BUENOS AIRES – Fellowship Morning Meetings
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 – 07:00 to 08:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

BYRON: …that's a company called SIDN. I'm sure you've been overwhelmed by acronyms this week and you will continue to be for the rest of the week, I'm sure. So, SIDN is a company that operates dot NL. They are also the company that is going to be operating dot Amsterdam, on behalf of the dot Amsterdam registry.

So we're all aware of it, it will impact us in different ways, and some are seizing the opportunity in them.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?] from Costa Rica. I'm talking on my own behalf. I would like to ask, how could we as individual fellow contribute to the work of the ccNSO?

BYRON: Well, first off, it's an open meeting so you're welcome to come and sit in it. The schedule is posted on the ccNSO website, which is a subsidiary of the ICANN website. So first thing I would say is, come and take a look at the schedule and look at the topics that may be of interest, because I'm sure there are some that won't be.

But some most definitely are and you get a sense of what the cc's do. I think that probably the best way to get involved is actually within your own domestic jurisdiction, whatever country you're from. Most of the cc's there have some component of broader work for their national environment, that they do other things on behalf of the Internet

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

community in country, and it's generally fairly straightforward to get involved there.

And that helps shape… Right at the ground level is where you help shape the policies, and the processes of your operator within country, and then bring that forward to the ccNSO. So we truly… I think the other thing about the ccNSO that I haven't really mentioned is, we are truly representative of the multi-stakeholder model.

Most of us are responsible to our Internet communities, not all of us but most of us, and it's a real bottom-up, grassroots Internet community that helps shape us. And then we, in turn, bring that up into how the ccNSO operates. So the best way is to get informed to begin with, and then I think the easiest way is to get active within the Internet community and country.

JANICE: And ladies, I know there is like a row there that's started. Leanna?

LEANNA: Hello my name is Leanna, I'm from Armenia, ISOC Armenia. I know that we're part of ccNSO. I represent dot am. And I have a question about payment. Isn't is it obligatory to pay to ICANN for a cc? You talk about a payment that we do not need to pay. Isn't there an annual fee for running ccTLD?

This is my first question. And you talked about, Paula said that you're making [?]… Since all of the countries limited within their country

regulation, is the policy you're making is an advisory. Because I don't think that some universal policy can be applied to all the countries.

Is it the situation or not? Thank you.

BYRON: So I'll answer your second question first. The kinds of policy we engage in, first off, as I said, is very limited because of that exact reason. And the type of policy that we have worked on tends to be universally applicable, like IDNs. So policies we worked on where about how IDNs would work, how some of the thorny issues, single character IDNs, for example, could be resolved.

And in that sense, there are universally applicable in that those who use their script, or Cyrillic script, regardless of your in country situation, that's about how the script works in a technical layer, and that's what we resolved in policy. And that's why we don't do policy on many other issues that we simply couldn't because we're too many discrete jurisdictions.

In terms of your first question around the money, first off it's voluntary. Today we have what we called a banded model, or tiered model, where there are a number of tiers based on domains under management. So those registries who would have under 10,000 domains…

LEANNE: Yeah, we have 25,000 domains so far.

BYRON: Okay. So, you know, like I also said at the beginning, we have registries that literally have single digit thousands of domains, and we have registries that have 13 million domains. So trying to find a fee structure that works for everybody is a challenge, but right now we have a banded model. So there are a handful of bands under 25, under 10,000 is where it starts, and it's a $500 fee.

So it's a relatively modest fee, and it escalates up to $100,000 plus. There are registries, there are cc operators who between 115 $250,000 right now today. Under the new framework, we will be making a materially increased overall contribution to ICANN.

So right now, all the cc operators together pay $1.7 million into the ICANN budget, which we as a cc group acknowledge that that is not enough for what we receive. That is not a reasonable number. And over the next few years we will roughly double that contribution, there is some wrap-up phase… I mean, these are some of the things we discussed in the finance working group.

But we will double that contribution, and the top band will pay about 225 to $250,000 a year, and those will be registries over five million. Registries under 10,000 will be paying $500, and then there a series of bands between those, and that's how it will be structured.

JANICE: And we can go on until 9:00, which would be great if we could do that. I'll say, in an effort to equally amongst four days and an hour and a half each morning get all of our chairs into – at least have the chance to meet with you and share with you, we have to cut our chairs off.

And I really hate doing this because Leslie has been in for so long, and has been amazing. And I sat here and listened to you and it was like listening to something completely different again. Seriously. Everyone, I've been doing this six and a half years, and I never leave the room when the chairs come in because I always hear something a bit differently, and the questions that you ask are different and I learn every single time.

So it's pretty amazing. You have about eight questions, I know that are in the queue, but we also have our good friends from IMPOC who have a hard stop at five of eight to get to another meetings. So I'm going to thank Byron here, and I know that the questions you'd like to ask…

Byron, I don't know, maybe I could just get, send them each by email? If that's not a problem? And they can connect also with you at the ccNSO meeting in your off time when you're not trying to chair.

BYRON: Sure. I'd be happy to respond to any emails and ccNSO meetings are all day Tuesday, all day Wednesday. So you can also stop in, check the website, look at the schedule, see if there is a topic that interests you, and you're welcome to join us today or tomorrow. Thank you very much and enjoy the rest of the week at ICANN. And all of your early mornings. I'm very impressed that you come every day at seven. Wow.

JANICE: Yeah. So you guys, I really am, I'm so excited to see all the interest, and it makes me – since you're all getting what we're talking about is that, you know, for each constituency, it's just the angle, you know, and the

different ways that they're looking at things, and the different ways that they operate.

And I've been, thank you. So the strategic planning that Byron was mentioning, is something that you can really jump into very quickly, into that working group. It's kind of a neat way to start out in the ccNSO, if that's of interest, because it's a real learning experience from a bottom-up ICANN perspective, to see who we are, how we're structured, and we're moving forward.

So I just want to key in on that, if someone is thinking, "How do I learn more about ICANN?" Don't worry about whether you're a country code operator, think about, what do I need to learn? And if you really want to learn about ICANN and where we're going, that might be a great place to start.

So Marie, I'm going to hand it over to you to introduce your team, and to jump into the morning.

MARIE: My name is Marie [?]. I'm the chair of NPOC. NPOC stands for Not for Profit Operational Concerns, which is a terrible, terrible name. So I won't blame you if you don't remember it. If you remember NPOC, it will be enough. We are part of the GNSO, which is the important part. You know, we belong to the GNSO, the NCSG, stakeholder group, the non-commercial stakeholder group, which is part of the GNSO.

With me today are two colleagues of the executive committee, Claus [?] who is the, well who was until yesterday, program committee chair and is now, I'm happy to say, that is now a GNSO counsellor. Since

yesterday, he is sitting on the GNSO council. So we're looking for a program committee chair. You can apply if you're interested. This is completely new, by the way.

And Rudy [?] who is both our policy chair and also treasurer. So we have a very short amount of time. Oh, I forgot to say hello in Spanish. [Spanish] …For the Latin American friends, you can call me Maria [?]. I am very happy to see fellow country man from Costa Rica.

