

ICANN
Transcription ICANN Johannesburg
GNSO – Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns (NPOC) Constituency Day
Wednesday, 28 June 2017 at 10:30 SAST

Note: 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.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: GNSO's Not-For-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency Day 10:30 to 12:00.

Raoul Plommer: Okay good morning all and welcome to the NPOC Constituency Day. I have a presentation in the end as well and so I'm giving Joan to be the Chair of this meeting and she can take over from here.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Raoul and welcome everyone. Does everyone just want to take a second and just introduce themselves very quickly, just your name and maybe if you're in NPOC and your position and/or your group that you belong too? Thanks.

(Fellow Pholey): Hello everyone. I'm (Fellow Pholey) from Africa 2.0 Foundation. I am a member of NPOC for more than one year already. Thank you.

Monica Zalnierute: Hello everyone, I'm Monica Zalnierute. I'm the member of NCSG and NCUC -- not yet of NPOC -- but I do have a NGO so mine as well join in the future.

Joan Kerr: Joan Kerr, NPOC; Membership Chair.

Raoul Plommer: Raoul Plommer, Acting Vice-Chair of NPOC.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Juan Manuel Rojas, Committee Chair -- Communications Chair.

Tapani Tarvainen: Good morning everybody. I'm Tapani Tarvainen and the Chair of the NCSG of which NPOC is a member. And I note that Monica is also a member of NCSG Executive Committee, so it's appropriate we are here.

Agustina Callegari: Good morning everybody, I'm Agustina Callegari. I'm working on the (unintelligible) by the program for the purpose of NPOC.

Martin Silva: Hello, I'm Martin Silva, the GNSO Councilor for the NCSG.

Jonathan Zuck: I'm Jonathan Zuck from the Innovators Network. I'm an NGO as well, so perhaps I should join the NPOC. But I'm here as the Chair of the CCT Review Team.

Jordyn Buchanan: I'm Jordyn Buchanan with Google so not an NGO. But I'm also here representing the CCT.

(George): I'm (George) (Unintelligible) from ICANN and I'm supporting the (unintelligible).

(Allia Zekocan): (Allia Zekocan) from ICANN Oregon. I'm also supporting the CCT Review Team.

Joan Kerr: Well whether or not you're an NGO or not, welcome and we love to have you. We do have a very busy agenda so we should get started.

We did make it very sort of fluid because we understand that different people are at different meetings, so the list is what we're going to - we're not going to work them as we'll work with who is here and as people come in -- if that's okay.

So I'm going to actually ask Agustina if she - does anybody have to leave for a meeting first of all right away? No, okay. So Agustina, would you like to start then?

Agustina Callegari: Hi again everybody. My name is Agustina Callegari; I'm from Argentina. And I will be talking in my personal capacity.

I will be talking this morning about the Onboarding Pilot Program and the work that Martin -- who is sitting here -- and I have developed for NPOC. There you have a photo of Martin and me working, so you can put the slide please; next slide. Well, check this.

Well firstly, I would like to start by telling you a little bit about the Onboarding Program. Maybe some of the people who is present here is not really familiar with the program.

The Onboarding Pilot Program is - the aim of this program is to build capacity with each ICANN stakeholder group. And in order to do so, it encourages skill set and knowledge sharing, and also cultivates self-sustaining mentor structure for new generation of volunteers and leaders.

The Program is part of a larger effort across ICANN to map and support the stakeholder's journey targeting individuals between newcomers and leadership status inside the multistakeholder model.

Well why the Onboarding Program started - next slide please. ICANN Staff has conducted different processes to identify areas of participation in each ICANN stakeholder group. So there it became crystal clear that many volunteers were still experiencing the real burden syndrome or that the different groups have problems to attract new volunteers -- also have problems to retain these volunteers.

So that's why this program started like more than one year ago. And currently, there are different ICANN stakeholders involved. You can see in the next slide that NPOC is one of the constituencies that are participating in this group, but also the NPUC, the IPC, the ccNSO and others. Next slide please.

As we all know, NPOC's new more active members -- which are interested in operation concerns of the domain name system and want to participate in the policy development process. So the Onboarding Program aim is done -- to create a community in this program that help - is continuous in any stakeholder group to attract newcomers in order to have a meaningful policy development and involving the ICANN related work.

So Martin and I asked NPOC (unintelligible) for this Onboarding Program. For the past year, we have met daily in ICANN meeting and participate in every decision of this Onboarding Program. It's not very clear in the presentation but we were discussing the challenges that NPOC were facing in order to come with a strategy to include newcomers in the work that NPOC is doing.

So - well first, we started by analyzing NPOC's need, then doing benchmarking and identifying the resources that were already available.

Then we organized a search here and wrote the first draft and the second draft of the materials while we also document all the processes that I am telling you here.

And when we were satisfied with the draft -- like the last month or a month ago -- we shared the material with NPOC ExCom to receive comments.

So I will be brief but I would like to highlight which are these materials exactly.

First of all, without the NPOC welcoming letter, we propose this welcoming letter for the newcomers that already come through the door showing a real

interest in being a part of what he or she understands what NPOC and ICANN are.

This letter is to make the newcomer feel safe and taken care of and that they -- or he or she -- will find guidance and a place of learning, work and respect inside the constituency.

We present that after reading the letter, the newcomer go into the Tool Kit -- which is the next material. And the Tool Kit is about to be a guide to the NPOC and the ICANN galaxy. And people can use it to learn more about acronyms and (unintelligible) about NPOC within the ICANN structure.

These materials are not replacing any other ICANN material. The idea is to have our own documents. And also, we identified that language and it's also - the idea is also to have this Tool Kit in several languages.

Here, for example, you have the Tool Kit that the ccNSO has developed, and the idea is to have something similar to this. I will pass so if you want to see it.

And also, we wrote the NPOC questionnaire that aims to contribute to the work that the Membership Committee is doing in order to collect more information about this organization who are showing in NPOC and what their interest is or what their interest is in domain names -- in order to have more information to help them get more involved.

Well, now I would like to highlight the next step of this program because there are many things that we still have to do because you may know that NPOC is (unintelligible) review, so we have to take this into account when we produce the final revision of the materials or to plan a strategy to update this material frequently in order to have the materials updated and to make it more appealing for newcomers - sorry.

Well, now one thing that we need to work on is the final version of the document. We already have received many comments from - sorry - from NPOC ExCom, and now we are going to work on the design of the document in order to make it more vision appealing.

And we are also going to start with the implementation phase of the project in which the idea is to have one organization -- one newcomer -- who help us to do this implementation in order to test the materials, identify things to improve or to create new things.

Also, we will be working with the NCUC members -- members of this Onboarding Program -- in order to create something that address the NCSG do. And while also - well, maybe then someone is going complain a little bit. We've done work on these materials to be part of the Web site too.

