply need to be respected. I mean it's not - for me it's not a question if we should apply them or not and I think an advisory committee of course it's very useful but if we don't have binding mechanism for board decisions then I don't see its usefulness.

I had a second thought but I forgot it on the way and if I remember it I'll come back thank you.

Man: Thank you very much Valentina. So (Cathy), (Roy), Avri and then I'd really like to put an end and move on to other items of the agenda if we can. Because bearing in mind again we will talk about this this afternoon in the NCSG meeting as well.

Woman: I checked on the media stuff while you guys were talking and they're willing to put it in the...

Margie Milam: Hi it's Margie Milam I just - I heard - I sent a note into the media team to see if they would tweet it and put it in the newsletter and they said yes. So tell me who wants to deal with them and I'll give the name.

Man: Who has the text handy?

Man: I just emailed it to (Yana).

Margie Milam: That's - okay good, she knows about it, okay, okay I'll tell her.

Man: Will you follow-up with her?

Margie Milam: Sure.

Man: And let her know what she received from him is definitive and hand that out.

Margie Milam: Great.

Man: Fabulous thank you Margie, appreciate it.

Man: Well that's good - okay so we had (Cathy), (Roy) and then Avri and then we try - is Joy also in line asking? Okay fine.

                  If people can be relatively concise we should have (unintelligible) - sorry I was off mic. If people could be relatively concise because we do need to have a few minutes on the agenda for other matters before we conclude.

                  Thank you, (Cathy)?

(Cathy):   Sure a quick question about implementation. And I'm with Milton; we have policy issues that come before the working groups all the time that have human rights implications. And the question is on that particular issue how do we request input?

                  So for example a group called the expert working group which is one of the many groups looking at the Whois data has requested a pre-validation screening before you can get your first domain name. You literally will have to go to your local post office or your local validator and show identification. What this will do for dissenting opinions is enormous. The ability to be a dissenting opinion within your own country what it will do for digital asylum is eliminated.

                  How do you know - so it's not a question for now but the question is as that issue comes up for an individual working group and individual time, how can we go to the council of Europe and to other and say can we please have a human rights analysis of this, a freedom of expression analysis of this so that it's someone other than the individual voices in this room.

Frankly with someone more you know groups with more groups coming in and saying this is a human rights issue. ICANN could really use that input - so this is an implementation question and if you could come up with the answer to that I'd be really happy.

Man: Okay.

(Cathy): Wait I think there might be...

Man: Oh do you want to - well I hoping they could like take all the questions and reply together. Alright, please could you reply?

Man: I think there's two things here. I mean I think that you know having different discussions; there'll always be different discussions. There will be a cross community discussion perhaps and there'll be other discussion elsewhere. It's just inevitable there's going to be today at 12:30 a commonwealth discussion on human rights for example if that wasn't mentioned but there is. And I'm sure there will be others. It will just keep continuing. So you can't just one space it will just keep going forward in different ways.

And really I mean (unintelligible) listening to this. I'm very - I want to take your word back and I want to try to put forward proposals to the members - see about doing more expertise for example. We discussed earlier with someone else about the importance of having the voice of law enforcement brought forward more in the discussion on questions regarding you know protection and compliance and those sorts of issues. And may that voice not be properly heard so there's a need to do more work for sure.

I think the thing just to be very, very clear is that report is I shot across the (bow) regarding just the key issues that there are issues there to be addressed. The first one be addressed in a (unintelligible) I think. And so then people are waking up - there are five different meetings this week or agenda items on this issue that's great, it's moving.

So I mean you know basically we're moving forward and I can't see why we can't have all things running at the same time and why can't be have them. I mean Milton makes a good point, you know why can't be have both? Why can't we have a general discussion in a cross community fashion and also actually taking the policy level directed action at the same time? Why is that not possible?

I mean it needs coordination so who's going to coordinate? You know who wants to take that task up? I mean you know I'm very willing to come back and help the community, the community - whoever the community is but I mean I need your advice and guidance. I mean you know we're all a part of the community.

Man: Okay thank you, Roy please.

(Roy Vyesta):   I just wanted to share briefly a couple of observations. This is based on my time in the (unintelligible) policy development and working group. Something that I noticed is the human rights aspect and the input regarding human rights into documents always came from the NCUC. None of the other constituents were involved or interested in bringing this up. This is why I think it is very important that we have a cross community working group.

Also it's important that the acting community that these issues are being brought up by other groups others than NCUC. I can tell you that in some of these who is meetings I was the only one bringing up human rights and I was told by other constituencies that human rights issues were hypothetical. So as you can imagine I was very frustrated.