Oh, I see two people from Costa Rica. Okay. For our French friends, welcome to Argentina, and as ICANN want to promote multi-culture, it's very important to work and to try to speak in several languages.

Very briefly, I speak about five minutes and then my colleague can build on what I just said. Basically what we do is represent within the GNSO, the interests of the not-for-profit community. So, NGOs in one word. So what we do on a daily basis is policy development, because this is what the GNSO does.

Regarding the top level domains that generate extensions, right? So one, I can give you some practical examples of the issues we work on. I don't know whether you heard about something that is called WHOIS, the WHOIS database, so this implies a lot of – there is a lot of privacy related issues with the WHOIS issues, so this is like one big issue of ours.

You know, because all members are NGOs, and represents… In the executive committee, obviously we are representatives of NGOs, so these are the kind of rights… We defend the specific rights, human rights, values that are very important to the hearts and the minds of

NGOs, and privacy is one of them. Internet good governance is also very important to us.

You know, transparency, accountability, so this is like a cross-issue throughout ICANN. It's not specific to the GNSO, but this is the kind of issue that is important to us. I give you another example. I was at the IGF a few weeks ago, and I had a very interesting conversation with a famous European child right experts. And he was very worried.

He approached me. I knew him from previous work I did with him, and he approached me expressing his concerns about the dot kids extension that has been applied for. You see, he's not very familiar with the ICANN world, and how this works. He said, "Well, listen, can we talk about what is going to happen with, you know, with the dot kids websites that have a dot kid extension? How can a private company…?"

And he was worried about a private organization applying for an extension that, in his view, has a public interest value. And how the contents that are going to be handled on those websites are going to be handled, obviously about, you know, some of the safety safeguards are going to be. So this is the kind of issue we deal on a day to day basis.

To give you very practical example, because we don't have a lot of time and I know that all of this information is new to you so it can be overwhelming. But basically we'll hand over the mic to my colleagues, and I'm guessing they have a lot to add. And I can see they have a lot of materials here. So this is meant to be distributed. Do you want to add, Claus or Rudy, yes you do. I know that they do.

CLAUS: Definitely. Good morning. My name is Claus. And I congratulate you to be so brave to be interested in ICANN. Somebody who is about 15 years or so with ICANN, I can tell you the most important thing that you need to know about ICANN is, it's a group of socially most dysfunctional people you can find in the world.

After you realize that one, everything is fine. And you accept it, and it's a great bunch of people but they have their issues. What I want to talk about is that what my [?] didn't say, is that NPOC is actually a new constituency of ICANN, and we are only about two and a half years old.

And that gives us the freedom to be a little bit different, and to do things other constituencies don't do. So, of our role, I see in ICANN is to think about, against the grain. And as you might have noticed, the Internet governance as a whole is in a huge crisis. Everybody's running around and saying, "Oh, IGF, ITU, ICANN, wicked." And things like that.

And you can do that, but if you a little bit cleverer, you actually sit down for a minute and think, what's actually going on, what's underneath all of that problems? And we did that. We did it for a long time, nearly two years with a lot of people, old and young. And we actually came up with what we things are the two reasons why Internet governance doesn't work.

One reason is quite simply that we are using concepts of [?] and of rights and understandings which are based on territories, on physical territories, so the ITU and even ICANN. But, unfortunately, or fortunately, we are living in a digital cyber world and these things don't work anymore.

So basically what is needed, and what will help everybody a hell of a lot to learn to understand, to work, if we start to redefine [serenities]. And that is a long thing to explain, but I will not do that because I've got some materials here. So if you want to read about it, please come. The other thing is, and you and I are living now dangerous because they heard that next one about 10,000 times, they can't stand it anymore.

The second big problem is quite simply that the Internet governance is like a country where there is 1% governing the 99%, and the 99% don't even know that the 1% exist. Internet governance has a huge problem of legitimacy because nobody actually knows what ICANN is, what it does, how it works, and we are merrily governing away. And who voted for me?

When you're going into an ICANN meeting, or a position, or you raise your hand and you think, please do me one favor. Think all of the time who voted for me? Nobody. We have to change that. People need to know what Internet governance is all about. To make a long thing short, we have a program called the I Engage Institute, which we are doing together with other organizations, like the Global [?] Partnership, with the UN.

And there are some materials over here. In that program, what we are doing is for example, when you think the concept of [?] through, you come to the point that the only way of new multi-stakeholder is not to go into another meeting, into another room, getting another cold from the air conditioning by talking, but this new multi-stakeholder wisdom has an element, which is very important, of joined implementation.

So, for example, what we then do in the institute is to get people together, small group of people saying, around the topic of, for example, of gTLDs for jobs creation, or for child online protection, or for getting a global program together for informing people what's actually going in the Internet governance. We're putting that, using that old model of putting people into a room, lock the door, and they can only come out when something, not even decided but when it's implement.

And as I said, if you want to hear more, on Thursday, we are, at 9:30 to 11:00 in [?] A, and you can – you are more than invited, you will hear a lot. And I actually hope that you will also get engaged with the I Engage Institute. There are some membership forms. It doesn't cost you anything – yeah, it costs an arm and a leg. It costs you your brain, and things like that.

So yeah, that's it. After that session, if you're interested in some of the materials, just let me know.

MARIE: Thank you Claus, we are in the announcement section parts. Before I forget, and [?], we also have at 9:00 today, our stakeholder session. So from nine to 12. So you are kindly invited to join us, it will be at the [?] room, which is in the hotel. So it would be nice if you could show up and we can discuss further, how to join us.

If you are interested in joining, we have here a fact sheet. You can also [?] or you can also access websites, it's www.npoc.org. Rudy, over to you.

RUDY: Thank you Marie. Rudy [?], I'm from Europe, from Belgium. My country is especially interested in having, for more than a year and a half, in our government, why we have five governments. So to make things simple, I will try to walk you through the less funny part of what we're doing in NPOC. It's policy. It's trying to get procedures in a way that they are implementable to the whole ICANN world.

And that's not that funny because you have to study, and study, and discuss with a lot of colleagues, and try to enter into a consensus. For instance, we are going to start a new PDP, a quite complex one is a translation and transliteration of contact data in WHOIS. It's not that easy at all, as you all know that WHOIS data is something that everybody wants to hide. So when you talk about translation, it means it's public.

And the other question that is on the table, is who is going to pay for that translation? Is it the registrant? Is it the registrar? Is it the registry? It is law enforcement? So you see, we have a lot of questions on the table, and there is a certain urgency. The new gTLDs are not going to wait to start until we have thought that we have a solution.

So we have always in this type of work, a kind of limiting time. That means that when you're part of the policy world, most of them, you have a lot of conference calls. For instance, when the PDP start, the frequency will be every week, conference call. That's the minimum. So you see, it's not that funny, because most of the time, as I'm in Europe, I'm in the middle, it's overnight.

