

Transcription ICANN Beijing meeting

Impact of new GTLDs on NGOs

Wednesday 10 April 2013 at 09:00 local time

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

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

(Marilo): Good morning my name is (unintelligible). I'm the - with the executive committee of (unintelligible). And I'll be the moderator today for this session.

We're going to discuss the issue of the impact of new gTLDs on NGOs. And basically I would like to welcome everybody. (Thanks distinguished) features for accepting our invitation.

And what we want to do today is really to discuss the issue of the impact of new gTLDs on NGOs from different angles, basically that's why we invited the panel of experts that we have today. And the angle - legal angle from the NGOs point of view, from of the point of view on registries, so - and the private sector.

So what we'll be doing is I'm going to introduce each of the speakers very briefly. You all have very extensive biographies and a lot of experience. So please forgive me if I'm very brief. Because for the sake of time, I won't be able to read the whole biography.

Brian is the CEO of the Public Interest Registry, among other things. Also the chair of the AT&T - (ATRT-2) team.

And Edmon is the CEO of DotAsia. And also the head of the secretariat for the regional Internet governance forum, among other things.

Anthony Harris is - has 14 years of experience in the international telecommunication carrier sector. He's the founder of many entities in Latin America, the executive director of the Argentine Internet Association.

And on my right side we have Zahid Jamil who is senior partner of (Jamil and Jamil) (unintelligible) at law and also counsel to the Cyber-crime Commonwealth Initiative.

And also Klaus Stoll. Klaus is a member of NPOC of the executive committee. He's also the executive director of the global (unintelligible) partnership foundation, which is multistakeholder coalition of organizations, so also includes Microsoft, the (ITU), and NGOs, and they'll gather around the issue of (ICT) and development.

So we might - want to start with Anthony, because Anthony has to excuse himself. He has to go away at half past 9:00, so he will be the first one to speak. Then Klaus will be speaking (unintelligible) in order. Then we can go on with Brian, if it's okay with Brian. And then Edmon and we can Zahid. So Anthony, I pass on the mic to you.

Anthony Harris: Thank you (Marilo). I just love the way she says her name, I wish I could say it the same way, with that excellent French.

Well good morning everybody. I've been introduced so I won't reintroduce myself. We're here to talk about the new gTLDs on NGOs. Can somebody flip the other - to the next slide please?

First of all I would like to say just for the record, because I'm sure you realize anyhow that I am an applicant for a new gTLD. I'm a fan of the new gTLD program, and if that comes out in what I'm going to say, well be prepared.

Soon I'll talk about impact, (I will) look on this program as being a benefit in the case of NGOs. We see all over the world, there are more Internet users constantly coming into the Internet. Bandwidth demand is going through the roof.

I can tell you that for a fact because my day job is setting up Internet exchanges in South America. And we're just doing - you know we just can't keep up with it. And Internet exchanges are what (unintelligible) knows where you interchange particularly domestic Internet traffic.

The IP address base with IPv6 has expanded immeasurably. I don't know how many times you multiply it. It's staggering when somebody explained to me how many IP addresses you can actually assign with IPv6, because as you all know IPv4 is completely - almost completely depleted.

The mobile Internet access in my opinion will explode with the G4 infrastructure. I think we haven't even seen that take off yet, but it's going to be amazing because of the amount of people who have cell phones and handsets.

So why is there such a concern about new gTLDs? I mean we've gone through I think five years of battles and discussions in the ICANN with a lot - I think everybody had a valid view on it. But my point is everything is growing in the Internet, but domain names were always those 21 that we had five years ago. And so now (unintelligible).

I think to get to a point of NGOs specifically - and I apologize (unintelligible) introduction, it was just something I like to day. I could use Argentina as an example, basically because my entity in Argentina is going to become a registrar soon. We're in the process of negotiating that.

So we have been looking at the way Argentina Internet users behave as far as registrations. One of the things we did was specifically we ran a study on 50 NGOs in Argentina, to ask them you know, what domain name were they using? Why they chose it?

And it was quite interesting actually, because they were all - practically all of them were small or medium NGOs. They were very surprised at receiving a call on this, it's completely removed from their day business, because they're NGOs that are helping people or helping battered women or families or people who are hungry. All that kind of stuff.

So you don't usually find them very technically proficient to begin with. It takes some explaining so that they understand exactly what you're referring to. And usually they have some young guy who's - he's probably the boyfriend of the secretary, and he's sort of taking care of setting up the web site and he's registered a domain name for them.

The domain names - most of them are on the ccTLD, at least in Argentina. Because they do want to have - or at least they so far they have favored the concept of having a national identity with their NGO.

And basically I think that - because that's all - they don't know there's anything else around except dot com. So we found that many of them had registered in - amazing in their - let's say their NGA - their NGO name, which could be familia -- for example for family -- dot com dot A-R. They hadn't even got to the - it could be dot org dot A-R.

Those that had a little more sophisticated knowledge were a little larger entities, some of them had a - directly a dot org and that sends you a message that they have looked around and they have somebody a little more technically aware.

Can we see the next slide please? And basically thinking back on why do I think this is an opportunity for NGOs? Well we have some example up on the screen there with - have taken them from this 1900 - was 1930 applications.

And most of these names could be used as a detail (unintelligible) by an NGO, because (unintelligible) on their daily activity, like you know if they're lawyers, they've got law (unintelligible) in Spanish. Or you see doctor and medical or med for the - if they're in the health business or activities. And you've got sports names and all kinds of things there.

So NGOs will have more options if they want to register a domain or change the domain they have. And I think that's basically going to take creating awareness, it's going to take outreach, and it's going to be quite a job.

I have highlighted as most attractive dot NGO and dog ONG because we did ask them specifically if that was interesting to them. Because of course that's their name. That's - that identifies what they are.

And amazingly most of them were extremely interested. They said oh, I can have something as specific as that. And I said, yes well if it gets through you know - the application is approved and that goes - becomes available, there's no reason why not. So that was rather interesting.

Can I see the next slide please? Oh thank you. Okay so well I was going to say something about (unintelligible) - about the concerns but I do - I know there are people at the table who will address that. The - let's say the downside of the program eventually.

But I don't really see first of all - this is a favorite catch phrase of mine. The new gTLD program is not the mother of all evils, by any means. I do think that one cause of concern would be identity theft, but that's probably (unintelligible) for everybody in this room and outside this room.

Because any of us could have our bank account hacked or if we were careless and in some manner there we could really be damaged in the online activities. I'm scared of having a Facebook myself. I wouldn't have a Facebook tells people who I am and what I like to do. I mean I'm sorry, but that's my private business.

And then I think also when we think about those concerns of identity theft, I do remember the words - there was some comments way back of - from the Red Cross about when they (unintelligible) a nation's collection, there are attempts to hack into that and get people to send their donations to the wrong place.

That's true that is around, but that would never happen to the vast majority, at least of the NGOs that I talk to, they would never do something around that scale. They just - it's not what they would be up to.

So I don't think the scale of damage on that front would be all that immense. And then - I can't read this. What does it say here? Oh yes. I don't think also that they would feel obliged to undertake offensive registrations, unless they were a very big NGO, because most of them operate nationally and I would say even within the country they operate in a very small area, like a specific city or even a district.

So those are my thoughts on the downside of this. And I think now I shut up, because there are people who have much more interesting things to say at the table. Thank you.

(Marilo): Thank you very much Anthony. Very interesting. Yes of course, thank you for coming in. Klaus if you want to (unintelligible). Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much. Klaus Stoll for the record. I actually was starting to panic when (Tony) pulled up the second slide, because the title of my

presentation is basically opportunities. And I really think that the new gTLDs are huge, huge opportunities for the NGO and not for profit sector.

And let me just go through some of the opportunities. One of the opportunity is basically with the creation of dot NGO and dot ONG, we are becoming available - and online a huge, huge tool for these NGOs, and not only tool for outreach impact community building and all that stuff.

And I know for example that (Prime) if very much concerned about how do we know that this really an NGO (unintelligible). This concern is absolutely right and there will be a solution found.