So I think that's all with this Onboarding Program, but I think that this program is very important for the moment that NPOC is going through and it would be good to continue working with that in order to have more new members and to make the newcomers' experience more interesting.

Joan Kerr: Gracias -- thank you. Well, of course we're growing and this is so needed in NPOC.

And I just want to stress that this is a pilot program, and so would you be collecting data for the next year/two years, or do we collect and evaluate it? Or has Onboarding ended?

Agustina Callegari: The program is led by the community so the program is still accepting the bylaw project because it's new and we are still the whole members of this Onboarding Program are analyzing the challenges of the experience of being a newcomer, how to attract new members. That's why it is in a pilot moment. But the materials we have created, we can use wherever we want.

Joan Kerr: Any questions anyone?

Martin Silva: Just one word. The stage as it is that we have base material, and it will be very up to us how fast we finish that material. The program is ongoing - it will be ongoing probably because once we have the material and we start developing our own and we start producing it, (unintelligible). And that's probably just going to stay there as support.

So it's actually up to us how fast this program evolves.

(Fellow Pholey): Okay, thank you very much. I guess...

Joan Kerr: Please state your name.

(Fellow Pholey): (Fellow Pholey) for the recording.

Okay my question is always taking into account, but I just want to emphasize something. If the material is available, have you shared it already with the groups, or can we have it so that we can provide comment or feedback because you mentioned a point that was very interesting. Like (unintelligible) NCUC to work together because we have the same umbrella -- I mean the NCSG -- so we can have a common understanding of (unintelligible).

For instance, I work to (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) (unintelligible) as question for NCUC members. And I think that in the NPOC, we may need that also. But if there are already some question that you have already taken into account in the newsletter -- you said or welcoming letter -- we'll try to avoid duplicating or we'll try to just put one comment (unintelligible) to telling who is on as a welcoming tool. That's it.

Agustina Callegari: Well the materials (unintelligible) in a graph version. We want to have the final version in the following weeks.

As I said before, we firstly will share it with the ExCom. The idea will be to send it to all NPOC members, so yes, and receiving comments from there.

Also the NCUC is developing their own materials, but the idea is we have been sharing our thoughts and even we shared the materials in order to have a better sense of what the others are doing.

And so yes, we are taking into account what is already done. And we are not trying to replicate anything but it would be good to tell what you have in order to improve our work.

Joan Kerr: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you so much. This is great work and we will work on it, and I think it's a great start for us go forward. So thank you very much.

Our next speaker, Jonathan, are you ready?

Jonathan Zuck: I'm ready.

Joan Kerr: You're ready, all right. You're up next. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. My name is Jonathan Zuck and I said, I'm with the Innovators Network and I'm here on behalf of the Review Team on Consumer Trust, Choice and Competition. It was originally part of the Affirmation of Commitments and now part of the bylaws.

I'm joined by Jordyn Buchanan and Drew Bagley as well as (Joe Batise) and (Lisa) on ICANN Staff that have supported us, so we're here in force. We can answer any question you come up with.

And we were asked to talk a little bit about what our review is doing and what it is. And we were tasked with trying to -- for a lack of a better term -- come up with a kind of a cost benefit analysis of the new gTLD program; kind of

looking at some of its advantages in terms of increased competition, increased choice, and some of the trusted advantages of the new safeguards and the new gTLDs versus its downsides whether it's increased competition, increased DNS abuse, increased cost on trademark owners and things like that. So that's sort of been our mandate.

And so we had three subteams within the organization; one that Jordyn was the chair of on competition and choice, another that (Loreen Kapan) of the OTC chaired on trust and safeguards, and then a third on the application and evaluation process itself.

And so we sort of looked into each of these areas and we produced an interim report that was out for public comment, and the NCSG was one of the commenters on the report.

And in broad strokes, we found an increase in competition, something like 50% of the new registrations during the period that we studied were new gTLDs. There's obviously a lot more choice; I mean that almost goes without saying.

But you tried to look at whether that choice is legitimate, you know, by looking at whether a lot of defensive registrations or people feeling compelled to get them. And while there was some, it didn't dominate those new registrations. So we saw an increase in competition, improvements in competition statistics like the market concentration has gone down a little bit.

The primary eliminating factor, frankly, is just the overall growth rate of registrations has remained relatively constant. And so the new gTLDs can't come on par with the legacy ones in just a year, you know, at the 5% growth rate.

When it comes to trust and safeguards, we looked at the issue of consumer trust at a number of different levels. But one was using a survey -- a pair of

surveys that were fielded by Nielsen -- to look at sort of whether or not there was a difference between a year in the results of people's feelings about the new gTLD program.

And as you might imagine, the biggest barrier was probably just even familiarity with the fact that there were new gTLDs at that point. The large majority of people weren't aware.

And so what we found, really, was a measure of their familiarity. And if the word rang a bell for them, then that seemed like something they would trust more -- which was interesting. And so often times, those were strings that weren't in the root.

And so, you know, those issues were difficult to assess. But for the most part, we didn't see degradation in trust as a result. There hasn't been huge news items about problems in the new gTLDs or anything like that that's led to consumers to be, you know, scared of using the new gTLDs.

And there has been some other interesting findings as well. I mean one is that with this rapid expansion of the DNS, there's a little bit of an expectation on the part of users that there's going to be a more semantic Web. In other words, that they'll be able to use that top-level domain to determine what to expect when they go to those sites.

And so that's an interesting opportunity and potential risk, right, because there are some instances in which that's true; .Pharmacy and .Bank and others like that that there's a lot of things like that doctor, for example, that's a completely open domain. And so it remains to be seen how the public will respond over time, you know, to the way that these strings have manifested themselves.

We began to look at safeguards, and one of the primary barriers to looking at some of the safeguards, again, is the amount of time that's gone by -- which hasn't been that much.

But also we found that compliance doesn't maintain the information in a very granular way. So it's difficult to say give us all the complaints related to Safeguard X and all the complaints related to Safeguard Y.

And it's true on the competition side as well that one of our primary barriers, if you will, was the availability of data to really understand what was going on in the marketplace.

And so as we move to our recommendations, the huge majority of them are about ICANN trying to collect more data about the marketplace so that the community -- generally and a future CCT Review Team specifically -- would have more to go on than making these evaluations in the future.

So not a lot of time has passed, but there have been some improvements, but a lot more data availability would really help future reviews and policy development down the road by the Subsequent Procedures Group and others that are doing policy development.

We also looked at the application and evaluation process -- not so much in its details and sort of its nuances -- but any of the potential in equities associated with it.