And that's something you have to deal with. But it looks like you're used to it because you're already here at 7:00. So I would say, you all

candidates to join us in the policy world because you're used to be there in the early hours. So welcome, join us.

MARIE: I don't know whether it was a good idea to bring them with me. They keep telling you that it's terrible to be here.

CLAUS: It's no fun, but I had the first meeting today at 4:00, and we… Do me a favor, if you can't sleep because of jet lag, just go outside at 4:00, or 3:00, or 5:00 in the morning – 5:00 is already too late, and have a look at what's going on, you'll find the lobby full of groups of people already working.

That's how it is. And as the week goes on, you'll see more and more zombies like me running around, who don't know where they are, who they are, what they are, but it works. That is, for me, the message about ICANN, I think is the most – what I said, socially dysfunctional group of people you can ever meet.

It's one of the most rewarding, most important group. It is not about pretending, and it's not about saying, "Look, we are doing something," and nothing happens. Actually, what you see here is through it's real, it's decision here. Not many [?] by some companies or some group of people, somewhere.

When you get engaged here, your voice counts. That's really, really important; and that's why we have that fight about Internet governance with the ITU, UN, IGF, and all of that stuff because we have to make

sure that the multi-stakeholder model, as it stands, is getting improved and that it is generally accepted because in the digital world, this is the only way for it.

MARIE: Claus is right. We are very, very tired but also very happy and highly motivated volunteers. So you know, there is a balance to it because otherwise we wouldn't survive. So I don't know whether you have some, like, a couple of, yeah, quick questions please.

EDWIN: So my name is Edwin and I'm from Ghana. I'm just wondering, what kind of NGOs can join the NPOC? Do they have to anything to do with the Internet? Or just any NGO. So like, typical example, there is a NGO that focuses on providing good, clean water to the rural areas in Africa for instance, or it could be a NGO that is focused on closing [?] feedback loop, trying to get citizens engaged with government via open data, open government, and all of this kind of things.

                   Are these the kind of NGOs that are accepted into the NPOC? What is it like?

MARIA: We're going to give you the brochure, but basically to summarize, according to the charter, to the bylaws, basically you need to be a not for profit and to have a website. And that would be like the basic requirements. The fields in which the NGO works is, I mean, it's not really our business in the sense that the formal requirements, once you

fulfill them, you're free to enter, but obviously if you deal with issues that are very remote and not really linked to the Internet, you might not be very interesting in getting into this business.

But you won't be prevented to do it, I mean you're free to join. And also, once you have joined, the level of interaction is up to you. I mean, you can be very, very active and engage in working groups, and volunteer to be on the executive committee if there is a vacancy, but you can also sit back and listen and read. I mean, it's really up to you, and the time and the interest you have, as a representative of a NGO.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?] from Bahrain, here to represent Bahrain Internet Society as a NGO. Can we join NPOC, even if we are part of other group within ICANN? Or there is a limitation?

MARIE: It depends on… ISOC chapters, we do have ISOC chapters as members. You can… It depends on which group you, which community you belong to. If it's outside the GNSO, I remember that you can. If it's within the GNSO, there is a conflict of interest, but…

RUDY: The gentleman around here from Belgium, is actually ISOC board member, so no problem with ISOC.

MARIE: Yeah, we have a lot of ISOC chapters.

UNIDENTIFIED: Good. The other question is, I mean, for this [?], where do you think they can, if we can compare At Large as an end user with the NPOC, as a NGO? So what would be the different, or which one would be more attractive to affect them in that?

MARIE: I'll let you be the judge of this. You join both, no seriously, because it… You join… We do actually have people who are in both groups, and some of them are active in our group and let's say, passive listeners or members of the other, and vice versa. So once you are in, you decide where you want to go and where you want to be the most active. It's up to you. Or in both groups, actually, if you have the time.

JANICE: And actually, kind of reminds me of yesterday, we had Alisa Cooper from the PC, and she was saying that her peer for [Mark] Monitor sits with a registry, and she's with the PC, and I bring that up just from the sense of, you all know each other here now, where you have a peer who you are going to engage into ICANN when you go back home, or is already engaged in ICANN.

And perhaps as you're trying to find maybe where your organization, as a group, or you individually, fit, you might kind of share that. You're a little bit more interested in the NPOC, you're a little bit more thinking they are, you know, part of At Large or something, and kind of share and compare if you don't have the time to taste them both.

It's just another option of how to try to do that. We're here, you can kind of share on your own conference calls on what's happening in each group, and kind of get a feel for the pace and what's happening. Do you want to take one more? Or time-wise, okay. There is so many, I don't know. We haven't heard from you yet, let's try that. Sala.

SALA: Good morning. Sala [?]. In terms of the policies you work on, is there is their adoption entirely voluntary? Or is there any binding mechanism?

CLAUS: The binding mechanism is that everything is discussed until the cows come home. That in the end, there is a minimum consensus, and that minimum consensus is a policy we will advocate for. It's sometimes, you have discussion, we're taking two or three years, but it's worth it because what comes out of it is actually well thought out and makes sense.

MARIE: I'm really sorry, but we have three minutes. We are due to be in another room with a group of people who are going to interview us. And they're usually on time, I mean, it's the ATRT team, and they are going to actually share the results of the report with us, so we can't really be late. It would be rude of us.

And they're usually on time, so we have to run. But I mean, I would love to stay more and share, and listen to the questions. But really, you can

approach us if you see us in the corridors, you can join us at our station this morning or on Thursday. Thank you very much.

CLAUS: And don't forget Thursday, 9:30, the revolution is taking place in [?] eight, A.

MARIE: He's such a good program committee chair.

JANICE: Thank you so much. And thank you for bringing all the materials too, this is super. You know, Marie, one other thing too. For these folks to know how quickly a volunteer can move up, how fast did you move into the chair position?

MARIE: Oh my God. I mean, a year ago I didn't know what ICANN was doing, basically, to be honest with. I mean, a year and a half ago, I don't know, I didn't know. So I've been formally engaged with ICANN for a year, exactly October last year. I was admitted, and within six months, I got to a big forum.

Due to special circumstances, I got to be a candidate for an election, and I was elected chair. Not that I am a special person, it's just, I'm not at all, but circumstances, and you know, motivation, and interests, it's just an example of what you can and cannot do, it's up to you.

JANICE:	And we're letting our members of the nominating committee settle in. Very good. And you're here Cheryl, I'll let you start and introduce each other, and whoever else is in the room with you.
YRJO LANSIPURO:	Good morning. My name is Yrjo Lansipuro, the chair of the nominating committee, today and tomorrow, but then on Friday, Cheryl Langdon-Orr will take over. She has been the chair elect this year. We also have here a few members. We have Glenn McKnight, I think.
	We have Siranush Vardanyan. We have Veronica Cretu. And we have our staff persons, [?] and [?] here. Okay. What is the nominating committee? You see a box there on the screen, right in the middle, under the Board of Directors. Nominating committee is there because ICANN has no members who would elect their leaders in an annual general meeting.
	ICANN has no shareholders who would elect leaders. So instead, this democratic element in the ICANN structure is the nominating committee. It's composed of people from those same boxes. We have representatives from GNSO, ASO, ALAC, and so on and so forth.
	16 voting members in total, two liaisons through the organizations you see here on the right hand side of the picture, and then you have a non-voting chair, non-voting chair elect, and non-voting associate chair. And what we do is that we elect a total of eight members of the Board of Directors.
	We elect three GNSO, three to ccNSO, and five to ALAC. This system is, as I said, it's a sort of a democratic element because there is no sort of

general election in the ICANN structure, and the nominating committee not only nominates, not only like finds the people and nominates them, but actually we are also all powerful in selecting them.