I'm thinking also in the other way round. Not only that the consumer or the user of the Internet knows that - there is a NGO, but that the NGOs know with whom they can do business and how to get into business.

And one of the - and that brings me to another opportunity I see for example is that - and I'm sure that dot NGO has looked into that already, is for example cross sectional potential of the new NGOs.

Now to do corporate social responsibility with an NGO for a dot com is very, very difficult. If you have a platform dot like dot NGO, and you can really evaluate, you can talk, you can communicate, just imagine how significant that is for the whole NGO, ONG sector. There are so many facets behind that dot NGO, which are just fascinating and I think we're just starting to explore them.

And it's not because I like dot ORG or because I had some (unintelligible) as part of the advisory board. But on the other hand, it's also (unintelligible) dot org is dot NGO is a huge opportunity because we are (unintelligible) the trusted and tried and tested partner.

Just imagine if that important NGO would have come to somebody who has no idea how to run it. And that is also huge, huge opportunity because we're going in (unintelligible).

That's basically for the NGOs who want - who don't want to go into the adventure of getting their own gTLDs. But let's talk about (unintelligible) a step further. (Unintelligible) huge, huge opportunity for NGOs to (unintelligible) hopefully more rounds if there happens.

I'm always thinking -- maybe I'm thinking wrong -- is the first round failed, we don't have a second a third round, because then something went wrong in the first round.

So let's take it as the second round. And I think there are huge opportunities for NGOs to really go for gTLDs, because gTLDs are community builders. Basically whatever you do you create - with a gTLD you create a community.

With a - and if you have for example a gTLD and I can't - don't want to give an example - a concrete example, but just imagine a NGO has a nice community and gives it a nice gTLD name. There are opportunities for targeted outreach for increase in all these things.

I mean being part of the digital world, reaching everything through the mobile phone. We don't have to go there. But what is a game changer is for example, is a part of sustainability. And that what went wrong in the first round with the gTLDs and people said, oh look, there are only 26 applications from Africa for a new gTLD.

What did you expect? Do you think Africa is swimming in money and can do these things on their own? What was missing was a business model. For somebody to enter the process of - or for the NGO to enter a process to get a new gTLD or to apply for a gTLD, you need a business plan.

And the business plan for NGOs - for specific NGOs, this community building onto sell not the gTLD to get the 99 center or the \$9.99 or \$29.99 for the user, but the service is a community around it. There are real business opportunities.

That brings me back to the last half of what I'm trying to say is, but who is going to tell them that these opportunities exist? And I think we really should think on all fronts more about telling the general public about the significance of the new gTLDs (unintelligible) governance.

We can't expect anybody to understand what's going on in ICANN, but we can by through good (unintelligible) and things like that find instruments to tell the general public what it means.

Somebody said, the easiest way to educate the part - the general public about Internet governance is to make an announcement in the BBC that by 12 o'clock next morning, the Internet doesn't work anymore. Suddenly it becomes interesting. We have to find ways to do that.

Two things I just want to quickly talk about, as it is an (NPOC) event and (NPOC) is working (unintelligible). Sorry about the people who have to listen to it the third or fourth time. We're having two initiatives to do the how to.

One how - initiative is quite simply called (I-Inform). And what we're getting together this year in the Hague in Geneva and in an event in Africa is the people who quite simply interested in reaching and making the outreach to the general public and getting out the message.

And one of the plans - and we have preliminary talks, but it seems to be actually going the direction for example, do a series with the BBC (unintelligible) of half a minute like in the context of the (unintelligible) click on line.

It's - and to tell the stories. So what happens - one of the stories quite simply, what happens if you access certain pages on your mobile phone? What's actually happening? What's behind it? Everybody is using, but nobody knows. That's just one example.

The other one is quite simply we need to get applicants for the second round. We need NGO - or not for profit applicants for the second round. And if we don't explain the opportunity and if we don't explain at the same time (unintelligible) behind it, we won't get them.

So we are hoping that also in the second week if - of October I think, we will have an event, getting just simply 100 entrepreneurs together in Africa, explaining these two things, and hoping that they take the message and that have some (unintelligible) second round. That's all. Thank you very much.

(Marilo): Thank you very much Klaus. Brian?

Brian Cute: Thank you (Marielo). This is Brian Cute with Public Interest Registry. And I'd like to pick up on some of Klaus's and Tony's points and I - discussion and for those of you in the room who may have heard some of this yesterday, I apologize for hearing some of it a second time.

But Public Interest Registry has applied for a dot NGO and dot ONG. We're going to be offering those as community based TLDs and as closed TLDs, so that only NGOs will be able to register a dot NGO or dot ONG.

And as Klaus said at the outset, one of the things we're working hard on is the basis or the mechanisms that we will use to have a verification in place. We've learned a lot of lessons along the way interacting robustly with the NGO community over a two-year period of time.

At a high level, what we're offering is first of all Public Interest Registry understands that it is a registry operator, with respect to the NGO community,

that it has to be a neutral third party. That while we are ourselves a not for profit and a member of the community, in offering this space, we cannot be positioned as some kind of central point authority who defines who is and who is not an NGO. That is not our role. And that is clearly understood.

From that vantage point, how do we verify NGOs working with community data, whether its lists are registrations or referrals or other mechanisms is what we're piecing together so that we can have a verification mechanism that projects that sense of confidence that when I interact with an organization at a dot NGO address, I'm dealing with a genuine NGO.

And that is the trust benefit. That's the value for the community. And some of the things we've learned along the way in those interactions is looking at the global NGO community first for me in doing a lot of workshops at the grass roots NGOs. While maybe they are thinly staffed and maybe they aren't technically savvy, they understand the power of the Internet.

In workshops where we - in India right during that day, got a number of NGOs online with a registered dot org, a basic web site, some training on how to use WordPress. They understand the power of the Internet, they know they want to be on it. And they like the control of having a web site and knowing how to maintain it themselves.

We're very aware that there are other platforms out there. There's social media. There are ways that NGOs can get online in a cost effective way, but the value of having a web site that has this benefit of being a trusted space and that you can control in how you project your message, your mission, and how you interact with others is seen as critical.

So those are other learnings that we've had along the way. In terms of the NGO community, looking at how services have been delivered to NGOs, a recognition that much of the effort to confirm that NGOs are bona fide or

confirm that they're doing what they say they're doing with the dollars that are donated to them, comes from the foundations down.

Looking at those services, looking at those efforts, I - we see dot NGO and ONG as creating a dynamic of the NGOs up, of creating a platform where the NGOs really are building that trust factor, projecting that trust factor, things that they can do on dot NGO that will help verify that they're doing what they're supposed to be doing with their dollars. That the donors who want to connect with them can trust them.

But creating almost a bottom up kind of effort to enhance the trust space across the NGO community. And to Klaus's point too, understanding that NGOs interact with each other, sharing information, sharing best practices, a critical learning for us along the way that indeed, this is just an opening, this is a first platform. There's many things that we know will evolve as NGOs begin to use this space.

And with other organization and entities (unintelligible) exactly. So we see all of that promise, what we need to do successfully at the outset is as Public Interest Registry, offer this space in a way that serves the community, in a way that projects that trust, working with the NGOs to build it, and continue to be that neutral third party that we have been for (ORD).

And we know that organically with the NGOs' efforts, with the (France) and other partners who are there to help build that community, this has great potential. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: I just wanted to add to that, because we're deeply involved in the project as well. My name is Andrew Mack. Brian talked about the top down and the bottom up aspects and I wanted to grab onto the side to side aspects of it.

There's - one of the things that we've seen through the research that's been done so far is just how much dynamism there is in the sector. But often times,

how much leverage isn't being taken advantage of. Not just in terms of best practice, but also in terms of things like groups coming together to work on larger projects that they all have in common.

And this is one of the things that we've seen, whether it's applying for larger grants from groups like the World Bank and major foundations and things like that. Or whether it's trying to find a partner in a new jurisdiction that you're trying to work in.

Because one of the things is, as people will often tell you, whether it's disease or it's you know conflict or whatever, it's not - problems don't stop at the border. And the work of NGOs don't stop at the border.