And so we looked at the low applications from underserved regions or the so-called Global South and tried to figure out what was going on there; commissioned a study by (MGlobal) that found that we might not have reached the right people with the outreach about the new gTLD program and might not have reached out with the right kind of materials.

There was a real desire to see case studies of what a successful new gTLD business model might look like and things like that, and of course we didn't know. And I think even a year from now, it's not even clear what a successful business model looks like, but hopefully we're in a better position to put those kind of materials into the field in the future.

Most recently, we feel that a study on DSN abuse, and we've received some interim results and expect some additional results in the middle of July that basically show that DNS abuse is -- in some measure -- at a constant or is declining somewhat, but there's been some shift to new gTLDs for some abusive behavior. And in particular, spam seems to have found a friendlier home in the new gTLDs, and that may be because of cost. And so we're again looking at some of those kinds of issues as well.

That's sort of a really broad overview and I probably talked way much and I should have handed the microphone over to the rest of the team much soon, but I was just trying to give a broad overview of what we're doing and what we've found so that we could get to you asking questions, and then the whole team will field them and answer them much better than I. So let me just open it up for questions.

Joan Kerr: No, you didn't go overtime; it was great information. Any questions? And when you're asking a question, please state your name. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Then probably other members of the Review Team might want to embellish my flip-shot job at summarizing.

Jordyn Buchanan: No Jonathan, I think you did an excellent job summarizing so I would not jump in with too much additional information unless Joe wants to talk about the new DNS Report.

(Joe Batise): No Jonathan, after hearing you rehearse this for a year-and-a-half, I think you've mastered it and summarized everything.

Joan Kerr: Well there you go. You embellish well.

Jonathan Zuck: So thank you. I mean like I said, a big part of our recommendation is for ICANN to acquire more data for the future.

I think one of the things you asked for was sort of hot-button issues, and I think that obviously getting data from contracted parties was a challenge and I think will continue to be so we need to get creative about how to get the data that's useful for the community. And we continue to have conversations with the registries and registrars on how to do that.

But generally speaking - oh, the other thing I forgot to mention - I'm sorry - is there was a study fielded by INTA -- which is a trademark organization -- looking at some of the costs associated with the new gTLD program.

And there hasn't been the same rate of defensive registration as there had typically been, right. When there was just 20 gTLDs, people would just go out and buy their name and every TLD and every variation of their name and that just isn't feasible with the volume that we have now.

And so it seems like more money is being spent on just monitoring and sending cease-and-desist letters and things like that. So the bar for taking action has gone up. So we're looking to try and quantify that cost a little bit so the community going forward and making decisions about the degree to which or how to expand on the new gTLD program will have sort of these both the costs and the benefits enhanced do so.

Joan Kerr: We do have a question from a remote participate. So Maryam is going to read that question, please.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you. This is Maryam Bakoshi for the record.

This is from Poncelet Ileleji. And he says, "Thanks Jonathan. Just wanted to know whether you have gone through the NCSG comment and your thoughts on it."

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, thank you for the question. We've received the NCSG comment and we've begun to go through it in the face-to-face meeting that we had at the start of this past weekend, but we'll be going through it in more detail in the next couple of weeks.

I think some of the big issues that were raised there, one has to do with the prioritization system that we came up with for our recommendations. So we came up with a kind of timing-based rating for the recommendations about whether or not something with a high, medium or low priority, and that was linked to periods of time.

And then there's also a prerequisite priority level for the recommendations; things that we thought should happen before any further expansion of the root.

And the NCSG expressed some concern that we might be slowing up the process of moving forward with the new gTLD program and to make sure that we're cautious about doing that, and certainly many have expressed that concern.

So I think there are going to be areas in which we stand firm -- at least on our recommendation -- that things are prerequisites, but we'll take a careful look to make sure that those aren't things that are too difficult to implement and would unduly hold up the program.

The NCSG also expressed some concerns that we had some recommendations for study by the subsequent procedures working group and that they may have already looked at -- or something like that as well -- that the timing of simultaneous actions might cause a conflict.

But for the most part, we've had very high coordination with the subsequent procedures working group, and at the outset, kind of divided up the world, if you will, in terms of what we were going to try to review first.

So for the most part, the subsequent procedures working group has held off on working on the issues we've been working on so they could take our recommendations as input into their processes. So I'm hoping -- fingers crossed -- that there won't be too many conflicts of that nature either.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you. Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: I have a question. I'm not sure timely it is or I missed it. But I've heard concern from people registering these new gTLDs that renewal cost is much higher than the individual registration cost, and that they are afraid that they will keep on going higher. So you buy a new domain and then it's cheap now and then the registration renewal cost keeps on jumping, and that's just a consumer trust issue. I'm not sure if you can address that.

Jonathan Zuck: I don't know without (Loreen) - (Loreen) would be the one to answer that question. So please, vigorously raise your hand down there at the end of the table if you'd like to field this question.

But we didn't address that issue directly. I mean there is a requirement for registries to look in a price for an extended period of time if people so desire. I think it's something like ten years. Jordyn might be able to clarify that.

But there is a lot of variation in pricing out because people are trying to figure out what their business model is. And if you realize that your string is not going to be, you know, catch wildfire and you're still trying to survive as a business, you might decide that it's a more premium type of TLD and raise prices. And then there will be an article in Domain Insight and you'll drop

them again and I just think there's a dynamic market right now to try and figure out what the true price point is for some of these domains.

You know, one of the complexities of the ICANN fee structure is this \$25,000 minimum. So if you're a Dot Kiwi and you've only sold 10,000 names, you're paying ICANN, you know, 250 a name whereas a big domain like Dot Com is paying \$0.25, right, things like that.

And so I think that some reforms in ICANN's fee structure are probably in the future as well to help support some of these smaller TLDs so that they can be less erratic in terms of what the renewal pricing and things is.

But Jordyn, you have some ideas?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, Jordyn Buchanan once again, so two observations.

As Jonathan points out, we didn't directly address this in the report. This sort of changes in pricing that we've seen from some new gTLDs have really just happened in the past few months. And so really, after the bulk of the initial report was already written.

So we'll take on whether it deserves some additional treatment in the final report although it wasn't on our original agenda or plans to do so.

We have seen - we did anticipate in the report itself that increased prices in some of these gTLDs was a real possibility. If you look at some of the more niche TLDs -- and as Jonathan said, they only have a few thousand registrations -- the only way for them to be economically viable may be to charge higher prices than we're used to for domains.

Whether or not that will be a successful business model I think is something that remains to be seen. We've actually seen prices go in the other direction as well. Some quite high priced gTLDs have been lowering their prices. And

so as Jonathan said, I think, you know, everyone is trying to figure out what market equilibrium looks like still.