Okay, you will be on the Board of Directors. So we are quite powerful. Traditionally, the nominating committee was known as a black box. It was like this committee of cardinals who elect the Pope whenever it is needed. And they go in somewhere, and then they sit there, and the white smoke comes out, and [Latin].

Now this… We have been trying to change that. Also because the ATRT, the group that is trying to develop accountability and transparency within ICANN, they have told us so, but also I would say from our own volition, we understood that we have to strike a balance, a new balance, between two seemingly contradictory requirements.

The nature of work is of course to find people who are willing to be volunteers, and they don't want their names to be out there at a time when they volunteer, because it would be a loss of face if they are not elected. So we have to have absolute confidentially about the names of the candidacies to protect the privacy of these people. At the same time, we have to keep the standard which is, by now it's universal in ICANN, of transparency and openness.

So a year ago, in Toronto, when our committee had its kick-off meeting, we decided that the process has to be open, but the data is [seeking] data, meaning the names of the candidates. And I think that we have succeeded in implementing that at least in two ways. We have held open meetings, which was a novelty. The Nom Com was like the public bureau, the criminals, something.

The people even didn't know where they met and so on and so forth. But now, of course, we have had at each public ICANN meeting at least one open nom com working meeting. And the other thing is that the – we have also been issuing monthly report cards for the various stakeholder groups, and constituencies that have their members on the nom com.

So I believe that we have taking a step towards greater transparency. Our cycle, the cycle is always the same. It starts with a kick off meeting right at the annual general meeting of ICANN. In the case of Cheryl's committee, it will be Friday and Saturday. The process will be started, agreeing on the rules and meeting a lot of people to get their input.

From there, it's recruitment outreach by all possible means we try to get candidates. And it's because we need a good candidate pool to be sure that we have people to select from. In 2013, experience – there were very few candidates at the beginning, and we really thought we were worried that perhaps nobody wants to be an ICANN directory anymore, let alone all of these other positions.

And we even extended the deadline from first of May to 15th of May, but then what happen is there was a real deluge, a real flow of applications as the very – actually at the very end of this period, so that we had 111, which is a record, 111 applications, and from there starts another phase. I mean, obviously we have to narrow down a choice, and that is the difficult part.

It's easy to go around and say, "Hey, please, apply. Field the SOIs and send us all of these papers." From, let's say, from May on, we have to start pruning this whole thing down. And finally, we come through

straw polls using the Wiki pages, protected Wiki pages, and also phone conferences weekly, weekly phone calls.

We come to a situation where we then we can like less than 10 people for the Board positions, and comparable the others. And finally, at the final selection meeting, we interviewed the top candidates and go into seclusion. And that is really like the cardinals, I mean we are completely secluded for two days. And after that, this list emerges.

So that's how it happens. I turn the floor to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Yrjo. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'd like to say it's a delight to be back in the Fellowship room. I've had the honor in some other leadership positions I've had over the years to come and talk to you, and I'm a great supporter, am I not, of the fellowship movement. So please if you see me, or indeed any of the people who stood up earlier, often found wearing these red lanyards, but do get a look at the faces because they are the people that you can approach and you should approach to ask questions.

They will tell you what they can. We have very strict rules of engagement with the community. But what I would like to say to you, of course, is now you've heard how it happens, and I would like to mention to you that within that grouping, you were told about voting and non-voting members. The leadership team of the nom com are non-voting, alright?

We are there to ensure that things run well, efficiently, are managed in an appropriate way, deal with the dynamics of the group. So as I've

served as the chair elect this year and become the chair, I get to choose another person. It's a leadership team of three. And of that leadership team of three, how can I do better than to have Yrjo stay with me as the associate chair?

I mean, you hear the experience, you hear the knowledge, and you hear the ability that he has to communicate. I want to apologize for, in fact, I just checked and he hadn't hopped in, and I don't think he has yet, our chair elect, Stephen [?], does have competing meeting commitments this morning, otherwise he would be here.

And it is an assumption, note an assumption, that if you are chair elect and you have your training in the first year as your chair elect, you have a good chance to be confirmed as chair. I was lucky I got through that process.   But please be assured it is a process, and it has a quality system associated with it.

The Board Governance committee appoint the chair and the chair elect. They do that appointment each year. The community appoints the others, they are the voting members, and the non-voting observers and liaisons are appointed by the community. One of the pathways to interaction and leadership that I would like to encourage each and every one of you to think about, is within the communities you choose to operate with, and might I say that should include the GAC, alright?

You would perhaps feel this is a role that you would like to play, to serve on a future nominating committee, and feel that you should ask questions of the nominating committee past or present that are here, and see exactly what type of commitment and workload it might be,

and then work within your communities to see whether or not they believe, and have the trust in you to do it.

But it's a leadership pathway, and I think you should all consider that as a very, very valuable one. The new thing this year, apart from amazingly coming forward in the world of transparency, because as Yrjo said, we just conduct business meetings now, normal meetings, in open forum, so you can come and watch we do.

And there is a very important meeting on Wednesday, help me [?], is it 11? 10:30? 10:30 to 12 in, help me with the room. Here… I'm sorry. In [?]. This will be the meeting of the nominating committee, it is open. Come, bring your friends, bring people who don't know how to spell nom com. Come and listen and come and learn, and it's an ideal time to do that because it is a situation where the outgoing nominating committee are – they've prepared and now given to the incoming nominating committee their report.

So you will hear a lot more detail. There were would be an opportunity to ask questions, providing time is there, and we would love to see each and every one of you. I'm going to stop talking and I'm hoping that you've got something to add.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you. My name is [Verik]. How do you ensure that there is proper representation from all over the world? To ensure that a community, no matter how small or how not engaged enough right now is in different parts of ICANN?

YRJO LANSIPURO: That's a good question. I don't think that we can be sure because the world is pretty large and our resources don't really reach everywhere, but we do our best. How we do it, of course, our members go to a number of Internet governance related watering holes every year. They go to IGF, the regional and national IGFs. They go to various meetings of the WSIS process, and all this meetings you hear about.

They are one of the recruitment opportunities. We also used this year, and let's see what happened next year, use the services of a professional head hunting agency. And of course, they are usually hunting for different kind of talent, but this is a good experience that we got. We also request everybody else at ICANN, and especially the ICANN leadership, to spread the word about the availability of this – about these positions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may. I was doing this, as Yrjo was saying, each and every one of you have a role to play in your local community. I'll think about that [?], I will deeply consider that. I think I did throw a little bit of tension to that side. I can change, it's alright. Okay, so only this side of the room, we only want this side of the room to do outreach, and I can even give you allocations of which areas of outreach.