The other thing I wanted to say is the advisory committee idea is something for into the future and if it hasn't even been really discussed what it will do but my personal views since I brought the idea would be that it would be focused

on the issues of ICANN, not to go all over the place. But I'm a big supporter of the working group, thank you.

Man: Thank you. Joy Liddicoat is with us from New Zealand and I was asking her if she planned to type her question or speak it and she said speak it so let's see if we can make this work. Joy, are you there? Do you have your mic on? Joy is now typing, so while Joy is organizing her technical side let me turn to Avri who's been percolating over there.

Avri Doria: Percolating, that's a mild word for it - boiling over was more like it. Partly, first of all, in reading the COE report and what first came out of there you know there was sort of this notion that it's governments' job to worry about human rights so we want the GAC advising us on human rights. At that point the immediate alarms went up and sort of said the GAC advising us on human rights, please, let's make that a cross community responsibility but the GAC participate in as well as everyone else.

So remember that that we're talking about something that was a replacement for the GAC becoming our human rights monitor. When it comes to talking about the right to food and to shelter and to healthcare that's obviously not what we're talking about. We're talking about human rights that are relevant to the ICANN issue. In terms of talking about but it's in the working groups that we do it, yes, we're looking at something functions.

When I think of a human rights advisory committee I'm thinking of something that functions very much like (SVAC) that basically sees an issue being talked about, gets the experts together, they basically do in depth research and feed out reports that all the working groups, etcetera. It's not the notion that you know it goes to the board and then the board says ah-ha our advisory committee. The board has never said ah-ha, (SVAC) said this and therefore what they do is say (SVAC) did something, how have you taken into consideration those issues that they brought up?

I very much agree that you know we've got human rights we have to just adhere to them. That's a wonderful slogan. But in terms of understanding what the implication of those variety of rights are on our issues it's much harder to do than to just say it's a human right, adhere to it. And so what I'm saying is we need more depth in our discussions. Our working groups need more than NCUC saying but it's rights people aren't you listening. No - they need a wider view on it from experts. Some of us are experts, some of us aren't, some of us are advocates for a particular right, some of us are advocates for another right.

As I say whenever we get into the freedom of expression I'm more a freedom of association person and those two things are in conflict sometimes. So you know so how do we deal with those particular issues and that's what I'm talking about in terms of that. So yes I think I've covered my points that basically we're not trying to dominate - I'm not trying to dictate, we're not trying to say some rights are better than others. What we're trying to say is we have to understand it so that we can take it into account.

Man: I'm very much in agreement, plus one they say. Now we're going to try again. Can we make Joy's voice appear?

Man: No I was just hearing from the (unintelligible) folks and I think we - I don't think we can get Joy online unless we call out. So I'm just going to read what she said.

Joy's points are the NCUC submission is clear, ICANN is not a standards making body but it must apply human rights in its work where it's relevant. Joy says I believe strongly that we must support this survey work and please do not demean human rights discussion by saying it's not about solving world poverty as if the right to culture is not important or the right to health. These issues are relevant in ICANN but in the very limited specific ways. AG on (unintelligible) so I support a cross community working group on this at least to discuss what our community roles and responsibilities including GAC's.

Man: So we have going forward then a strategic question and since we've heard different views in this room as to whether a cross community working group is a desirable approach going forward, it's something for all of us to model and think about and take up again this afternoon when we meet. How long is CSG are we talking about this? Do you remember the schedule? Half hour, 45 minutes?

Man: Yes we can go to half an hour.

Man: So we'll take it up again this afternoon and then we'll have the meeting tomorrow and then hopefully we will bring all of this energy into that room and we'll see what we get when we interact with the GAC people. Let me try to move this towards conclusion by asking if our visitors have any last thoughts? Again the purpose was not to interview you and ask you about the report or your thoughts you know personally but just engage in the conversation. We've already had that prior step. So any last thoughts on how we might proceed going forward?

Man: I think the first thing is I have the feeling that many people have not read the report and I know that sounds a bit strange but I think people have just read bits and it's really worth reading the whole thing. It's very, very good and a lot of the questions you ask are actually in that report. And going forward I will try to be very balance and I will try to be very concrete tomorrow in moderating this session. I really need you to come up with some concrete steps. I will you know summarize them and we will - I will really try to make a big effort to make sure that your voice is heard. So I'm really counting on you and others to make that clear and I will push for clarity, thank you.