There is an important protection in the new gTLD contract as Jonathan eluded too which is that any registry that wants to increase renewal prices needs to give registrants at least 180 days notice. And in that 180 days, the registrant can renew for up to ten years at the existing price.

So it does give a registrant quite a significant ability to, you know, you could register right now at that price for a long period of time, and then if you thought you weren't going to want to pay the future prices, you'd have a lot of time to migrate away from that gTLD.

And so I think that's an important consumer protection. We haven't seen any direct problems with individual registrants sort of not being able to avail themselves of that protection, but it's something that definitely deserves to keep an eye on because it is an emerging phenomenon.

Joan Kerr: Any other questions? Seeing none, well Jonathan, thank you so much and thank you to the team. Great presentation, great information, and it's great that the consumer is being protected.

Our next speaker is also a member of NPOC and he has graduated to becoming a Councilor. So now we're going to listen to Martin Silva. Thank you Martin, you're on.

Martin Silva: Thank you Joan. I'm going to try not to overwhelm with information because a Councilor has a lot of things going on, and we actually get the input and we discuss almost every working group or PDP that is going around and that has some sort of impact. I'm just going to try to do a minimal presentation for whether we agree to discuss later today -- which is basically the official meeting of the month of the GNSO Council. I think that's where you're going to find the most useful information at least to join, if you want, the discussion.

The first (unintelligible) of the agenda is the confirmation of the leadership of the GNSO Standing Selection Committee. And if you remember, this committee was created to appoint specific people from the Council to special groups or committees.

So instead of the whole Council wasting time in debating who is going to be selected in the Council, for instance, to be alias with a working group, to be alias with another AC or SO, this committee will select. So this small group of councilors or a small group of delegated people that will choose the name of the council, and the council can then review that. It basically takes the job of discussing with the whole group each applicant or each candidate.

But basically here, there is agreement that this is a new committee, so they appointed the chair, the vice-chairs, the co-chairs and the GNSO Council now has to approve the selections of the chairs, vice-chairs and co-chairs -- all the selection committee. It is so very (unintelligible) the process on voting. This is approval of the leadership of the Selection Committee.

I don't think there is going to be a problem. I think that everyone is absolutely fine with the outcome.

Next topic is the process and criteria for selection of the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community.

As you know, with the new ICANN bylaws, we now have the empowered community (unintelligible) the new process of appealing and a whole new responsibility and accountability system.

And this Empowered Community has representatives of the community. In this case, the GNSO has to send someone in their name, and basically they decided that that someone would be the chair.

And it seems that no one is objecting that so it seems that the Council already agreed that the Chair was well enough to run the GNSO Council and to represent as the Chair, then it's good to go to the Empowered Community and communicate the GNSO perspective.

As you see, there is no match fights sometimes in the Council. It's not always that because things there get very worked.

So a lot of the work has been done beforehand in the working groups -- in the constituencies. And usually it happens that when it gets to the Council, yes there is discussion, there is (unintelligible) change a thing or two. But in general, things have already been processed a lot when it gets there.

And that's the (unintelligible) of having the whole system so that the Council is respected (unintelligible) thing.

Next topic is the initiation of our drafting team to consider changes to the name of the GNSO. I don't know if you heard this, but they're planning or they've proposed to change the name of the GNSO. The GNSO means Generic Names Supporting Organization and they want to change it to Global Name Supporting Organization because, as basically said here, again, this is informal talk but this is the general idea is that this is not something that - maybe there are good arguments to change the name.

I didn't feel the will in the room to discuss this, like, we don't have time to discuss changing the name right now unless there is a very compelling argument being done to do so.

Next topic to discuss in the agenda is of the charter for the cross-community working group on Internet Governance. They are reviewing the charter. There was a report being made about the group and basically, the report was just a few days ago and so I didn't have time to study it very well.

But mainly, they are trying to see how to make the working group more efficient, accountable, to have measures of them, to maybe have a structure that is better (unintelligible) to the goals of the working group.

This is a matter that is still going in discussions so I can't really foresee the specific point of view that the Council has as a general.

Next one is the proposal on the amendment bylaws changes. This is a very laboring vote. It's number seven in the agenda. It's very laborious (sic) because they -- the ICANN Board -- approved an amendment made to the ICANN bylaws.

And by doing that, some responsibilities changed from one board committee to another. The Board has committees to deal with different subjects, and that change of board -- from one committee board to another board -- has to be approved for the community because of the new bylaws.

Specifically, we have to approve the change of board committee if makes us or not. I don't see anyone really opposing that. I think really the Board knows what they're doing with the committees they are creating; at least it seems so.

Number 8, the cross-community working group on these Country and Territory Names, I don't know how familiar you are with this, but this has been a very hot topic in this meeting in ICANN. And basically, they are discussing or they are starting to discuss the use of two characters and three characters and territory names in the gTLDs.

And the thing that the discussions basically came to a stall -- they broke. The GNSO agrees to grant some sort of protection to only two character sub-domains like - I'm from Argentina; like A-R dot legal. So that it wouldn't create a confusion with Legal dot A-R.

But when it comes to three-letter characters, it seems that they couldn't really solve out what would happen if there were three characters that could be identified with a territory or country or the ccTLD.

And they basically are trying to work out how to move from there because they could actually achieve a place for that before, so they are trying to figure this. This is an ongoing problem, okay, how do we move forward with the GNSO and what other angles can we use to move forward with this.

GAC also has a lot of interest in this discussion. As you have seen, they have at least two or three session on this.

Nine, Initiation of the GNSO Section 16 Process for Amending Approved GNSO Policy Recommendations, ready to (certain) Red Cross Movement Names.

I don't know, again, how much you know about the Red Cross Movement Names, but basically, the Red Cross has been trying to have a special protection to the names that they use in their organization -- especially when it comes to the (variation) of Red Cross in each territory.

And this topic has been treated by different institutions. So basically, the GNSO resolutions regarding this topic are in contradiction with the GAC advice and also the source working group regarding this that also has their own recommendations. And the Board and the GNSO and the GAC and the Red Cross Working Group are trying to come together to solve this contradiction.

And there's also a power struggle, if you may, of the institutional role that they have because since these are gTLDs, the GNSO wants to make certain that this is how remain. We are the ones who created the policy even for the protection of the Red Cross and not a GAC initiated process.

But it is a heated and interesting discussion, but also very specific because you are not going to find it everywhere. Not many people know about this to really have a full conversation.

In any other business, I think the interesting thing that will come up today is the idea to maybe start doing audits on ICANN -- maybe even do so from the GNSO or from different collisions of the community to have a community review directly of the ICANN books.

This is what the GNSO is going to discuss at this meeting, but of course there are many, many, many others, and every PDP or working group that will have been around has a relevant impact on the GNSO Council. And that's also been discussed. This is to get the main idea.