This side of the room, up to a certain point. And to that, [?] has some of the tools and materials that we do utilize. These are little bookmarks. You will see these at a number of future ICANN meetings. Feel free to grab one, two, or 22. We also have clever little business cards, and this is also important.

On the business card, it has a URL, a link to one of the places on our webpage, and there are two things you can do. You can nominate, you can say, "I believe I have something to contribute to the ccNSO counsel, and I believe I would like to put in a statement of interest." I'm also going to click that button and say, "I am interested in a position."

And there is another link, which is you think you know someone who would be good for one of the roles. So you may be at a networking function in your own areas of interest, and you meet someone who clearly meets the criteria. The criteria is published, and you need to look at the criteria because it will change each year.

There is a set of established everyone has to have, and desire or characteristics, but there is always a set of specific requirements that the receiving bodies, the ccNSO, the GNSO, the ALAC, and indeed the Board, give us. They want someone who is perfect a crochet, at knitting, at sewing, and they tell us that's what they want, that's also we all rank and look for.

So look each year at the criteria. If you know of someone, or if you know someone who may know someone, you may put their name in and then we reach out. Okay? And that's a very good intro. So you're probably the best way of getting out to the edges. And you'll notice I did say the GAC. There are some rules, for example we don't taking sitting and currently leaders.

So you can't have a president of a country, but if you've had political experience, if you've run departments, that does not mean you can't if you fit the criteria, make it through the process. So if in doubt, ask us,

and we will tell whether there is a limitation or an opportunity. Any other questions?

JANICE: Did I miss some bragging rights on a couple of the fellows who have gone through the nominating committee process? So I think Leon had to move on to another meeting, but Leon Sanchez from Mexico, two time fellow, came up through the nominating committee process, and is now sitting At Large.

Silvia Lerman came up through the nom com process, a home town girl, here from Buenos Aries, Argentina. And she is busy taking care of one month old George here at the hotel, at the same time as taking her seat on the ccNSO counsel. And [?] who could not make it here with us today, but a two time fellow from Prague and Beijing, and she is also At Large.

So I think we also have outgoing [?] from Albania who has been on the ccNSO. So, it's all attainable. So I rattle off those names because it is so attainable. I know, because I read the applications coming in, 121 for this particular round of fellows, and 30 here, and so I know how unique you are, and I know how experienced you are, and I know the resume that you all have come in here with. So it is attainable around this table.

And you also have a network, and you know I stress this whole bonding thing that you're doing here, but you also have a network outside that you will be able to help this committee, you know, find those people to fill these spots. You know these people, you know the people that you

work with, the organizations you volunteer with, the universities that you came from.

So think about that when you're leaving. You don't know what you don't know and you have it all that they want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And even wanting more, as Siranush quite correctly reminded me, three graduate fellows, of course serving with the incoming nom com. So there is a number of pathways.

JANICE: I think you maybe, you stunned them. They are in consideration. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you for having us. Thank you.

JANICE: Tracy is very excited that there is a little bit of time left here because he had a conflicting meeting at 7 AM. In his timeslot to talk to you all about the GAC. So Tracy, I'm going to have you jump up to whatever spot you want. Tracy Hackshaw is a fellowship alumni. Tracy joined in Sydney from the fellowship program in 2009, and he took the seat of vice-chair for GAC at the Durban meeting in July.

So again, just reflects how attainable, it's kind of like what Marie said, it's motivation, and what you want to do, and of course, some fate and other things. But Tracy, the floor is yours.

TRACY HACKSHAW: All right. This is Tracy Hackshaw, good morning. Glad to see so many of you here in this early morning meeting. I've been through this, how many times Janice? Three, four times with Janice and the early morning meetings, and the laptops down, or now iPads. I think iPads off.

I'm one of you. So it's nice to come and speak to you now as a former fellow, and be in the position to speak to you as the vice-chair of the GAC, which is, again as everyone was saying, everything is very attainable. Just to let you know Janice, we had a GAC election on Saturday, so I was reelected vice-chair for another term, so that's good. Thank you.

So everything is very attainable. So the time I have, what I'm going to do is try to maybe unveil the mystery of the GAC, which I think has been very challenging for many of you. So basically, the GAC is the government advisory committee, which you can see on the slide, and different color, strangely enough, in that box, brown box, yes.

I don't know what that means. But it's, yes, it's one of those committees that is unique as all are, but this one is made up of governments. Anybody here from the government on the fellowship program? Just raise your hand. All right. Do you know who your GAC member is? Yeah? If not, and your country is not on the GAC, probably is a good time to either [agitate] your whole government to represent,

or even yourself if you are interested, and ask them if you can represent on the GAC in future meetings.

The GAC has a seat of support for several people, I think it's 13, it's quite a lot, from developing countries. The same criteria that the fellowship uses, so [?] Janice and I will [?] new criteria, so that's very welcoming. So the GAC has 100 and, if I'm not mistaken, 130 countries now, and several countries coming into the GAC are from the developing countries, from [?], the Caribbean,.

I'm from the Caribbean, by the way, Trinidad and Tobago. [?] Jamaica here, so Jamaica. It's my colleague. Anybody else from the Caribbean here? Dominic, excellent, fantastic. And Dominic has just joined the GAC by the way. Yes, and he's not here unfortunately in the meeting, but he's here.

Okay. So about the GAC. So I'm trying to make it seem that the GAC is not, you know, it's a friendly place. And you may have heard all of these stories about what the GAC is doing in closed meetings, and you can't come in, and so on. So I'm here to tell you, certainly from this meeting, we've opened all the meetings except for two.

So all of the meetings are open, except for the ones that are explicitly closed, which will be a prep meeting for the Board today, just before the Board meeting. So the entire meeting is open to the – so feel free to visit if you haven't done so before. And the communique drafting, which is normally closed anyhow, and that's on Wednesday from about 2:00, so the morning session is open as well.

And what you find in the GAC meetings is that they will be, and especially today, the community comes a lot to speak to us and to develop questions. So today we have several reports from the ATRT here, ATRT 2 regular reporting. We have the Board GAC meeting which is the most popular meeting in the ICANN agenda actually.

Because I sit on the meeting strategy working group, which is another group that is setup within ICANN, [?] for all the meetings, and the GAC Board meeting is the most popular meeting, in relation to, of course, the open forum and the opening ceremony. So the most popular meeting is the Board GAC meeting.

It's generally very entertaining [?], and a lot of things can get resolved or not resolved as the case would be in that meeting. So the GAC meets three times a year, it meets along with the ICANN meetings. Representatives of the GAC are official representatives from the government, so you have to… To be a GAC member, you have to have a letter to send to the GAC chair, nominating you as the GAC representative from your government.