And so we are in this kind of new world where whether it's bird flu, or it's - you know it's political instability, you've got - you need to be able to address this across a region often time. And one of the great excitements that I'm seeing about this project and what people are talking about a great deal is, the ability to work on a regional basis to come together to leverage resources.

Often times you have corporates that are interested or foundations that are interested that wouldn't necessarily be able to find an individual NGO, which can find them and will be able to find them through this kind of a platform. So we see tremendous new leverage effect that a lot of people are very excited about.

(Marilo): Thank you. Edmon you want to go ahead? Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you and so I guess building on that, myself Edmon from (Dot Asia), we are probably one of the NGOs that is running existing TLD. And I can share a little bit about us and then I'll talk a little bit about the new gTLD program.

So well (Dot Asia) was formed - when (Dot Asia) was formed, actually the - one of the interesting things was what created the environment for us to be

sort of born is that in the Asia Pacific region, the Internet community is very - has a very collaborative environment.

(A.P. Nick) and many other organizations work very closely together. One challenge though was that there are lots of initiatives that want to be formed around Asia, the Internet community. But funding is often a tough thing to do.

The reason being local initiatives, like if you want to do an Internet initiative in China or in Japan or in Hong Kong or in Indonesia, locally you have grants, you have government support and those kind of things.

But when you want to do a regional initiative, it's - there really isn't any grant funds. Because if you want to get a grant the - usually the...

(Marilo): (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: ...so that was actually the background of when DotAsia was formed and we're lucky we are economically viable but at the time we are - there was question how do we find the funding as well. And running DotAsia allows us to plow back all the surpluses into community projects to promote Internet development in Asia.

We're quite excited that since our launch in 2007, 2008 - it's been five years now and we're quite happy with the development - we have been able to actually help fund and support a number of initiatives in Asia including the as mentioned including helping get the Asia Pacific regional (IGF) started off the ground because, again, the first few, couple is usually very difficult to get up and you need to have funding, you need to have the coordination and you need to have the coordination of the region and that plays exactly into my point. And before the possibility wasn't there because the regional body is not always there.

And also we have been able to put back the surpluses into supporting the initiatives like one laptop per child so we're helping them expand into Asia sending laptop to rural religious in China, in Cambodia, in (buton). We've been helping create commons in Asia. We've been helping - we've been actually bringing young people to ICANN meetings from Asia and to different Asia Internet governance discussions.

So these are, I guess, in terms of the impact again following from when Tony started off in being opportunities and from Klaus as well. I really see this as a very good opportunity for NGOs running a registry. I think in the future, not actually always running a business not always going to be making money for a lack of a better word.

But there is an opportunity for making an economically viable platform which can then benefit the community as well. With that if I move to sort of the new gTL- that the current new gTLD will be processed and bring about another example. So the DotAsia example is what I just mentioned and we were able to help NGOs in that format.

In fact we are helping run as a secretariat for a number of Asia-wide initiatives right now because a lot of these initiatives when they start - they're not fully formed, right, and DotAsia gives it a home and we help them as a secretariat.

One of those which is a new gTLD reapplication is I guess we want to share about is DotKids. This is another very good example. DotAsia has had the opportunity to use to support it through the program. And I think what Klaus mentioned in terms of building community - this is exactly the type of, I guess, an example - we hope a good example of a gTLD that is built around a community.

The DotKids foundation is a actually built as a new foundation that is a consortium of children's rights organizations and children-led organizations.

This is something that I learned the last couple of years helping them through the process is that there are these organizations that are children-led.

What it means is that these organizations have board and to get in the board you have to be under 18 and to vote on the board you have to be under 18. But what is interesting is that through the process of getting DotKids together, two things become very apparent.

One is that the kids community obviously - I think everybody knows - starting from grade school or even earlier they're online. They care about the Internet. And what became very apparent is that because they are also involved in these children-led organizations, they're actually well-versed in policy believe it or not.

They are very well-versed in policy but once they realize the Internet governance and hear about the ICANN process they are actually very excited. They do not know that they would be able to participate. And through the process it was - allowed us to engage these children's groups to tell them this is a platform you can participate.

Not only participate in general policy but participate in the policy of something they really care about and they've on it basically 24 hours a day. because they run a 38 hour day based on the reports that I see because they are doing multiple things at one time - anyway.

What is interesting is that the new gTLD itself, let's say for example when it was Sell.Kids it doesn't necessarily means the kid has a DotKid domain. But the initiative helps build the global community and also helps it with kind of like a flag or a beacon or allows them to come together around a cause - rally around a cause.

And something I think was not really mentioned about which I think is quite exciting is that after the new gTLD it's not just about - sometimes it's not just

about selling names or is it just about a sort of technical name registered database in the VNS. It's not just about that.

It's very visible and it acts as a flag to so that the community can rally around a cause and that cause is to bring it out what they call the kids friendly Internet. And what I've been again educated about is that kids friendly is not just about kid safety. There's a big difference between that.

A couple good examples is, one is like Wikipedia is probably (kid safe) but the information can be very dense. It's not kid friendly. Imagine a Wikipedia DotKids. It would be quite different from a Wikipedia dot org right now. And that's the dream and that's the cause.

Because right now on the Internet there's tons of information but not a lot of companies and not a lot of initiatives have the mindset to have a kids-friendly version of their site and DotKids is about that and that's sort of the dream that they are building around. And so just kids safety, kids safe is a basic. Kid friendly is the dream that is being built.

And what is interesting is I always like to think is as it becomes successful just think about ICANN DotKids. I would probably be watching - reading the documents on that one rather than (unintelligible). So that's a vision and I think this is part of the impact or part of the benefits that the new gTLD the possibilities processing bring about.

I did want to and another important aspect that I sort of mentioned earlier on is the children participation. This allowed them to bring together the children's rights organization, the children's organizations that are very keen about the Internet but we don't see them around here. We very seldom see them in Internet governments form either. But this initiative now allowed them to start participating which they didn't know they could or before. So this is I guess part of the impact and part of the benefit that the GTO program can bring as well.

So ending with a couple of interesting observations of that too but because the new gTLD the program actually has some challenges for type of initiative to build around as well. A new organization for example, they went through the applicant support program for example which is with the new gTLD program but that's pretty big challenge.

As the results show though we're very happy about it. (We did get it) but overall the you know it's very challenging to look at the results out of 1900 applications and three actually decided to (fly). There's a reason for that I guess many others might be applying if the barriers weren't that hard or it's not that confusing for the applicants. So that's one area.

The other big challenge is going to be the difficulty in the community gTLD validation process. Right now DotKids are in play but they are against two Goliaths. One David against two Goliaths both Amazon and Google applied for DotKids.

So aside from the possible benefits, there are challenges with how the gTLD process is. It's a very difficult process. I'm sure those around table is probably aware there's this fixing point process and you have to get 14 points which is close to impossible. We'll see how it pans out.

What would be very tough for NGOs is that especially built around a community is that you will - it's very likely that you might be up against for profit companies that have much better resources and, you know, you might not be able to quote unquote beat them in the process.

But that's you know for Dot Kids even if they lose even if they eventually did not get it I think it's still the new GTOs program still brought about a couple of benefits. One is I believe that the group - let's say they lost to Google Amazon they would definitely be watchdog of how they will be running the DotKids registry.

And the other one is the ability that that has the benefit that it already happens being able to bring those groups those stakeholders really to ICANN and have them participate at Internet governance at ICANN and IGF and different forums.

So those are I guess part of the sharing and just overall one of the key messages. I think is it's very interesting for new gTLDs that it's not just domain names, not just DNS because it's so visible it could be a rallying cause for initiatives for NGOs as well.

(Marilo): Thank you very much. That was very interesting. Zahid, you're next.

Zahid Jamil: Hi, I feel terrible because I'm going to spoil the party.

(Marilo): Sorry, that's why we let you the last one.

Zahid Jamil: I figured. Now I get it. Well let me start by saying - yeah, Edmon heard me yesterday, right, the day before or something. So he knows most of what I might say. Let me start by saying there are definitely benefits and a lot of them have been sort of laid out this morning.