It seems very complicated when you see the agenda, but if you spend your time to read and do research on each of these titles, you will be very aware of what they are trying to discuss. And again, usually, GNSO Council discussions are less heated than you may think.

Any questions that I can answer from these topics or any others regarding the Council?

Joan Kerr: Please state your time.

Remmy Nweke: Thank you Madam Chair. My name is Remmy Nweke. Thanks for the report Martin.

Martin Silva: Can you speak closer to the mic? Sorry.

Remmy Nweke: Sorry. My name is Remmy Nweke and thanks for the report Martin.

During your presentation, you made mention of the review on the Internet Governance Working Group. I would like you to maybe throw more light on

that and probably what is expected of NPOC if there is any -- especially looking at what is going on within the Council.

Martin Silva: You mean with the Internet Governance Working Group.

Remmy Nweke: Yes.

Martin Silva: There is really no special position I can say about the GNSO Council on this. But there has been a report released just a few days ago which will truly impact on the way the change of the Council is going to resolve or debate.

So the link is in the official agenda. I just can recommend you to read the report because probably that's where the discussion is going to be based on that report and probably around other issues.

But I would start there to look more into it. I cannot say more because it is something that is new.

Remmy Nweke: Okay, sorry. As for the second part of my question or comment, with regard to the propose change of name, for me I think this is like going to be a very controversial (unintelligible). But at the same time, we need to make sure that organize our position. Are we aligned with all the members of our stakeholders -- the (unintelligible), NCUC and (unintelligible) -- so that they will be on the same part when we are dealing with this.

But I am sure, likely, they may not take -- if the way things are going accordingly -- (unintelligible) probably the continued (unintelligible) for sure. Thank you.

Martin Silva: Well, mainly the idea behind changing the name is that Generic can be confusing specifically in the trademark environment because generic has generic words or it's a legal term sometimes to refer to terms that are not (unintelligible) for appropriation -- for commercial appropriation.

And it also may have other impact. So they want to change it to global in construct with country codes. So the ccTLD's country code top-level domains, and gTLD would be a global top-level domain of generic. And I think that's the idea; to avoid (unintelligible) of confusions.

I don't have a specific position here. I mean I'm fine with the name we have. But if someone gave a strong enough argument, I mean I am open for someone to convince me. So far, I don't think we should change it. I don't really see the need for that.

It's not that (unintelligible) the name is going to be less obscure thanks to that. If you are already reading about generic and certain names of the organization, you are not going to care if it is a generic or it's global. But I can be convinced otherwise.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Remmy. Any other questions? You're going to make it for your Council meeting.

Martin Silva: Yes I have to go less than ten minutes.

Joan Kerr: Great, thanks a lot for your presentation.

So we have Adam Peake here. He did request some questions from us about what we would like him to address. So here's a story and I'm sticking to it.

We really are trying to focus on education and participation for NPOC members going forward. And so - but more than that, we want to start to at least invite collaboration between the NCUC and ourselves more as the global representatives of NCSG.

So how can the GAC help us do that and what resources do you have?
How's that?

Adam Peake: Resource - good morning everybody; Adam Peake from the Stakeholder Engagement Manager for Civil Society here. So thank you for inviting me.

Resources are always a difficult thing so we'll come back to that later. I think on education of NPOC members would be one part of this, and this goes back to some ideas I had some time ago.

You know you have access to the communications team. And thinking about what you do in terms of explaining how the domain name system works, how the security aspects of it are, how not-for-profit organizations -- NGOs -- can use the DNS effectively.

I'm thinking about in particular, originally I had an idea to try and create a simple guide that would be helpful for you. And we went through some part of that process, so we have a guide that is basically an introduction to the DNS and how you use it effectively and safely. And the simplest things about, you know, renewing your name and what happens if you forget that date. There are ways of getting that, you know, there are policy mechanisms to secure your domain name so you don't lose it.

And then I'm also -- just to move on from that -- thinking about the event that you put on in Hyderabad with - oh gosh. I can see his face and see him exactly as he is standing there from Afiliis -- Jim Galvin -- right.

So if we look to that simple guide and then building in some of Jim's presentation, and spoke to Coms about that -- and we, I mean yourselves and me and talking to Coms -- then I think there's a good opportunity to build some basic materials that you could use to not only introduce NPOC and NPOC's works, but also as a guide that would help NGOs that you're reaching out to say, "This is why what we're doing is important and here's some basic steps to how you can use the DNS effectively."

So that's something that I would like to talk to you about ongoing...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Adam Peake: ...and see if we can build some useful materials for you. They could be print materials, they could be presentations, they could be videos if you want. There's a lot of resources that you have available and I'd like to work with you to make those available and useful. So that's one thing as sort of an action point. Let's try and do that. So that's the sort of education part.

On working with NCUC, this meeting is probably a good example. You know that the Non-Commercial Uses Constituency used some of their crop funding for a pre-event. And I think when you use crop, you sort of feel like it's yours.

So I did not make any attempt to include you guys or (Rallos), I didn't think it was appropriate. And you would probably feel the same way in your event.

So at this meeting, because it's the policy forum, there aren't the usually types of outreach events and so we're not seeing much happening.

But what could we do for Abu Dhabi for ICANN60? We're beginning at the Staff level discussing the type of activities that the local hosts would like. I think we're all aware that civil societies differently approached within some of the Gulf regions.

So we're looking at - my initial thoughts were how do we talk to universities. And as we do that, then I promise that any meetings that we hold -- whether it would be meetings at university or universities coming to us -- then you and NCUC and of course the (Rallos) but thinking specifically about NCSG -- then they should be included as lecturers, as people, you know, on topics of expertise, but also to introduce what you do so that the students and others know what's going on. And so that would be our next area of collaboration.

And something we're also thinking about -- and Raoul, you were involved a little bit -- is the idea of having - when we have meetings particularly as a regional meeting -- I'm thinking of (Euro Dig) and (Rights Com) and things like that and meetings that have been held in Europe recently -- we've had boots.

And where we have the ability to do so, we would like the community to be the one to support those boots. I don't think - it's okay to have a Staff person there, but it's much more effective and interesting for the participants to hear from you. So, you know, trying to get Raoul and you there and it's also where delivering your materials there.

So we'll try and organized that in a more sort of structured way. So if we can - - again resources come into this because we may not always have the money to bring someone to an event -- have you helping us support the ICANN booth or the community booth as it may be. And that would come up at regional Internet Governance forums, at various - and then larger conferences.

And, you know, particularly, if we're in Brussels and you have members in Brussels, your members ought to know that there's an ICANN-related event going on. Even if it just happens to be (Joe Jack) or fits in Latin America, it could be someone from the Lat team, you know, if somebody is speaking in Brasilia, then your members in Brasilia should know that hey, he's there, we might as well pop along.