So you can't just walk into a GAC meeting and be a GAC member, unfortunately. You have to be an official government representative. And the GAC sees itself as the body which has to the public policy issues. What does that mean? I know all of the committees have the same thinking, but because we are governments, and I'm trying to speak as a government representative here, in the area of politics the government represents the interests of all, and the government generally are elected by the people.

So, if we use that theory, in most democratic states, you will find that theoretically the GAC members do represent the public interest and represent public policy from that perspective, and attempt to represent all interests of business, civil society, academia, etc., etc. And believe it or not, that does happen in the GAC meetings, but you can imagine, that itself creates its own issues.

So when you're representing all of those interests in one forum to discuss certain issues, you tend to find a lot of conflict, a lot of discussion in the meetings that will generally result in very long debate about what should go into a communique, or the response, and the negotiating of text and so on.

So if you wanted to see an UN style meeting in action, come to a GAC meeting, because you would see a variance of what the UN does, not as official, but certainly along those lines in negotiating meeting countries. You will see different regions, past meeting and representing the regional interests. You would see even regions working together to represent a collective interest, and represent that thinking.

And you'll also see, in many cases, quite unique perspectives brought by developing countries on topic that you'd be surprised to hear what an African nation would have to say on a particular issue and in response, what an European nation might say, and the interests may divert dramatically. So in terms of that kind of thinking, if you're interested in that kind of work, it's very, very healthy to get a healthy discussion and I'm very happy to get involved in that, and be in the vice chair in that discussion.

The GAC operates very formally on operating principles. The GAC website is GAC dot ICANN dot org, and it has gotten very open with its documents recently. So we have things, we have all the communiques posted there, and so a very rich repository of information, for those who are interested in what the GAC has been doing.

But also recently, [?]. So what the GAC does, like the other advisory committees, it provides advice so it's not a policy making body per se in the scheme of things, as the SOs are, but they are advisory. Now, in the case of the GAC, the Board has to review GAC advice in a certain way, and the bylaws allow for that.

As a matter of fact, if the Board has to reject GAC advice, it has to be done formally, with reason, and if it's rejecting it, there will be a procedure thereafter the rejection to come to another arrangement, the consensus or compromise as to why that was rejected and perhaps what the next step forward is.

So it's very formal. So GAC advice is very important in the whole scheme of the ICANN world. So when you see the GAC register advice, the actual advice means that what the GAC is saying is effectively supposedly driving ICANN policy in the scheme of things. So for the new gTLD program, almost the entire program now is resting with the GAC in terms of the last steps of those extensions that are outstanding.

And if you look now at the register, you'll see exactly what's outstanding and what else you need to deal with in terms of contiguous strings like [?] dot amazon, and dot [?], and dot Islam, and those strings, they are all sitting a last step in the GAC and moving out to the Board to be discussed.

So you, yeah.

JANICE: Yeah, you can see me looking at you saying, "I think we're finished." So we were able to slip Tracy in since we were conflicted at seven. Bill Drake is here from the NCUC, so I do want to respect his time too. Tracy thank you so very much. And if there is anybody who is available in the hallways, and coffee breaks, and beer breaks, and all of that kind of stuff, it's Tracy.

That's why his voice is so coarse right now. He makes himself available to everybody. So as you said, the meetings are open. I remember going to my first GAC Board meeting in Brussels, and the room was too small because it became so packed, it was rings of people coming around, so we learned to make a larger room space for it.

But it's a great opportunity that you would have again, pick those things that face to face, you might not have an opportunity. You can hear the recording later of other meetings, but those that you won't get the chance to really see the faces of the people expressing their passion, and their cause, select wisely. And Tracy, thank you so much.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Sure. So 9 AM in the room downstairs, it's [?], GAC meeting it begins. Alright, thanks a lot, bye.

BILL DRAKE: Good morning everybody. My name is Bill Drake. I'm the chair of the non-commercial users constituency. I have some nice little flyers here

for you.   Could I see hands, how many people on this side speak Spanish?   Two, I would appreciate that.   And how many on this side? Boy, we don't have a lot of Spanish speakers.   Well, all right, then I guess I'll mostly pass around the English.

Could you do that?   Here's a few Spanish.   So, I'll tell you a little bit about NCUC.   Unfortunately, I have a three and a half hour meeting to run at 9:00, it's constituency day, and for us it's always a rather full schedule so we're pretty packed today.

So I'm going to have to get out of here promptly and go do that.   I understand that you've already heard from [?] about the NCSG, the stakeholder group that we are part of, right?

JANICE: Bill, actually I misspoke on that.   She talked to me to speak about it, because she had to leave, so if you could start with that, that would be great.

BILL DRAKE: Okay. Have the heard from NPOC?

JANICE: Yes they have, they were just here this morning.

BILL DRAKE: Okay, fine.   So, you know that basically the generic name supporting organization is the part of ICANN that manages the policy development process for generic top level domains, dot com, dot org, not the ccTLDs,

but the other ones. And that it is organized into four stakeholder groups.

There is the registries, the registrars, and they together form the contracted party house, that is to say, the parties that are under contract with ICANN and hence regulated, effectively by ICANN. And then on the other side, we have a non-contracted party house that represents users of different kinds, and there is two stakeholder groups there.

One is the commercial stakeholder group, which represents businesses and includes intellectual property interests, business constituency, and the Internet service providers. And then on the other side, we have the noncommercial stakeholder group. The NCSG was born, I guess it was – and I should remember – 2010? I think it was. 2010 or 2011. And effectively it groups two constituencies, NCUC, that's us, and NPOC who you've heard from before.

Actually in a weird…

JANICE: And Bill, I know you're trying to rush through it, but…

BILL DRAKE: I will speak more slowly.

JANICE: Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: So, NCUC was created at the onset of ICANN as the place for civil global society, thank you very much, participants in the process to try to advance public interest objectives within the GNSO process. And NCUC so then is basically about as old as ICANN. However, in 2010, I guess it was, when the GNSO was reorganized into this current structure, we had to have the stakeholder group rather than just the constituency.

So the stakeholder group was created basically, mostly out of NCUC, but the NPOC people joined and formed a new constituency alongside us. So we've been here from the beginning. And we have about 300 members, about 85 organizational members and 220 something, I think, individuals. One of the important things to know about NCUC relative to some other groups that you may have heard about throughout this experience, is that it is a place that individuals can join.

You don't have to be a representative of an organization in order to be a member of NCUC. Now, what is NCUC about? Basically, our main focus from the beginning has been the promotion of civil liberties and human rights effectively. It has been a longstanding interest in particular, on issues of freedom of expression, privacy, access to knowledge, things like that.

Over time, the focus of NCUC has grown in parallel with the developments within ICANN itself. So that the agenda of the things that we focus on has expanded to include a lot of issues pertaining to, for example, the concerns of developing countries in the GNSO process, the broader global Internet governance arrangements, and policy frameworks pertaining to that. Many of us have been deeply involved from the beginning on the world summit on the information society, the

creation of the Internet governance forum, and all of those kinds of activities that go on under the United Nations rubric.