And I will be focusing and you can take what I say with a pinch of - a grain of salt because I come from a business constituency. We are views with respect to the new GTO program very much on record. We have serious concerns. We continue to have serious concerns with a whole bunch of things.

And let me start, you know, by saying let's look at these situations where an NGO is not actually a new GTO the applicant. That's one thing I'd like to focus on. The other thing I'd like to focus on also is there are NGOs who have budget reconstraints and there are NGOs who come from developing countries and particular circumstances.

So, you know, having sort of preamble that in that form not saying that this is completely wrong and they shouldn't have but certain groups do come to mind. So of course it's a business opportunity.

There's a possibility to monetize it can have great benefits but also it means that you have to have the capital to be able to start it. It also means that you are lucky enough that there are registrations within your gTLD space and then basically you are able to make money out of it.

You know, if you were looking at a general NGO, say they wanted to apply for a new gTLD. What does the new gTLD program mean for them? It means that, you know, let's frame it first. They have limited budgets, they're working working on (crans), running and monitoring just the dot com space TLD can be a challenge, getting Web hosting, making sure the Web site is up is a challenge.

So, you know, the cost of admin, cost of budget constraints and the fact that they always need help but then the position where they aren't necessarily the best of position when we have these sort of explosion of domain names that will take place. And I say, again, and I say it especially in developing countries.

Let me also sort of say that we should look at the people affected in three forms. Now the business constituents do the IPC do a great job of saying, you know, protect the brand holder. That is true for NGO. NGO also has a brand a sort of trademark but it's definitely a brand. But there are two other components to this.

There's the obviously the brand and goodwill holder but there's also the (ending confusion) because at the end of the day people get online, want to be able to reach you and whether they're confused at which Web site they've gotten to is an issue.

The third is the registrant confusion. When you go as an NGO and you want to - which TLD will you choose to register in? It's a decision. It's a very important decision and I think Brian laid out very important reasons why you should do your research but is that going to be obvious to most registrants in many other countries of which TLD they're going to register in.

Just look at the domain name. Should they do the S or not the S. I mean, you know, there will be this problem that there will be TLDs and this is something the board has made absolutely clear yesterday saying there is no visual confusion between help and helps.

That's perfectly okay and they will exist and they will be fine and according to them that's not a problem. So which one do you go for? If you go for A or S would you add an S then? And these are decisions that registrants are going to have to make at the second level.

And also if you were going to apply for a new TLD I'm also going to add that in. Do you also apply for the S just to (unintelligible) that means it's 185,000 plus another 185,000 because -- you know, there's WHO and there may be SOS, there may be AID, there may be others and do they actually have to get DS as well.

Now these are things that may be ironed out we were very clear that they do not intend to do anything about this issue. So that means for anybody else, not just NGOs, is the thing we need to consider.

There's also the aspect of the IDN space to what extent do IDAs (function) and do they work and in the GNSO there was a lot of sort of lively discussion. We had some folks from China actually make the point that (IDM), we have problems with them because when you do register an (IDM) there are variants. Variants mean they look exactly the same.

So, the Chinese (card) simplify and traditional will look exactly the same. Does it mean we need to have both? (Ramone) yesterday or I think the other day Edmon when you were in the room also mentioned there was a problem with email because you don't have the keyboard.

So when you reply you can't actually first of all see the email address and then write the email address. These are things that need to be sorted out. Again, that's a narrow area, right. Okay?

So let me come to the point that was made about, you know, whether there's a threat of cyber-crime within this space. I come from Pakistan and a lot of money was collected during the earthquake and during the floods and there were issues when it comes to cyber-crime and cyber-fraud. Similarly you have the Olympics. \

The amount of cyber-security that the U.K. put into online try to make sure to protect the Olympics brand is incredible. That's an NGO. So those issues without the gTLDs are enormous and they cost a lot of money. What's going to happen when you do go to these expanded (name) space areas. And again let's go back to developing countries situation.

You know, there is a tax now. I'm not sulking about identity theft and the money being, you know, fishing attacks and things like that. What I'm talking about is shutting Web sites down

Just the other day my country's going through an election. The (human rights) commission which is not a government-owned body was attacked by a foreign hacker using an emblem from a foreign country, shut the (unintelligible) down and there was a backup by some other cyber hackers or whatever to try and bring it up again.

Now this is going to keep on happening. In the mean time, records for election, for where to go and vote, what the records of candidates were, all

these things were in play. The election commissions own Web site went down.

So, I mean, again, even narrow sense those things get very contentious and their NGO space will require - well, there will be an expenditure involved. A cost involved in making sure that we get that right.

Now, what kind of protection can say someone who's not a client for a new gTLD that has a domain at the second level, what can you do. Well, you can do whatever basically a brandholder can do. They can try and get their name in to the trademark clearinghouse, okay, and say, well, here's my brand, I've registered it, I need it protected by an international treaty, by a lawyer something else and so basically get to the trademark period.

But what did that give you? The only thing that gives you is either protection at (sunrise) and you've got to pay for it. So it's again cost to an NGO and then all you get as a benefit is a notice to the person who's going to register it saying oh, by the way, just to let you know this might sort of conflict to an NGOs brand. That's it.

And, by the way, that protection only lasts 60 days after launch. After that it's wide open. So the question one would ask is (unintelligible) would limit funding. Would I want to put my brand into the trademark clearinghouse? Does it give me a benefit with that limited protection? Then what do I do if I don't do that?

Well, I do rapid suspension and I have to pay every single time to take any sort of domain in those TLDs out. Do I go to ICANN and say listen, I've got a major problem. I'm Olympics somebody else and there's this massive abuse about me with my name. Well, you (can) under the post allegation (unintelligible) process and procedure. The only problem there is you're not a party, one, okay?

ICANN can decide how they want to deal with it in that arbitration and the second is that it will only cast situations where you can prove affirmative action on the part of the registry, now permission or not a lack of trying to take some kind of action.

So there are certain things that have been built in when it comes to really serious malicious abuse though, you know, cyber-crime. A registry is supposed to have certain policies for malicious abuse, rapid takedowns and extensions. That was a really good thing.

So something that's really really obvious, you know, you're supposed to be an abuse a point of contact for a registry you contact and say we take it down. But imagine who's going to make that call? Will the NGO do it? Does it have the money? Does it have to contact a lawyer to do it? Does the lawyer in that developing country even know who to call or know there is an abuse point of contact?

At the moment they're just struggling with UDRP, you know? What do I do? Do I go to my cyber-crime guys and my police station or do I go see a lawyer who has no idea about ICANN and where do I go? I mean, they're still learning. So those are challenges and I'm sure, you know, you can address with some sort of awareness. It's not global necessarily yet.

And we have a problem with contractual compliance. We've seen that. I know we're trying to ration it out, we're, you know, ICANN's contract is supposed to get better. We continue to see that as a problem. Imagine with the explosion. I don't think anybody expected this number of applications.

Imagine the amount of contractual compliance, staff and resource. They were required to monitor the space. So it will come down to good registries like dot org basically, the new NGOs providing high security zone gTLDs, providing DNS sec, providing good qualities within their TLD space.

So those are the things one should look at and say that's where I want to be, I want to be in a place which is safer than anywhere else. Maybe I don't need to apply for my own but that again there may be a cost associated to it.

On the rest of the TLD - this is where I am. What about the rest of the TLD? Well, you're going to have to outsource - sorry - you're going to have to outsource the monitoring to somebody. That's going to cost you whether it's mark monitor or somebody else, people monitor. Are phishing sites on there somewhere just like they were doing for the Olympics.

And you might have to (file) with search engines, social media because if there's confusion about where you are or you want to get that message out and so it's trying to spend lots and lots of money trying to take down Web sites.

Maybe you want to pay the search engine but, yeah, it was a Google or Bing and say give me preferential treatment when somebody does a search for something. So those are things you might have to consider. By the way, remember, all this costs money but it's not perfect.

If you're in China you've got to ask yourself are you going to be blocked. If you're in Saudi Arabia, you have to ask yourself will you be blocked in your search results because search results in China and in Hong Kong are different, and the rest of the world, right?