So these are things that we're trying to build into our overall approach. And your help with events that you think we should be going to is also extremely important.

So that's something I ask back from you. Where do you think we should be having presence in is important -- particularly the larger events. Particularly in

Africa, I think, at the moment. We're trying to understand where we should be, having general engagement activities.

That's sort of the summary. I don't know about resources at the moment. It's coming towards the conclusion of the budget process so I don't know what's available. We'll do what we can but it's never very much. I don't think I'm authorized to say how much money I have in a budget for this kind of thing, but it isn't much. So at the moment, sorry.

Joan Kerr: It's Joan for the record. It's interesting that you interpret resources as money because I think of it as everything -- including money.

I am - just before I ask anyone, I am so happy to hear some of the strategies that the (TSC) has -- particularly the participation of regional members. And I think you and I have had several years of discussions around that, so I'm happy that it's being included.

And certainly, I think that it's a much better situation if we work together when we're visiting shows and in the conferences.

Anyway, I will leave my opinions if anybody else has questions or comments, and we've got one - and yes.

Adam Peake: No, I mean the reason I mention money, I try to actually focus on the fact that Coms are available as a resource.

But, you know, travel is important, and that's what I'm thinking about. You know, we want to be able to get you to meetings and get you with us. And it does cost money and it is a problem and a challenge, so not one we can ignore unfortunately.

But let's work with what we can do with, you know, the Coms-type resources and so on. We can do that.

Joan Kerr: Tapani, please state your name.

Tapani Tarvainen: Tapani speaking. I want to pick up on one tiny detail of one sentence that was made because it's relevant to what NPOC does.

When that one issue you've been working on has been taken care of, folks will forget to renew their Web site. And with the new gTLDs, there's been a related issue which came up in Zuck's presentation -- I pointed it out -- that the renewal prices can jump up and there's 180 days warning time on that.

So if you only look at your domain once a year and if you try to make it cheap, you may discover that the price renewal has just tripled or something like that.

Some of the new gTLDs have a rather surprising price here. They may have - and if you are a small NGO looking for a cheap domain name, you pick one that seems to cost nothing now and there is a special offer which is available now and may not be next year, so you might want to keep that in mind.

And as a policy issue also, is this 180 days actually too short? I tend to think it should be more than a year.

Adam Peake: It's Adam for the record. Yes, and then you'd sort of be in a two-year cycle. But anyway, but all of these policies came out of policy development right? In 2012 - sorry - about 12 years ago, there was no redemption price process. It came about because people were losing their names.

And so getting involved with Martin and - yes, to do what we're talking about really. You know, getting involved in the policy process and, you know, making these points known is exactly what NPOC should and must be doing.

And you're quite right. But, you know, if we do produce a guidebook, then a warning on when you're selecting a domain name, don't just look at the price today. What is this thing that is going to service your domain name? For ten years? If it's a project, it may not be.

I mean there's a lot of things to include in that and I hadn't thought of that. But that's another one that should be in that -- if we're going to produce a guide -- that should be in there.

Even things like, if it's a project domain name, you know, how many times have you gone back to a Web site and it was a project two years ago and now it's basically is an adult site because somebody deliberately dropped their domain name, but somebody has put - you know, you're getting traffic through on it so they put porn on it. And that doesn't look very good for your NGO project of five years ago.

It's happened to some major, major, major activities. United Nations used to be quite guilty of that. So, you know, that's the sort of thing to think about, yes.

Joan Kerr: I just wanted to respond (unintelligible). It's interesting because I was invited to become part of the Dot Eco community, and the first year was free to build a community -- not to buy a domain name. But they were building a community.

And I wrote back and I said, "Thank you for your invitation. Could you tell me what the renewal fee would be," because I didn't want to get a \$1000 bill the second year.

So it's very important for us to educate people to ask the questions beforehand as well. Go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: So we were talking about resources.

Joan Kerr: Name.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's Raoul for the record. So if it's not going to be a crop fund for the next financial year - and when does the financial year begin?

Adam Peake: There is a crop fund and it's going to be back to the old style. Maryam, you may know better than me, but it's going back to the old style. The event opportunity will be dropped. It was too much overhead for everybody involved to do.

But (we be) back to five - will it? Five, yes. I mean five slots as I understand it. And I think the financial year begins July. Doesn't it? Yes.

So get thinking about it now because, you know, it's between now and December. Isn't it twice yearly? Maryam.

Maryam Bakoshi: No it's once a year so from 1st of July to the 30th of June, yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead.

Remmy Nweke: My name is Remmy Nweke. Nice to have you hear Adam. Basically, I would like to ask, looking at the African continent -- in essence we are here -- how do you think African non-profit can leverage engagement to (unintelligible) with NPOC from your office given a lot of challenges that probably we face within the continent in terms of engagement ourselves?

Adam Peake: Yes so how can you leverage engagement in activities and build better relations I suppose is - excuse me. One thing is to -- specifically for any region, Africa in your case -- would be to make sure that you're building a relationship with (Daganu) and his team, so (Yulvy) and (Bob).

There's only three staff members covering 54 countries -- which means that, you know, they actually really need to hear from you what you need. It's very hard for them to keep aware of the whole continent. You know how enormous it is and how difficult it is to cover all those different interests.

So building awareness - you know, relationship with him, and I think that's a good thing for NPOC to do. Probably inviting -- not just inviting me in -- but inviting all of the regional VPs in, you know, as you're strengthening the group here then let them know and remind them that you exist and you want to be involved in their regional strategies.

The African Regional Strategy is being developed - you know, it's there and it's out there but it's evolving. So does NPOC have a voice in that? I mean all you have to do is ask and they will, of course, respond. And they want to hear from you -- basically.

So that would be my initial response is, you know, make sure that you're talking to our GSC regional groups, make sure that you have a voice and know what they're ongoing strategy -- regional strategy -- is because they do generally want to hear from you. That's the whole point. And if they're not coming to find you, then you better go knock on their door and beat it down and all the rest of it, and apologies if they're not talking to you. That's what I would do.

(Fellow Pholey): (Fellow Pholey) from (Unintelligible). I guess I have one question. As you said that if we want to have more engagement in Africa, we can work with this team.

And I just want to ask whether they have internal means like a budget, a (unintelligible) or anything that could make themselves autonomous to drive or to make outreach event (unintelligible), or every submission we submit - every work we submit to them should go through our own process within ICANN before then can be done or we can work with them (unintelligible).

Adam Peake: They do have resources. Sorry, Adam for the record. Yes they do have resources and you go to them. And if, you know, if it's available, then they'll help you.