Woman: No thanks, no additional comments. Just thanks for inviting me and I will also try to contribute to your work as much as I can, thank you.

Man: Okay well we thank you very much for coming along. It's been great having you here and having now twice in a row an hour long conversation that was anticipated to be a half hour. I don't know why I thought I was going to get away with that but anyway, that's fine. This is an issue that I think animates and unites us all so I think it's really good. So thank you very much.

We have just a few minutes left until we take a break again - or until we conclude because as we - as I mentioned on the (lister) NCUC always had 3 1/2 hour meetings but this meant that we only had a half an hour for lunch before the NCSG meeting and people were showing up late and this was making crazy so it's not nice when your people wander in 15 minutes late to your meeting. So we've decided to end NCUC 15 minutes early to give people more time to get something before they show up for the second half of the day.

Starting next - in the next meeting the things, everything is going to be rejigged because the board NCSG meeting is going to be moved to the morning, right? No, it's the board GAC meeting is being moved to Tuesday mornings, 8:30 to 9:30 which is rather inconvenient. It works for them, doesn't work for us. Everybody likes to go to the board GAC meeting, makes it very hard for us to convene NCUC starting at nine o'clock if people are all at the board GAC. So we may have to begin doing the NCUC meeting later, cutting it a little bit further. It's to be discussed and recalibrating the whole schedule. So we'll look into this question.

Just a few last points then, operational points to put on your agenda. Things that I think we have to be aware of going forward. I guess I'll skip the - yes (Cathy)?

(Cathy):   I was thinking a number of people came in during the last discussion. I was hoping you could again announce the meeting details for the human rights meeting tomorrow?

Man: Okay, if there is anybody who has not yet heard, thank you (Cathy), the meeting is at 1:15 tomorrow...

Man: Up to 2:45 in room (Encino) down the hallway to the left and we greatly welcome anyone who wants to join and bring someone from another constituency.

Man: Yes, and for Californians that would be room (Encino), for Dutch it's (Encino), so Italians, I don't know what they would do with it. Okay, all good.

              Okay just to point out a couple other little operational things. The item on the agenda about the non-contract party house. I want to call your attention to the fact that this is happening, it's been mentioned before on (lister) but people have not replied so I'm not sure how fully it's on everybody's agenda.

              So we did have a meeting in January of 2000 - was it '13? Or 2012, I can't recall, at the ICANN offices here in LA of the non-contracted party house with an eye towards trying to encourage greater awareness among people from the non-contracted world of issues and greater ability of the so called house somewhat fictional being to work together more effectively. And that has been an issue in a number of contexts with our meeting for example to elect people to the board of directors and to the GNSO council and so on.

              It's often it's difficult for the CSG, the commercial stakeholder group and the non-commercial stakeholder group to work together terribly well as well within the various stakeholder groups there are various fishers as well. So with all of that in mind we will hold another meeting in January in Washington DC at the center for strategic and international studies on Monday and Tuesday, January 12 and 13. There will be - why are you making faces at me?

              The center for strategic and international studies is a major think tank in Washington DC known for advocating bombing things. And it's on (Kay)

street; they have a very nice building. And anyway here's the points though - if I could have people's attention.

There's two relevant points. One is who we will be sending. So there will be six slots for NCUC people, six slots for impact people, nine slots for NCSG people and we will have to determine exactly how - who we want to have there to maximize our effectiveness and our ability to be strategic in interacting there and we will want to set up a process for planning our participation in that meeting. One would presume that all of the councilors would go and one would presume that the chairs would go and then beyond that we can do various things, the slots - how we all hit the slots is up to us.

But there will be ultimately then two groups of people. One other thing I wanted to point out what I've been talking with staff about is as long as we're going to be there why don't we stay for a third day and do an outreach event with Washington DC based society organizations and think tanks and so on that have an interest around these issues.

And so we're looking now into whether we can get the budgetary extension that would allow for people to stay the extra day. If so then on Wednesday the 14th we would do something where we would try to get the folks from some of the prominent of society organizations and think tanks involved in internet issues to come over with us to be with us.

So just wanted to put that all on your agenda and say that you know I don't think this is a conversation that should just be taking place among the NCUC executive committee, at the same time when you put conversations like this on the members list they kind of get lost because a lot of people think well I'm not involved in that.

So we may want to set up a group or something, we'll have to think about how we want to proceed. But I think we should try to plan this in a way that we make an effective intervention there and get something of value out of it.