So you have to think the engines will have to consider where they're going to. The biggest risk I see for those who are in conflict zones or the (unintelligible) stuff is whether you're going to be in a TLD which can be completely blocked.

So if I'm a government that wants to shut down a human rights TLD I take everything down because now I've got one space and one attack target. That's it. I'm done. Triple X as well. If you want to get rid of pornography triple X you're done. It's over.

But does that mean that I want to be just one TLD if I'm a human rights activist? No, I want to be in multiple places so that it's much more difficult for a government to try and attack me. So, again, this is not true for everybody, this is not true for the World Bank for instance or (IMF) but it is true for human rights (like) Amnesty International or people who want to use You Tube, et cetera.

So what should, you know, end part for instance to consider. You need to sort of work out what your issues are moving forward, there's a restructure for review of the NGO. You will have a place there. You will have a voting power. Whether you have concerns which align themselves with or you are aligned because of your interest with other interest you need to consider and to what extent how do you move forward and what if currently a stalemate space within the GNSO. That's sort of something I would advise you to consider.

I think you have great opportunity to be able to make partnerships across different constituencies because, you know, say the (BCNI) have similar groups in this area.

The other thing is be ready. There is a review that's going to come up on the new gTLDs eight months after launch. So that's an opportunity to be able to look at what's happened. I know it's not a massive period of time between launch. They may be limited statistics but you will have something to go back with and say maybe we can fix some of these things, how do we create space for yourself?

I just want to end saying again all the concerns that I do raise may be narrow in their application and may not be true for every NGO but there are true for some and they are definitely true for developing country NGOs with cost issues. Thank you.

(Marilo): Well, thank you very much. This is indeed very interesting. Maybe I would like to ask once and see if we have questions from online. We don't so I would like to open the floor for questions. We do have a question. (Unintelligible) please.

Man: Thank you, Zahid, Edmon for your presentation (unintelligible) On one of the most important things that has occurred already the last couple of years, one we look at the overall (equa)system in different elements is actually how do you identify what exactly, who's an NGO?

You talked about what happened during the crisis in Pakistan which (unintelligible) and we also have a lot of challenges too that where will (young) people get (uncomfortable) and stuff like that. But my question - all the points you raised are very valid points. They are the realities of our time and we have the public interest brand which has done brilliantly and I have NGO coming up.

And the biggest challenge with us in NGO is not about people are going to be relevant but how do we advocate the importance of it to our community and that is the question I don't know if (unintelligible) can help me on this.

Man: Thank you for that. So very soon in the coming months public interest registry will engage in what I've described as our second wave of outreach to the community in a very structured fashion.

The first wave was really an outreach to the community to test the idea and get feedback as to whether or not the community has said this provides potential real benefit and the answer was honestly across the board a resounding yes.

So we will be reaching out because we are anticipating a launch at the NGO and ONG in early 2014 if ICANN sticks to its current calendar. And so workshops, working with partners to get the word out. We have an expression

of interest list that is now open and we're publishing across all media and through any channels and we're happy to work with problems to get the word out on that front so the NGOs can express an interest in a given string prior to the launch and build awareness across the community.

But that is a think task that we in our own shoes will begin to address. And so we're working to find ways to amplify the message.

And the message if you go back to some of Zahid's points and he raises a number of very very important points, the single problem - this doesn't address all the problems - but the single problem we heard Zahid's from NGOs was the problem of briefcase NGOs and frauds to set themselves up.

There's a hurricane, there's a flood and certainly well-intended dollars are taken and absconded and the resounding yes from the community was if you can provide a verified space so that genuine NGOs -- bona fide NGOs -- you're doing us reputationally a real service that we can build on. So what I'm getting to is the second part of how can we get the word out is, "What's the message?" So, that's incumbent on us with you to clearly define what we think the benefit is. So that's the core of the benefit that we can create a trusted space that is uniquely identified for bona fide NGOs.

The other important part of that is that we know in building verification that we can find lists that we can use to identify you are a NGO so you can come into the zone. And let me be clear, we are not doing deep validation. Our test is a high level one. Are you or aren't you an NGO? Is there some evidence - whether it's a registry list or some documentation or referral from a bona fide NGO that we can rely on to say that you're a good guy, you can come into the zone. But there are other focuses that make that work holistically.

We're going to provide the community also with a mechanism to raise a red flag about a registrant if a bad registrar has gotten into the zone, there has to be an active mechanism or mechanisms for the community to flag that and

there has to be a challenged process where evidence can be put forward because it's not in our interest or the community's interest to have frauds in the zone -- full stop.

So, when we talk about how to get the word out and what is the word. The word is a trusted closed dot NGO space that can elevate the entire community but it has to be interactive. So, part of the outreach will be bringing the message to the community and asking the community what can you do? What resources do you have to provide those other aspects of verification and engage them because they have to be aware. They have to be watching. They have to be helping to make this a holistic solution. So, in the coming month or two we will have a more put together packaged expression of what is the benefit, what is the message we're bringing and be engaging very actively in outreach. So, we're looking forward to working with partners to do that effectively.

Man: We have a question from Eduardo, a remote participant for Zahid. He wants you to please elaborate more about NPOCs opportunities down the line once the new TLDs go live.

Zahid Jamil: Let me just also add to something that Brian said. For all the reasons I described it becomes extremely important to make sure that you are in a trusted space and so the sort of policy that a particular registry has that you go is very crucial.

And that is the reason once you see a trend of the NGOs within their community moving across to a certain trusted space, what you will find is people will follow because everyone will say, "This is why I'm here." And the NGO space is pretty much - a pretty solid community - it's not like a disparate -- a business community which is slightly different. An NGO community really does talk to each other. So I think having those sort of high zone TLDs, DSNX or better policies against malicious abuse, et cetera will help.

On the question that Eduardo raises - I think I addressed some of that at the end by saying that you need to sort of prepare yourself with your positions - both - and I think you'll have different positions depending on what kind of registrar - sorry, what kind of not-for-profit organizations you have. So, whether they're a developing country or smaller ones or budget constraints, we have different views and then they may like more protection, et cetera and one may say, "Where do I fit in?" And maybe those may say, "Hey, I have the money available to me because I'm an international not-for-profit, et cetera and those positions have to be sort of drawn out.

Once you have those positions, I think you need to take an active role and active participation of a GSNO. I think that will be an important area. What you might also want to consider - and I don't want to kind of burst anybody's bubble here - but in a sense what I'm thinking is - if you have the end part which is those who are interested in policies as a user then there's the not-for-profit registries.

So, who owns DotHelp for instance - if that is a not-for-profit, I'm not sure, I'm just guessing. It isn't currently as I know. Currently there is a lot of contention in that space. But say there was a DotRights which isn't basically - (one can apply for) - but supposing would they be NPOC or would they have their own constituency? And initially I think obviously there were very few, so it would remain in NPOC and their view would also be important to consider.

And then as you grow I think you have to consider maybe whether you should also have a separate constituency for that because that's what happening - I can tell you for business. A lot of businesses and brands have also applied for registries for their own brand and there's a brand registry constituency that is being conformed by the contractual party has.

So these are things I think you should consider and I think you have a fantastic (unintelligible) GNSO in the coming months after the (unintelligible).

(Marilo): Thank you. (Allan) is next.

(Allan): Thank you, (Allan) (Unintelligible) from NPOC.

I have a comment (unintelligible) Olympic international committee. Maybe I was in the wrong space to argue this but frankly I could not prove - although I had proven in black and white - that the IOC in every country was truly a not-for-profit corporation. And facing three, four (unintelligible), I was not able to make the difference between the not-for-profit nature as the national committee and the ones every two years Olympic game organizing committee.

So, of course, I just wanted to say that maybe times have changed and we will see. One comment I have is that I happen to be some times and I know (unintelligible) in Canada - and this too - and I'm using that as an example. A relative quick step (unintelligible) not-for-profit (unintelligible) is (unintelligible) and that (unintelligible) into their business development report and the world (unintelligible).