So basically, it has been a place that has been discerned with a range of sort of public interests type issues here. And you can see, in our little snazzy brochure, a few other examples of the kinds of things that we've been particularly concerned with. As we say here, I don't have my reading glasses on, protecting noncommercial users diversity and consumer choice, human rights, freedom of expression, privacy, access to knowledge, development, multilingual Internet, global Internet governance.

That's a pretty representative sample of our interests. I haven't had enough coffee today, so I don't really recall. Did I already say that about two-thirds of our members are from outside the United States? No, I did not, so there we go. So, it's a very international or global organization. We have many members around the world, and it's probably, I would guess – maybe NPOC is the same, I'm not sure.

It's certainly one of the very few places in ICANN where people from the US are in a minority. So, that's one of our definitive characteristics I suppose. And on the many of the particular kinds of issues that have been faced, come up in the GNSO. We have pushed for, essentially, trying to build in protections, in a process that otherwise would be very much driven solely by the contracted parties who seek to expand the domain space and have as much freedom as they want, quite naturally, to be able to sell domain names and manage domain names as they please, on the one hand.

And the commercial interests, the intellectual property folks, trademark issues, and so on, on the other. So we often find ourselves in a curious alignments in the GNSO process, because sometimes we agree with the registries against the registrars and commercial stakeholder groups. Sometimes we agree with the registrars against the registries and the commercial stakeholder groups. Sometimes we agree with the commercial stakeholder and not contracted parties.

So this is very characteristic of the GNSO in general. Shifting geometry of interests and alignments and votes on issues. Now of course, I think you understand that in the NCSG, well in the GNSO generally, the different groups of the GNSO, the stakeholder groups, elect members to the GNSO council. The GNSO council is the coordination body that manages the overall policy development process.

But much of the real work that is done on domain name issues actually is done in working groups of the community. So those working groups will develop a proposal on something, and they get language that they've worked out amongst themselves, often with great difficulty, and sometimes they don't actually succeed, they come back with split kind of positions or incoherent positions, and then those come up to the GNSO.

And it's at the GNSO level then in voting occurs where we actually would adopt formal motions that would say, "Okay, the work that has come from this working group, we will adopt this as the GNSO's official policy." Which then, of course, goes to the Board, and the Board decides what they want to do.

And sometimes the Board decides that it doesn't like what the GNSO did, and does something else which makes some people unhappy because there are specific provisions in the bylaws about the conditions under which the Board should really follow the GNSO. It has to do with voting thresholds and things like this, I won't bore you.

Normally speaking, fi there is a strong consensus in the GNSO community, and the GNSO council which reflects that community, for a policy, that policy nominally should be adopted by ICANN. Now, in some cases, as I say, the Board may think we've done the wrong thing, and there is certain provisions that allow them then to say, "Well, you've got to do something else."

There has been concern in recent years about a trend that many people perceive that this bottom up process, which is very much what the GNSO is, of aggregated the interests and perspectives of people in the community and then percolating them up into working group outputs, and then motions adopted by the council, is being subverted or bypassed by decisions taken by the Board, and/or the GAC.

And this has happened on a number of occasions recently, and this has been the source of great disquiet to people who believe that the whole fundamental nature of the multi-stakeholder process that we champion, when we go around the world with not only in ICANN meetings, but in UN's context and so on, is the very point that it is bottom up.

It is supposed to reflect the views of the community. So if the community comes together on a position, and then says, "We think it should be X." And then the GAC comes in and tells the Board, "We don't like that. We want something else." And the Board goes off and

says, "Okay, we're going to do that because we want to accommodate the GAC," or some other interest, powerful interests sometimes work behind the scenes, then the process is subverted.

So that's an ongoing issue and a source of tension within ICANN, but of course this is entirely natural. When people sometimes say that the process is in some respects broken, because the GNSO works slowly, or comes up with divided views, or comes up with something that the governments don't like, or whatever, I think it has to be borne in mind, that's reflecting the interests of the people who are actually out there in the broader Internet governance environment, and that's quite natural that we have different perspectives.

So you know, the intellectual property interests that come together in the intellectual property constituency are going to push for very strong and expansive trademark protections, because that's what's in their interests. And because we believe in access to knowledge, and not having excessive, in our view, trademark protection, we're going to push back and advocate the opposite.

And it's through the multi-stakeholder process that these ideas get fought out and some consensus is going to get reached or not. So, the fact that there are, both within the GNSO and within ICANN more generally, strong differences of view, doesn't, I think, is not really troubling. It's to be expected and it's an adequate reflection of the real world, the real world is where people have different interests depending on where….

There is an expression in American politics, where you stand is where you sit. And depending on what where you work and what's your

perspective is, then you're going to advocate different positions. So, that's effectively, the main point about NCUC. Now, normally when I've met with the fellows in the past, one of the first questions that people have asked all of the time is, what's the difference between NCUC and At Large?

And because I know that you hear from a number of different groups that come around and say, "This is what we do, please join us." So, and At Large might sound somewhat similar in some respects. So just to be clear about this, I'm involved in the At Large side as well. I've been on the Board of Directors of the European At Large organization for five years.

They simply perform different functions within the ICANN structure. At Large represents users generally, both business users and noncommercial users. But on the full range of ICANN issues, they're not limited to the GNSO, they nominally have a broad ambit that pertains to….

They can give advice to the Board on any range of matters, whether it's security or something else. Whereas we're focused on the GNSO process. So that's the first difference. A second difference between the two would be in At Large, in the At Large environment, you can join as an individual, and be on the list and express views, but actually the way voting and decisions are done, you have the five different regional At Large organizations, which each involve a number of organizational members.

And, I think, in NARALO, the North American one, individuals can join, but I think in all the other ones, it's only organizational members. We in

NARALO have been trying to figure out how to accommodate individuals, and we're having an ongoing discussion about creating a special At Large structure that would represent our individual members, like me, so that they would have one vote along the other 25 organizational members within European At Large.

But, again, the point is that in terms of having a direct input into how the group is managed, and so on. For example, in our case, NCUC, we have elections that involve the whole community. In fact, we're having an election right now. And over the next two weeks, we will put in place, I think, a new executive committee. With representatives, by the way, I should point out we have representatives of each of the five ICANN regions, as well as the chair, which is me.

And in the context of At Large… So there is a direct linkage there between the individual member's perspective and what they think should be done, and who they vote for, and they can provide direct input into what our decisions will be, etc. Whereas, in the At Large context, the ALAC group is a bit separate from the individual membership and there is not as tight a linkage there.

So, that's that question. And now, I have 10 minutes that I can take questions if anybody has any, and then I run off to do my constituency meeting. So fantastic, love to see hands. Please introduce yourself when you speak. Yes, we'll start with, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: My name is [?] from [?]. I mean, when we see the interests that you present, I can probably see that they are competing with the interests of

the commercial group or the commercial constituency. For instance, you mention the privacy and that [?] compete with the intellectual property and with organizations that collect information.

So, particularly with the resource and expertise of the commission constituencies can afford, how much is it a challenge for your group to come up with your interest? And how do you deal with that?