And I'm very thankful that the staff is supporting this, this is - we put this into - we in collaboration with the commercial stakeholder group put this into a budget request. That's why it's happening. We played by the rules, we applied for a budget request and we got it.

Okay so that's happening. Any questions or comments on the wonders of the house, quote on quote. Yes?

Man: Yes I'd also like to mention in the wonders of the house so it's became pretty clear this year that we had our procedure for electing our board representative and is abominable and pretty much unworkable. And also on investigation we actually have no procedure what's so ever for electing a vice chair. The CSG just decided to kind of allow us to do that.

So there has been some preliminary - just very preliminary discussions not of what we should do but just that we need to do it and that when we do have this hopefully this intercessional is a good opportunity for us to actually try and get some of those issues resolved. Preliminarily - on a preliminary basis myself and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the CSG have volunteered to kind of coordinate that process but if you have any input on what our election processes should look like in order to actually you know produce a result in some reasonable time I would very much appreciate hearing them.

Man: Okay thank you very much. You know I do think all that said there is a long and painful history between NCSG and the CSG and sometimes our history weighs us down a bit more than it should. I know that I have had a lot of communication with the CSG leadership including dinner in London and they were definitely seem to me ready to turn page.

There were questions about the old blood versus new blood which often there are a lot of people with long memories, previous conflicts which often made things difficult. But I think we're getting some new people cycling in on both

sides. So hopefully we can make some progress on this and we do not want to replicate the kind of things that have happened before.

The situation with the board slot was ridiculous, the situation with the vice chair of the council was also ridiculous and so on. So hopefully we'll make progress there and so that meeting is happening and again people should be aware of it and participate.

One other point then we have an election and I think actually probably - it's probably too late to start this year but I can't help wondering, I don't remember if when this practice began of holding the election after the annual but personally I think we should be syncing it with the NCSG session, it would make things a lot easier. And we could have the simultaneous check and processes. But this year that's not going to happen because it hasn't happened.

So the election will be mid - like it has been the last few years from the middle of November with results announced in early December and then the group hopefully getting put into place and scaling up fairly quickly in December and January. The election will include the chair, me, or the slot that I'm currently in and five slots for regional representatives from the five ICANN regions.

We - there are several members who have indicated that they intend to stand for re-election, there are several members who have indicated that they intend not to stand for re-election. I don't know if I should say who is in which camp here but I would simply encourage everyone to start to think about who we could put into these positions, who would be really committed to doing the work.

One of the problems that often happens is that the work of the sort of managerial aspect has increased and yet the level of engagement on the part of these have not always increased in tandem and this is something of a problem, something of a challenge. We need to have people on board who

are really committed to working together and promptly taking decisions and so forth.

So but I look forward to that election and I wonder are there any questions about the election from anybody? Or any comments of any sort? And no - so okay than any other business? We have five minutes. Is there anything that anybody would like to bring up that we did not comment on? Carlos?

Carlos Afonso: This is basically a question of procedure. We received visitors like the nominating committee and the others. And after that we go to our agenda and we forget that we should have say five or ten minutes to comment on the interaction with each of these groups. We just go by like nothing happened. We discussed with the nominating committee that they go away and we get back to the agenda. We need at least five or ten minutes in the agenda after each group visits us to interact with ourselves about what we just heard. That is just a suggestion, okay.

Man: Thank you Carlos, that's an interesting idea. I'm all for debriefing, the problem of course is time. Everything - the schedules are so compressed and of course it's very difficult when everybody wants to speak to a topic you can't even stay in the timeframe so people come for a half hour and then it ends up an hour. So when there's that happening and you're readjusting the schedule on the fly it does become difficult. But I take your point and it's something we should try to do more and I appreciate you saying that. I'll try to figure out how to make that happen more.

Any other comments from anybody? Everybody's tired, burnt out; okay let's hear from Chairman Rafik about the afternoon.

Rafik Dammak: Yes so the next meeting will be at 1 pm in the same room I think. Then we have later the meeting with the board at 3, 3:45 in Los Angeles - yes Los Angeles room, we're all in Los Angeles.

Man: The big room, okay, so that's all for new folks who are here the meeting of the stakeholder with the board is always a very lively and interesting experience and so you should look forward to that. Okay I don't know why people are coming in behind me suddenly.

Woman: There's a meeting scheduled here in a few minutes.

Man: There's a meeting scheduled here, okay but then we're here again at one.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Okay fine.

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay so let's pack up because apparently they have loaded a meeting in between our two meetings. So thank you everybody, we're in here again at one o'clock Rafik just said. So we must leave...

                                    END