But (unintelligible) the issue (unintelligible) for the money (unintelligible) take (unintelligible) direction of where you're going with this issue. And also the fact that things can change in the country like being a NGO eight years ago in the liberal government and being a NGO today after eight years of conservative government is not the same thing.

Man: Yes, we are serving a wide sloth of countries to determine - just as you said in Canada there's a registration process or a legal process to become a NGO. There's a tax process and we are using a wide survey of countries -- northern hemisphere and southern hemisphere. And the first thrust and the easier possibility is the list base or the registry base that are available, that are open, (unintelligible) that are viable or (unintelligible) in some way and (unintelligible) examination. You just can't take things on face value. But

there's clearly a (unintelligible) or list base of sources that could be relied on to check whether or not a registrant is identified as a NGO on a list.

Getting beyond that, if there is a NGO that is not the list - and clearly there are many (unintelligible) around the world that are not going to be on the list - that's the second piece of the puzzle - and so we know there's going to be a manual base process which will require more resources and rely on other forms of evidence or documentation and it varies country by country and it's a bit more costly to build that part of the mouse trap if you will. But those are the two fundamental building blocks of verification process (unintelligible).

And again, we can't just stop there. We can do our best to build that piece but there has to be both registration community tools to raise a red flag. We know the community is very active and talks to each other and looks out for its best interest and then the ability to exit a bad guy who gets in.

That being said, where we are now - it's clear to me that there isn't - there aren't the sources to build a complete global 100% verification process - let me be clear about that. We know that. And so, we are thinking through going to market with the best built reliable verification platform with the community interaction tools with the challenge process - but how can we engage the community - because this is the only way we can do it - to build out the rest of that verification tool. And that squarely is the question mark in front of us. How can we work with the community to fill in that gap so that true - whether it's a year from now, two years from now, five years from now - we can say, "Yes, we can validate any NGO who comes to apply for an address." And that's where we are in the process.

(Jeff): This is (Jeff). I'm just going to add a tiny bit just as a small bit which is that we also realize that this is not a - it's not a one-time shot in - it's not a snap shot. In fact it's (unintelligible). So part of the mechanism (unintelligible) involves being able to go back to people who are in the community on the

(unintelligible) basis just to make sure they're still active as NGOs. Again, raise the level of confidence in the community.

(Marilo): Thank you. Klaus is next.

Klaus Stoll: I want to come back (unintelligible) to your question in which (unintelligible) ties into what Brian just said. (Unintelligible), you asked a question how can we transmit or how can dot NGO transmit to (unintelligible) of a new TLD? And I think the question in the way you asked among us - I think as dot NGO is a tool -- more of the NGOs -- it's also the responsibility of the NGOs to get the word out. We have to do our part too. We just can't go and say, "Okay, NGO you do all the work for us." I think we have to take our responsibility and some of the initiative - of course, close cooperation. That brings me exactly again back to the validation part. We can't expect and say to dot NGO, "Now you find the perfect model and you do it." We have to contribute from our part to it.

And I would just like to throw - and I pointed to that direction before - but I think it's also significant - it's not only an outreach to tell the community (unintelligible) of the dot NG's or NGOs, what is important is also at the same time to go to the private and to the governmental sector and say here is a game changer at hand.

For example, if you want to have to list of registered things, you have to go to the government and say, "This is such an important tool for you in the future - cooperate with us, help us." And I think there is so much - again, there is so much potential. And to the private sector I explained before - I mean, just in the sector of (unintelligible) of rules - but (unintelligible) for NGO. And to come back and I really hope that also (unintelligible) - and I severely hope GTPF can really help to get the message out and say not to our clientele but also to the other sectors, this is where the show is.

(Marilo): Thank you - the gentleman over there and then (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you very much. (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible) of India for the transcript. First of all, the complexity of the definition I completely acknowledge and agree. I've been working with engineers for the past thirty years but right now for the last two years I've been working under a label law for a government and you - (unintelligible) but as (unintelligible) organization that have by the government (unintelligible) and funded by the government, registered to a NGO but administered by me who is appointed by the government. So, there are all kinds of writing the labels that we can think of defining engineers.

The next point is that in (unintelligible) right now - this is mostly in regards to what happened in India - do not seem to have any policy on electronic assets including the (unintelligible). They are completely fragmented. They have dot org. They have dot (unintelligible). They have dot in. They are all over the place and before there is no visible policy for most of them to follow right now, as of now. However, there is a realization that, you know, it's almost like in (unintelligible) dot zero like the (unintelligible) that if you look to the future that many of you think that there needs to be the focus and the policy on how they should be, treating the electronic asset including domain name.

However, the problem here is when you project something that (unintelligible) India where there is a (unintelligible). Is (unintelligible) would like to say are you forcing us to come under this label? In which case, you do not want to because they seriously value their independence and they do not want to be coerced into any label which they think is not necessarily - it's not from the point that the label can be kind of, you know, censored or blocked off. It's because they do not want to be kind of painted (unintelligible) and they value their independence. That's the other point.

And I see that the (unintelligible) in a place like India with (unintelligible) the only way to handle this problem would be to have a community validation process as has been mentioned earlier. The challenge is to look at a

mechanism that is (unintelligible) and, you know, (unintelligible) responsive to consider these applications and validate. Thank you.

(Marilo): Thank you.

(Allan): So, I just want to make a point. I mean, I run a NGO also in Pakistan. We have challenges trying to register NGOs at times in certain countries because of the requirements and when financial (unintelligible) - and I don't know how they're going to work this out within sort of the ICANN space financial contributions for (unintelligible) applicants.

I think that you'll see the rules says you can have a mixture of having a private sector of NGOs -- sort of combination as well -- they recognize that but not all places have the same kind of construct.

And I can tell you that in order to - in my country, for instance, start basically working as a not-for-profit - the easiest thing to do is register a company even though you basically say that you're not going to be distributing funds, et cetera. The trouble is it's not ethically (unintelligible) under that legislation a not-for-profit. You may not have the exemption, et cetera, but the problem is that - I'll give you an example.

In order to be able to register a NGO in my country the file goes right up to the chairman of the SEC - that's just a problem in itself and you have to get really all done. So, keeping that in mind I just want to sort of suggest that, you know, have that flexibility in there. Thanks.

(Marilo): Thank you - the lady in the back - I'm sorry, I don't remember your name.

Jennifer Knoll: Hi, Jennifer Knoll, San Francisco Bay and also DotGreen. Actually, Andrew answered my question. I was just curious to know how you keep the list up and make sure that - and I was just curious how you felt about liability issues with regards to determining whether or not someone was verified to receive a

dot NGO - like if you're feeling at all concerned about being liable -- held liable in some way -- probably not relevant but just a thought that I was wondering.

Man: We have a general counsel - so those questions are clearly addressed. We do - we are looking at the questions on the list and viability of the list and how often are they refreshed and what are the criteria that we need to rely on so that a list can be relied on, so it's part of the calculation clearly.

But we do think it's important to provide the community the mechanisms to assist us as well. It's - we don't view this as a holistic verification without those elements - without the challenged process - without the ability for the community to red flag and bring bad actor evidence to bear. Those are critical, and they're critical not just from the liability standpoint. We submit this as a community based application.

This is not PIR building something in a vacuum. We had many workshops and did lots of outreach including in India and got very good feedback in consistence with your points, this is truly a community based application. This is truly an invitation for input and collaboration with the community to make sure this works.

We have a fair understanding of the politics of the NGO community and how sharp they can be and so we have to walk a fine line being a trusted neutral third party, using the best source data, interacting with the community, giving the community a role. And we think if we do that well, then it's going to be the right solution. So, that's kind of our approach on the...

Jennifer Knoll: I just want to say thank you and it's inspiring to know that you're going with that effort and hopefully the rest of us can benefit from it somehow. Thank you.

(Marilo): Thank you and (Unintelligible), you're on next.

Man: Yes, I just put another hat on and the hat is as a (unintelligible) member of a foundation in Latin America. And the situation in Latin America and some countries, quite simply is - some of my fellow NGOs in the country would use any kind of complaint service available against my foundation. Quite simply we closed as a business and as less - and there's more foundations that I can take out of business or out of the NGO space but this is for my business.