I don't know how they'll respond because all of us, as I said, are tight on our engagement budgets. It's not, you know, there isn't that much available. They will generally be very willing to come to events if you organization an event and you give them enough time, then actually providing speakers themselves or trying to help other people attend, that's the kind of thing that sometimes can be easier.

But, you know, just, I think, trying to build a relationship with them and an understanding, you know, telling them what you need. And trying to do so in advance because, again, if you're running three people over 54 countries -- in Africa particularly -- you know, that's a heavy schedule. They're in the airplane a lot. And you know the distance from Draghi to Nairobi is about eight hours, so it's an enormous place to cover.

(Shascat): (Shascat) for the record. Thanks Adam, for raising these important questions.

One thing, on September, we will have a global conference in cyber space -- which is one time per year. The first one was just in Hague. And now I'm sure that, for example, we as (unintelligible), we go to invitation.

One thing is that it's possible just to (unintelligible) there may be in (unintelligible) or just try to little bit rising up for NPOC relations.

Adam Peake: I know, I know. Sorry, Adam for the record. I know a little bit about the conference. So yes, it's a good example of one where you would find a group of NGOs and others because you don't just have to talk to NGOs; you can educate other people at the same time even though they're not your direct constituency.

It sounds like - yes, I mean, but how you use your funds is not up to me. So yes, I should stop there. But yes, it's like an interesting target to go to.

Joan Kerr: Joan for the record. Just so you understand, we will be looking at where we're going to be going, what we're going to be doing in the next little while. So we'll consider your conference and then get back to Adam.

Adam Peake: Again, Adam for the record. It is one of the things about the crop funding is that you do have a lead time, don't you, of certain number of days, so it can be quite difficult to - yes. So, yes, events have gone so it will be six weeks.

So if you're looking at September, you've really got to get it up quick. But anyway, that's not for me but that's for you to keep in mind.

But yes, we do have some issues with crops in that you do need at least six weeks' notice. So some of the other groups have had multiple requests rejected because they were too close.

Maryam Bakoshi: And just to add as well, the six weeks is from when we have VP approval. So we have to make sure...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Maryam Bakoshi: ...yes, so we have to make sure that the things you need to do before then. Yes, so the six weeks, the comp starts when the VP approves it. So yes, so give or take seven weeks -- seven in-a-half weeks -- or it can be six weeks and a day or a half a day.

Adam Peake: Because I mean, you know, when you see the urgency, we can push it through. But if you miss the six weeks, then people have lost this in the past.

But again, those are your processes; you know what you're doing. But we'll help as much as we can. Flag it up as high as you can immediately and et cetera.

Joan Kerr: And so does the six weeks include Visa issues?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes it does. So and that's why it's per region. But in the new crop program, we can have one out of region for travel for (unintelligible), so just one. But the other four has to be within the region, so hopefully the Visa...

Joan Kerr: Any other questions/comments? Closing it down. Sorry, go ahead.

Adam Peake: No, just one last thing. There is a community sort of civil society Wiki -- which I try and maintain every so often when I remember. That's embarrassing isn't it?

And there is an Events Page -- which I haven't updated for a while. What event do you want? You know, what should be on that agenda because it's not just helpful for you, it's helpful for me, it's helpful for other people as well around whether it's the (Rallos) or whoever it may be. So the At-Large group, sorry.

So for example, the Global Conference on Cyberspace, you know, I'm not sure if I have it in but I better go and have a quick look now. And I'll send - Joan, I'll send you the link again so you can see it. And we can update those materials all the time, but I need your help with it. So I'd be grateful for that.

Joan Kerr: Great, thank you Adam. I liked when you said the Civil Society Page because we were supposed to give you information and content, so I was laughing at you and just like uh-oh.

So thank you so much for coming and thank you. I think that we're looking forward to working with you. And I think you'll find working with us is a really good experience.

So moving on, Renata will not be joining us; she is not feeling well. So we will ask Juan to give us the presentation on the Web site for NPOC.

Juan Manual Rojas: Okay, this morning, again, my name is Juan Manual Rojas and acting as Communications Chair.

Okay, we are trying to getting the screen there in the Web site if you didn't know it already.

But if you have the opportunity, you can visit NPOC.org and you can see yourself. That's it, okay.

Okay the first thing that I have to talk about is that a lot of the year we were talking about reassign to the old Web site. To do that, we had to change. We are fine with this challenge to change.

There is domain names on maybe the keys for hosting too. But it was issue at the start but then the process, it could be start with the domain name councilor and come from that.

We have already material to work, right. We have that, the domain name because for some things we almost lose it. We could recover this with the name -- the domain name.

And then we have that. We could put fast move on and make the architectural information for this Web site to get that you are looking on our screen.

Okay, first, in order to get this, we have to look at some similar Web sites to find a way to organize all the information to be easily browsing.

We have decided finally to get three main boxes in our main menu. It's called Get Involved, Governance and About.

In Get Involved, you find all information for anyone who wants to know how to join us such as How To Join, our Contact Details and a kind of depository of past ICANN meetings with our links and record transcripts or something like that. We have to update it, but we have the 57 - I don't remember, awhile -- the repository of (unintelligible).

In Governance, we have all information about how is organized NPOC, our structure, our committees, our current leadership and our leadership in the past, and our charter.

At About -- the box of About -- has all information of what is NPOC and what does NPOC, and who are their members. This does - we have right now. But we are thinking to, of course, we have to improve this, and maybe the sign includes some more information such as Agustina said before about Onboarding Program and some social media embed windows and some other ideas that we are developing with the team such as have a blog containing a lot of information, updating for what happened at ICANN meetings.

But are also open to receive your information about what you think this meeting in our Web site.

I not too longer much. I think that the rest is entered just to the side and not (unintelligible). It is available to navigate it from the laptop and also from your device more from your phone.

Then I would like to thank to Rudi who facilitates our job in the first stages and all ExCom Members for their support during this process. The information to put in there is made by Raoul here, and all content inside, it was discussed with all ExCom members before to put online.

That's why I am asking again if you think that something is meeting in there in our Web site besides that, I think that I always said of course, we are open to receive your information -- your input. I think that is enough and I don't have too much more to add.

Joan Kerr: Great, it's an evolving process isn't it. Yes, and we've only just - it's just newly created really. So we're hoping our members will start to feel free to help us with content and share with us what they're doing in their own organizations.

Did you want to say something? Please go ahead.

Remmy Nweke: Remmy Nweke for the record. Let me start by commending the committee for a job well done. It's not always easy that the time it was always being correct.

And then getting involved, you say that in the content, specifically the ICANN past meetings, I think it should be more useful if you ask them to get involved and show meeting upcoming events and for those meetings.

So it makes more better sense to actually have upcoming events so that - when we say get involved, I'm already in it, I can start looking for opportunities to get involved.