BILL DRAKE: That's a very…

UNIDENTIFIED: Particularly multi-stakeholder approach, I ask for this kind of [?]

BILL DRAKE: That's a question that cuts to the very heart of the matter, of course. Obviously, that's a very good question. Obviously, you know, if you're talking about large companies with substantial resources and so on, they are in a much stronger position to be able to influence a lot of things normally then we would be, as a rag tag gaggle of non-profit actors who are seeking to promote our conception of the public interest based on what are members believe and so on.

Because we don't have those resources. On the other hand, one of the things about ICANN that is really distinctive, relative to any other process that I've been involved in, is that despite those differences, when it comes to actually voting on policy, we have votes just like they do. Okay.

So for the GNSO to adopt a policy, there are certain voting thresholds that have to be achieved in order for a policy to be adopted. We have six seats on the GNSO council. The commercial stakeholder group has six seats on the GNSO council. So we are balanced in terms of the number of votes we can bring to the table.

Now, the registries and registrars, they have fewer seats, but their seats hold more votes. So the point is, within the architecture, the institutional architecture that's been setup here, I would argue that the civil society has a greater ability to effect real policy outcomes, then in pretty much any other multi-stakeholder space that I know of, and I'm very involved in the UN and other types of things.

I mean, [?] sat through the GNSO council meeting on the weekend and watched us operate, or fail to operate, depending on your perspective, and, you know. If you go to a council meeting and you watch the way it works, a vote with sufficient majority has to be made to pass the policy, and that means, that in a lot of cases, somebody has to persuade us to support them.

Now there are also additional complications, there is a nom com appointee who kind of holds the balance in the noncommercial house, because that makes seven votes, but sometimes, for some certain things, you need eight votes on our side. So often, some effort has to be made to reach out and accommodate across the aisle.

So it's through that kind of a process which is a normal democratic politics process that one side says this, the other side says that, and then you try to find a place in between. And I would argue, while, you

know, civil society in this body has, in most bodies, is not the dominant force by any stretch of the imagination.

We have very often been able to soften otherwise really bad proposals, make them better. And we have often been able to put ideas on the table, which then the other groupings had to take up and address, and so on. So, for example, I mean, things like human rights. When we talk about human rights on the council, most of the business folks don't have quite a sense of what that really means in relation to domain names.

And so we get into a discussion, and some effort to try to figure out how they address the kinds of concerns that we are raising occurs. So right now, they're having a big battle over privacy aspects of the new registry that the replacement for the traditional WHOIS structure.

And again, our people are there and they are saying, "Wait. No. You can't set it up in that way because that would protect privacy of individuals at all. We need to have the following protections built into the mechanism, and if we don't get that, we'll vote no against it." And then they'll have to find some way to overcome our no vote by building stronger alliances, etc.

So, we have a measure of influence, that I think is greater than what you see, for example, in a lot of the United Nations space processes. Then gentlemen here was next, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: I have a question, more the workings of ICANN. So, if you help that great, if not I apologize. We heard today that different people are

working on different constituencies and different topics.   WHOIS [?] again and again.   Like [?] the other topics that all the different constituencies are working on.

So how do you ensure that not two separate constituencies are working on a PDP process or something similar, and they will realize only at the end one of them are working parallel on the same thing?

BILL DRAKE: That's a good question. WHOIS is an example of a policy fight that's been going on since the beginning of ICANN. And it is something that is driven largely within the GNSO council. And so therefore, everybody is aware of who is involved, and what positions they take.

Now At Large, because they float across, can also express their views. And there are difference between At Large and NCUC on some issues. I mean, At Large has tended to be much more… The ALAC, the people that actually vote and set the policy, have tended to favor an approach to WHOIS, and an approach to privacy, an approach to intellectual property, which is much closer to the commercial stakeholder groups view than our view.

They see that as a consumer protection issue, so you know, WHOIS, we want accurate information so that spammers and other people aren't able to hide and do things. We're more focused on the fact that, well, appropriate measures have to be put in place to prevent misuse of the domain name system, but we also want there to be protections, for example, for human rights workers who are operating in a dangerous

environment, and who don't – maybe they don't want to have to have their all of their details readily available.

So in terms of the overall coordination, sure, within the GAC you'll have people working on a topic.   Within the GNSO, you'll have people working on the topic, and there has to be more effective coordination and often there isn't. Between the GAC and the GNSO, we meet with them every time, but very often one of the problems is that the GAC does not send people to participate in the policy development process because they say nobody can represent the GAC.

No one representative can go and capture the views of all of the governments and bring them into the GNSO, so therefore, how would we do this? So we've tried, for a long time, to figure out ways through liaisons and other things, but this is an ongoing problem.   Then gentlemen down here, I've got just a couple of minutes left, but yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: This is [?] from Pakistan. My question is, you've discussed [?] speech in NCUC. And definition of [write off] speech varies from region to region and culture to culture.   So how do you reach consensus in your meetings?

BILL DRAKE: Well, the point there, I would say, the question from our standpoint is whether different conceptions of appropriate speech and so on, are something that is properly addressed through the domain name system. And our argument would be, the domain names should be neutral.

You should not have censorship within the domain name system, or anything else. If individual countries wish, because of their culture, or whatever, legal traditions, etc. to adopt certain types of approaches, for example, block and filtering things like that, that's within their purview as sovereign states. But from the standpoint of what is the global framework, our view is that the global framework should be neutral and reflect either one kind of cultural orientation or another.

It's just the domain name system should be open and how states and peoples interact with it, is a matter of local choice. But I would have to say generally speaking, in terms of the overall viewpoint, I would say certainly we are more – our membership is more inclined towards a more expansive approach to theme of expression than probably some other people from different cultural traditions might be. That's possible.

UNIDENTIFIED: Any more questions?

BRIAN DRAKE: Okay. I should also say, because I have said so in the past, everybody is, of course, most welcome to join our constituency day meeting. We are going to have a very interesting meeting today. We have visits from members of the Board of Directors and senior staff to talk about the whole initiative with the Brazilian conference and the post Montevideo process on Internet governance.

We have a meeting with the ATRT, the accountability and transparency review team to share our concerns. We will be addressing a number of

internal matters pertaining toward our own organizational activities, upcoming conferences. One of the things I should have said, we often organize substantive policy conferences and things like that.

We will have a big one day conference in Singapore the day before the ICANN meeting opens, which will focus probably on global policy stuff. So, we're going to be meeting for the next three and a half hours, and anybody who wants to come and find out more is certainly most welcome to come along with us.

We'll be in room, I think it's [?], which is, I guess, on the 24th floor. And [?] and I have to go to that meeting now.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you very much.

BRIAN DRAKE: That was useful. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Fellows, we are done with the meeting, but as always say, try to utilize this day as much as you can, as a fall back day. Go to the rooms that you think you are fit to that, and don't forget the meeting at 6:30, the social meeting. And if anybody wants to have the At Large, any of these brochures [?] you can get one of these. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

ICANN 48 · 17-21 Nov 2013
Buenos Aires