I'm not complaining about that practice because that is human but I think it points me - points us a little bit in the direction that maybe the solution should be - I think at the end the defining body or function needs to stand above that level and it needs to be above the community but from the community because otherwise we will have all kinds of shenanigans and tactics going on.

And I think that's where the solution will be now. I'm very certain it's all - as we got the GPL sorted out, we will sort out NGO and how that one works.

(Marilo): Thank you. (Unintelligible), you're next.

Man: Thank you. Again, eight years ago I said about the (unintelligible) of the Canadian-wide NGO alliance would have (unintelligible). And then I see eight years of insurgent government - and I'm not against everything -- a conservative government does -- but what I have noticed is the funding of that institution is - a good part of it of which came from the government has been reduced.

I am not in the prime minister's head. I don't know what's going on in his head but I just want to back up his argument because the country is talking about is - I guess in a dire straight compared to Canada - but it does raise the issue he mentioned of having a body that is financially robust enough that they can do that check-in and check-out, unless you have somebody moving around and checking the files.

So, probably another - you probably have thought about that but I just wanted to raise it because it's something I wouldn't have even thought of in (unintelligible) eight years ago.

(Marilo): (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you (Unintelligible). I just want to share a brief experience on when we look at them - Eduardo's last question on verification of (unintelligible) road in helping to verify NGOs. The (Gambio) is a tourist country - most of it's (unintelligible) comes from tourism. And what tourism has also brought to the country - people coming for holidays and meetings, people on the streets (unintelligible) - "Oh, I have to build, I have that in my village - my auntie has a small garden farm. I'm doing this and this." And there are a number of guys and holidays and number of women and are not happy with these hours.

And people started - this has been happening (unintelligible) times with the tourism center - and later all the NGO committee said in the (unintelligible) - including the YMCA action aids, SOS - they all came up and said, "There's something wrong here because we go to the community and we want to do something and at the end of the day something has been half done because some - as we - as they use the word, "some white man" his and (unintelligible) and they ask the boy, "Who brought him? What happened?" "Oh, he didn't send more money."

And (unintelligible) what we are going to do, we are going to put it out there - if to all the communities through the (unintelligible) - that if anybody wants to do any donation - you know, you want to work with schools, you want to do stuff with (unintelligible) - if you don't - if you come to the country and you don't want to the actual aids of the YMCA and maybe you are American or you are British or you have development agencies that work directly in communities - go to the Peace Corp for example - Peace Corp volunteers has been in (unintelligible) forever.

They have data on what interventions because since they are all over - the Peace Corp has all that data of community based NGOs that get funding from the big owls. They will be able to verify who's doing what in that community. You go to the volunteer center of (unintelligible) and stuff like that.

So, basically I started thinking when I'm hearing all these verifications talk and I want us to remember that we have the big NG who walk down a certain layer like, whether action aids or ox farm - at the same time we have - they're not really (unintelligible) international development agency like Peace Corp, like (unintelligible) who have credibility in putting foot soldiers as we call them in the aid development process and we (unintelligible) for that community in helping us use them for the verification process.

Man: Thank you.

(Marilo): (Mack).

Andrew Mack: Okay, Andrew Mack - to a couple of points that have been made because I think they are both excellent points. To (Unintelligible) point, you mentioned the fact that the government was cutting budgets and I think this is a real and significant factor around the world.

As we go through the changes in corporate finance and government finance - places from all around Europe to the United States, this is going to be a factor of our future. However, one of the things that happened with the internet is the credible diversification and democratization of funding. What we're finding more and more is that individuals are able to fund initiatives and also you mentioned this, vis-à-vis again, it's a very important point.

There are literally millions of donors in a place like the United States. How are they going to find a charity or an NGO in the (Gambia)? That's the thing and so one of the things - one of the pieces of this initiative I think is so powerful

is exactly that - that they might, through that NGO, be able to say, "Okay, I don't even know where the (Gambia) is.

I certainly couldn't go to the (Gambia). It would be cost prohibited for me to there - set up shop, learn all the things that I would need to learn - but through dot NGO I might be able to find partners on the ground - that I would know that they are real." We might - and you mentioned the idea of working with people who are already working with you on the ground.

Part of the verification process that we're working on is - a part of it is working on lists but part of it is also working through people who are on these lists - who already have a track record and allowing them to also nominate local NGOs such that we capture not just the, what they call the BINGO -- big international NGOs, right -- but also the people who are on the local level who are doing good work, right.

And so, you've got these two things happening simultaneously. One is, tremendous numbers of people - and there's a lot of wealth and personal hands and private hands now, right - not all of which needs to go through a major foundation -- people who can give \$100.

A \$100 (unintelligible) (Gambia) - you need five of those. You've got a project, right. So, this is a very powerful thing but they would have to find you and they would have to trust you. And this is part of the (unintelligible) that we see in this space.

And in terms of government spending, a lot of what we are seeing with USID or (unintelligible) or what's left of (unintelligible) - whatever's going to happen, right - what we're seeing is the development agencies are changing their role from being full stock implementer's to seeing themselves as more catalytic sources, right. They're trying to leverage corporate resources. They're trying to leverage personal resources and foundation resources and this is yet another we can use the internet for that.

(Marilo): Thank you Andrew. Do we have another question? There is a remote participant, then Zahid, then the lady over there, young lady.

Woman: I don't have a question, but I want to share with you about the situation here in China.

Just now I heard your examples about the NGOs in your own country. And here in China the situation is quite different, as you might know this or not.

I will like to give you some (unintelligible).

A lot of NGOs here were (met) properly referred as public institutions or public service image.

And we have different type of that. Some are fully funded by the government, some are partially funded by the government, and some are not funded by our government.

And we have close relationships to the government since they have to go through with them procedures to get approved.

For example, by Ministry of (unintelligible) Affairs or (unintelligible) levels.

Also we can see that as our (unintelligible) functions, sometimes we are not only public service units, we can also have the public administrative functions, that is what their government should do.

And the Chinese government is trying to put forward a reform to further classify this (PSU)s or NGOs you might have referred to.

This might take a quite long process. So for those who you want to register TLDs or NGOs and you want to package that to the Chinese (PSU)s and the public institution, it's quite important that you get to know the situation here.

I'm from (Konac) and we also applied for two applications. One is (unintelligible) (dot) TLD. That is - in English it means public interest.

And we are going to accommodate the Chinese communities globally. We're going to accommodate those who are going to serve the public interest purpose.

(Like) we are doing that in China because we are running a (unintelligible) for several years. We try to cooperate with governments, with different ministries to get their approve that to see these registrants (or these) end-users whether they are satisfied (unintelligible) as the NGOs or public minutes.

But once we get approved and be added to the (unintelligible) we need to reach out to the global community and we need to cooperate with other regions, with other registries.

And the reason I'm here today to listen to the NPOCs discussion today is that we really want to learn from NPOC what are their smart moves or the successful mechanisms the other regions have and we can share with that.

Also (Konac) is willing to cooperate with those registries or (PLD) applications that you're going to (install) here in China.

(Marilo): Klaus, the now remote participant, please?

Man: Thank you very, very much for this very important contribution. And I'm sure that (Anil) and others from NPOC are more than happy and (unintelligible) to follow up with you.

You actually stung directly into a very, very big wasps nest because, for example, we are in exactly the same situation with NPOC.

Think about, we can't register any Chinese NGO in NPOC because the statutes, as they are written here, it's impossible for a Chinese NGO to fulfill the requirements. There's something wrong in the ICANN statutes for constituencies and things like that.

On the other hand, then the next wasps nest is does the eventual list of (dot) NGO becomes a binding lists for NGOs, definition (unintelligible) at which then becomes a state function basically.

And so I don't want to even go there, but to repeat somebody already talked to you about how we can help you. And secondly, there is an internal housekeeping problem here in ICANN about who can actually become an NPOC member.

(Marilo): Thank you. I believe there is already a meeting that had been arranged between (Konac) and NPOC will take place soon.