Then on About Us or - I don't remember what it is but I know it's about something - About us, we have what NPOC does and What Is NPOC. To a very light extent, there's a (unintelligible) there. I should preferred if the two could be merged and (unintelligible) frequently asked questions on NPOC. Frequently asked questions on NPOC and frequently asked questions so that

you make it two instead of creating the (unintelligible). Thank you very much for the job, thanks.

Juan Manual Rojas: Thank you Remmy. Okay, in Upcoming Events, we need information from you, yes. It's not just ICANN meetings information of upcoming events.

But if you are, I don't know, organizing some event and you are talking about what NPOC does, you have to maybe send us all information to put in there, right, because without that resource, we couldn't do anything, right, if we don't have that. But then if you have that, please send us and we are, of course, putting it in our Web site.

Joan Kerr: Just one note to that though, it could be that our members send us information and that we promote the ICANN conferences, but maybe on a global scale, inform our members about what's in their regions as well, you know, so anyway.

Any other questions?

Agustina Callegari: I'm Agustina for the record, sorry.

I didn't comment before, but as part of the Onboarding Program, we have the possibility to use ICANN resources to design -- not only for the materials for the Onboarding Program -- but also to contribute to the Web site. SO maybe we can take advantage of that and use it to improve - I don't know - wherever we think we have to improve with the design.

Also, I have been making for those depository to use for our (unintelligible). But I think that it could be useful tool to include some photos on the Web site in order to make it visual appealing, so I will share it with you.

These are the photos that I published in ICANN for the Web site. And maybe we can use some of the pictures that were taken during Hyderabad. I think

that (Glenn) took those photos. Maybe we can talk to him and ask him if we can use it, at least one or two to illustrate a little bit more the work that NPOC is doing.

Joan Kerr: That (Glenn) guy I don't know, but I'll try and ask him.

Remmy Nweke: Just a little add-on to what Agustina has said.

I think it's also important that we have kind of a link-back, if you like, linking back to some of the things that we do that are related to each other -- like the Onboarding. Have maybe - create a line within the new Web site so that initially, (unintelligible) about Onboarding -- the age or something -- you go to the site and you can see each and then click on it and it can take you to wherever it is. So have kind of a link-back.

And also from the Onboarding, there should be also something linking back to the site. Thank you Juan.

Joan Kerr: Great. I have to close the session now because we have - do you mind if I just have her give a quick announcement? It's just a quick announcement because she has to go and then you're on?

Man: All right.

Judith Hellerstein: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record.

So I just wanted - I mean (unintelligible) and NPOC, but also want to invite, in At-Large we have a technology taskforce where we look at the different technologies that are in use in ICANN and we see how we can improve uses and make it more accessible and open to all.

And I want to make an open plug to anyone who wants to join our technology taskforce because we are discussing many of these same issues. Especially,

on your next topic, we thoroughly have been discussing these and different tutorials and also a new form that people who have problems with Adobe Connect can use. This will make it easier for the team to fix it because, as they say, they have a lot of open tickets but they don't get information because it gets passed from Staff. And as you know, these games that some information is lost and then they have no way of contacting the user.

And so we are looking at all these issues as well as policy tracking and track tools, looking at other stuff on those. And so we work closely with the IT staff in ICANN, so welcome your involvement on any of these topics.

Joan Kerr: Great. I think we'll be talking to you Judith.

Judith Hellerstein: Also, another quick add, in that At-Large, (Dev) and his mentees in Onboarding have done a lot of great work in describing a lot of these different processes. And I'm sure they'll be happy to share their work that they've created with the Onboarding in your team. And so that way, there's no reason to duplicate a lot of this extra work.

Agustina Callegari: By the way, I have been talking to them. We are in the process (complex process). We are in touch with them.

Joan Kerr: And I have as well. I actually have the report that I was going to share. Okay, so thank you so much for sharing that and we'll be talking to you.

Raoul, you're next.

Raoul Plommer: Thank you. I'll just Maryam's computer to do a little demonstration on Trello.

Joan Kerr: While he's getting that ready, one of the things that we're doing at NPOC is really trying to track our work and ensure that it actually gets done. And one of the tools that we're using is Trello so that's what Raoul will be speaking about. Ready?

Raoul Plommer: All right so basically ...

Joan Kerr: Name.

Raoul Plommer: My name is Raoul and I'm presenting some of the collaboration tools.

Basically, for those of you who aren't familiar with Trello, it's basically a glorified to-do list. But you can have - there are a lot of functions within like the things that, for example, once you've completed a task, it will send you an email or other kinds of things. You can make schedules in there and different kind of taking items off like, basically, if you have a small project that you need to do, you can make little ticks for all the steps of the project that needs done.

And here are some of the cards that we got. And there's - the first one if quite like a miscellaneous one. It's got all kind of different items. Next one is a little more specific.

And people who have access to this were member of the Trello team. They can make these lists and cards into them - so this Web site. I'll turn it back to that.

There's the Charter Review, that's something that we've been working hard here at ICANN event. There's Outreach and so on. So you can really like put the information into sort of where it belongs and you can even have deadlines for certain things so it starts to notify you if the task isn't done by the set deadline.

And then there was - about the Web site, and this is overlapping a little with Juan's thing, but we're planning to embed Twitter there on the Web site. And we were thinking of using this automating tool IFTTT so that when an NPOC

member makes a blog post, that will be automatically put into Facebook and Twitter.

And so we only need to write something once and it appears like, well, in as many places as we want really. You make these recipes and automate things. I think that will be quite helpful.

And the other, the photographs is definitely a good idea. I think it will be easy to make like a photograph gallery there, and I think we can even make like a posting system where our members or the Web site editors can send us pictures straight into that gallery and so on.

What else? I think that's pretty much me timing out. So that's what we've got on collaboration so far.

Joan Kerr: Thank you Raoul. It's not so much the length of the presentation but the fact that we are getting more organized and making sure that we track our duties.

So we're out of time unfortunately. Did you have a question? Okay, go ahead quickly.

(Fellow Pholey): It's (Fellow Pholey) for the record. I know that this is a good tool and discovery. But I also know that we can have workspace on the GNSO Web site (Conflux) system for instance.

Why did you consider IFTTT separate instead of using (Conflux) That is my question. Maybe you have considered it but I'm just asking.

R; Yes, I certainly didn't consider it. I didn't know of its existence or that we could use it or sort of integrate it. I mean, yes, the thing that ICANN uses, I think that can't be integrated into our Web site, for example. And I was unfamiliar with the system, so that didn't occur to me to use (Conflux) for example.

Joan Kerr: We have to leave the room but thank you; that's a great question.

Please, if you haven't voted, please vote for your ExCom. And thank you so much for being here and we really would appreciate if you become participants and engage in our process.

END