But I think - can we take the question from the remote participant (unintelligible).

Man: It was not - sorry, it was not actually a question, it was a comment on (unintelligible) intervention. Thank you.

(Marilo): Okay. (Unintelligible) if you want, please.

Man: (Unintelligible) from NPOC, for the record.

Yes, we were approached by (unintelligible) about three weeks ago to organize a meeting here in Washington. And I'm so glad that you came to the meeting and explained the situation.

So yes, 540 million consumer end-users in China should be enough arguments to look at regulations.

I mean, we do change our charters as the environment change. And I'm so glad that Kathy is here to - because you (avert) the argument. And the argument right now is if we do a black - black and white interpretation of our rules we wouldn't be able to acquire (Konac) as a member of the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group.

But that is - I think that's part of business. And I think we have an environment now in the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group where NPOC's arguments, if they put them first, will be (listed) as well as if they were put forth by other colleagues from the community.

So I welcome our meeting today and looking forward to discussing with you some of the details. Thank you.

(Marilo): Thank you (unintelligible).

Gentlemen, what else? Satish, that your name?

Satish Babu: Thank you...

(Marilo): I'm sorry, before you start, I think that Brian has to go. So I would like to thank him for his important presentation, was very nice of you to be here with us. Thank you, Brian.

Brian Cute: Thank you, all, very much.

(Marilo): Satish, please?

Satish Babu: Thank you very much. Satish Babu from India.

I'd like to - this is not (division). Like to point out that the phrase nongovernment (unintelligible) has a history and it is rhetoric from 30 years back when institutions wanted to be away from the government because the government was considered corrupt and inefficient and unresponsive 30 years back.

And people throughout the organization - this is the interpretation that we have in India because we also have a part in the generation of this label.

Now we have to be sensitive to the origin. Although today the interpretation's widely different.

We are not saying that we are against the government anymore. However there is an (issue) that there are categories of organizations. For example, noncommercial organization or (unintelligible) inside the organizations or non-government (organization). These are actually labels that you all have but they mean slightly different things.

Now the (issue) of China has been brought up. And also in some cases a new generation organization filters that the organization in many countries do not follow the label of nongovernment in the sense of they do not - the nongovernment accentuates the difference between us and the government. That's what the label is fundamentally.

So I think you have to keep in mind that, you know, we will be excluding a bunch of organizations which are perhaps (unintelligible) the organization by calling (unintelligible) to India.

(Unintelligible), thank you.

Man: Just very quickly...

(Marilo): Klaus is my co-chair.

Man: NPOC doesn't stand for NGO, it stand for not-for-profit. That is, I think, very important. We have to, from time-to-time, reply and remind ourself to that one.

(Marilo): Do we have another comment or question? Please (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: It's Andrew, for the record.

Just to respond to what you said. One of the things that we've seen is around the world what it means to be and what people call NGOs are different.

And so the entire community needs to be sensitive to that, we are sensitive to that. You know, in Bangladesh you don't call NGOs at all, you know, except with their major internationals.

And we recognize that there are many, many terms for what are effectively the same thing. The goal is to capture all of the good people as much as possible and to create a structure that's going to be supportive for them.

(Marilo): Thank you. Rudi and then Kathy.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Sorry for being late. I just arrived.

I would like to begin on what...

Man: (Sorry), I just want you to say your name for the (record).

Rudi Vansnick: Oh yes. I'm Rudi Vansnick. I'm the Interim Treasurer of NPOC and sitting on the Policy Committee. I want to begin on what you were saying.

I think it's good that we make a clear definition of the reason why we are there and for who we are there.

As we say, the NGOs, everybody talks about NGOs. We have IGOs. We have so many structures in the world. And at the end they are all doing the same work. They are not there for the profit, they're there for the profit of the community but not for the profit of the business.

And I think that's something we have to clarify in the charter, that NPOC space for the not-profit, which is a very (clear) group.

And in the beginning I also had the difficulty to understand what is difference between NCUC, NPOC, NCSG.

At the end it's all the same. They're all struggling to have the (defense) for the user. And at the end, no matter what name we have, we have the same goal. And I think it's good that we could work together, close together, and have the same ambition in order to obtain what the user needs. His or her domain name, they (give) it, which is their property.

(Marilo): Thank you. Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Kathy Kleinman, I don't know what hat I'm wearing. So let's go back very far in ICANN.

Forgive me for coming in late. I came in a little earlier than Rudi, but not much.

I'm hearing a lot of different words and I'm not quite sure what the overlap is. And I don't know whether this is the time to discuss it, I just thought I'd raise it.

NGO, NPOC, governments, business units that often have nonprofit foundation in organizations.

I heard Hartmut Glaser say something very interesting in some session, I don't remember where. Hartmut Glaser is one of the founders of CGI.br, the Brazil Multi-Stakeholder Group.

And he said that under I guess the equivalent of .org, .br, they created rules that restricted the types of nonprofits. So those that were not organized for businesses or for business goals, but specifically for what we kind of traditionally consider nonprofit goals.

So as - and maybe I'm being too much of a lawyer, but I think of different categories. Governments are, of course, nonprofits. But they're governments and they're operating for something different. So if someone's donating money to an NGO, they might not be happy to know that they were donating money to a government.

There are these different categories and I don't know how we deal with all of them, but there's certainly an issue there. And obviously within the ICANN world different places for different types of groups getting blurrier and blurrier.

(Marilo): Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Yes, so the not-for-profit objective or category, and then the mission and the purpose are extremely crucial.

And then there's also the fact of, I think, what the issue of the government is the independence issue. It's the governance aspect and independence.

Now if you have money coming from a government, that's fine. You know, the international governments have money they gave across border to NGOs in other countries, you know, that's also government money.

Question is to what extent is that money used in an independent fashion and as a governance mechanism to ensure that independence maintained. That's the key.

(Marilo): Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Sorry, just to add.

I wrote down the three things, the nonprofit category, the mission and purpose and the independence. I think (unintelligible) had never heard it quite that way. I think that's a very useful way to think about it. Thanks.

(Marilo): So do we have any more comments or questions?

Andrew? No. We're done, okay.

So I think it was a very interesting debate. We're almost done, it's 5 minutes before 9:00.

What I would like to say, sort of sum up what we've been discussing.

We heard about the benefits and challenges and we heard - among the category of benefits we heard about community building and the fact that new gTLD program would allow communities to come together around the (call).

And also we heard about the fact that it would be a program that'll improve participation among NGOs and activists.

And also we heard a lot about trusted - about the fact that it would provide a trusted environment, the DotNGO spaces, provided that the mechanisms, the validation and our authentication mechanisms, the right ones exist and they

actually working on that. But these mechanisms have to be established together with the NGO community.

That leads us to a big challenge that exists is the cyber fraud. And it's already happening. We heard examples in Pakistan and other countries. And also some of the challenges or different labels among the NGO community, different realities that these NGOs are facing.

We heard example in China, India, and that adds complexity to (unintelligible), of course.

And some of the other challenges, we heard about IDNs and all the variants and the fact that all issues are not solved yet. And also the costs that are going to be associated to the fact that they are new gTLDs and that the NGO community, as such, is most of the time facing financial constraints.

And finally, the (issue) of the blocking, the (unintelligible) of some NGOs in some countries based in some specific regions, that might oblige these NGOs to use multiple (species) within the online world so that they can avoid being blocked and censored.

So with that, I would lack to wrap up this session. Thank all the speakers for being with us, having been with us for the important presentation, have been very interesting.

Thanking the public for sharing (unintelligible) with us.

And I think (Anil) wants to say something.

(Anil): Yes. Actually for closing the meeting, so this is close to post-workshop.

We just learned yesterday that (clear).org and other donors will fund a one-day workshop in (Durban) and a one-day workshop in Buenos Aires about

the role of civil society in building capacity for the DNS sector respectively in Africa and in Latin America.

So I just wanted you to be the first group of 20 people to go and spread the - spread the word. Thank you for doing that.

(Marilo): Thank you. We can stop the recording now, thank you.

Another add now that you...

END