Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
NPOC Meeting
Tuesday 14 October 2014

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

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

Rudi Vansnick: Welcome everybody to our (unintelligible) meeting at the Los Angeles ICANN 51 meeting. I think we could do a very quick role call so that we know who is on the meeting, physically present and connected to the other connect. I'm Rudi Vansnick, the chair of NPOC.

Lori Schulman: I'm Lori Schulman, vice chair.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco, policy chair.

(Joan Kerr):   (Joan Kerr), member.

(Martin Slovak):   (Martin Slovak), incoming member.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus Stoll, member.

Rudi Vansnick: And on the other connect, is - you want to make your statement about your presence? You can do - now. I don't hear anybody on the web. If you want to speak you have the ability to speak now.

Okay, if not, I can mention that I see the names. I'm - (Anna Maria Mauricio); Benedetta Rossi; (unintelligible) who we know very well; (Eduardo Morgan); and who is it?

Man: Rudi, this is Glen here, would just like to make a short announcement.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, if there are people who would like to speak I think you can call in. you've got the numbers and if you can't call in, if you've got difficulties send us your number and we will be able to call out to you.

Man: Thank you, Glen.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Glen, for the assistance. And we have also in the room Lars Hoffman, ICANN staff; and Glen from ICANN staff. And yes, that's it.

So the idea is we can start our real work and - by the way we have also online on the Adobe our new administrative support from ICANN staff, (Miriam), welcome (Miriam). Maybe it's good that you can put up the agenda that I just sent by email that people in the other room can follow the agenda of today.

The first item on our agenda is the current state of the Excom as we had the elections in June just before the London meeting. We had the installment of the new Excom but we still have some open vacancies that we want to fill in as soon as possible.

There is a procedure foreseen in the charter that allows us to do nominations and put the nominations forward to the membership for validation in a quite short delay, which is about two weeks, which would allow us to have the new members of the Excom being seated around mid-November.

So I don't know if there is anybody who wants to nominate or self-nominate for the two positions that we actually have to fill in. It's the secretary position

and it's the membership committee chair position that we need to fill in as soon as possible. So I'm looking around the room to see who wants to take up one.

Woman: Can we ask questions first?

Man: We are not a democracy here.

Rudi Vansnick: For the purposes of the transcribes please mention your name before you speak. It will help to know who said what.

(Joan Kerr): Accountability, (Joan Kerr). I went through the - on the website on the wiki to get some background information and I wondered is there a - I'm interested in the membership in particular because I work with a lot of not for profits.

Is there a database other than what's on the website of how these people were contacted, how we outreach to them, how current they are, and any benefits or anything like that of becoming a member?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Joan). Rudi speaking. Very interesting question. As we (unintelligible) (Joan), (unintelligible) our database is quite small and we can give it a - we can explain a lot but it will take at least half an hour to get you the full picture of how difficult it was up until today to have our memberships database or mechanism working well because the membership database is in fact a combination with NCSG, NCUC, and NPOC.

And it's all in fact managed through a Google Docs spreadsheet. So you can imagine how difficult it is to have a clear view.

I have been working on a solution that would be integrated with our website so that people - every member will have a profile on the website available so that the - they can communicate with us in a decent way, mention changes if

somebody is replacing - so that we can reach the organization and the person without any difficulty, which today seems to be a problem.

So you will get a lot of assistance because we have now also administrative support in ICANN that could help us. But initially what I think it would be the best solution is that we can manage our own membership database and you will have the necessary tools to do that.

I can guarantee you but otherwise it ends up in situations where the communication with the membership doesn't work. So if you're interested you will get a - I think, a lot of assistance from (Sam Franco) because he has been doing the work before in the previous Excom and he has a lot of experience. Klaus has also a lot of experience.

So I think that you will get maybe too many support in the beginning. You will not get lost.

(Joan Kerr):   Well, then I'm interested in the membership. (Joan) speaking.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori. (Unintelligible) made the point online that connect - we're connected by NPOC voice. We have our own listserv through ICANN and we do have an updated membership list that we just did from the elections.

                 Not sure if the keeper of list at this point is Rudi or Cintra but there is an updated list because in order for the elections to occur we have to validate names and contact information.

(Joan Kerr):   So (Joan) speaking. So how I'm probably going to start is pretend it's, like, from scratch and - how's that? Okay.

Lori Schulman: Perfect.

Rudi Vansnick: And I think you will be very helpful. So I'm looking to the other side. Now that (Martin) is actually not yet the official member but there is a request of an organization that actually is already a member of NCSG and NCUC and (Martin) would be the representative for that organization in NPOC. So we will try to validate that membership as soon as possible.

I hope that we can do that this week so that we can officially accept you among us. We know that (Martin) has been doing already quite a lot of work in the sense of doing a bit of PR and marketing among the fellowship and impacted the result of our contacts with the fellowship that (Martin) joined us. So (Martin), up to you to decide.

(Martin Slovak):   Well, thank you very much. I always feel so welcome in the group since I - first joining almost roughly a year ago. And I decided to be - to represent the (unintelligible). It's a double acronym, it's a very long name.

But basically NGSO - research and represents (unintelligible) economical, legal, and technical aspects of (unintelligible) technologies (unintelligible) for information. And the - specific thing (unintelligible) for me to comment. Do you have any specific thing in mind for me to comment?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi speaking. We have a vacancy for secretary that's still open and I think you are a perfect candidate for such a position because actually the secretary will help NPOC in getting things - (unintelligible) in the correct way, manage the - I would say, administrative and legal level.

(Martin Slovak):   (Unintelligible). I wasn't really sure about self-nominating. I've never self-nominated before. So of course, yes, it is normal and self-nominating is the correct way, self-nominate to that position.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori. To ease your comfort I nominate (Martin) as secretary for NPOC. Does anybody second the motion?

Woman: I second the motion.

Rudi Vansnick: Well, I second the motion and I think as we heard several people were seconding the motion. So I would propose that we finish the membership request first but that we - at the end of this week make the - or even earlier if possible, that we make the official announcement to the NPOC membership on the NPOC voice list.

And we allow the membership to object or approve within a period of 14 days so that we can plan to have you being seated in NPOC at our next NPOC monthly call. So we have monthly calls that normally would enable us to start thinking of a lot of work in the near future.

(Martin Slovak):   Thank you very much and very, very pleased to join the team. I'm so full of joy and energy to do things with you that - let's get on it.

Rudi Vansnick: So thank you - Rudi speaking. Thank you for your commitments already. We are looking forward to work together and have actually a full Excom team operational again. As we know, NPOC has been through difficult periods and it seems to me that this is the third year, the third trial, it's going to be the best trial because this is going - the one that we'll win.

Coming to the second point on the agenda, (unintelligible) the NPOC Excom at ICANN physical meetings. There has been - it's not new, it's a problem that is spanning for several years already, the issue of getting everybody from (unintelligible) into meetings - physical meetings of ICANN. And one of the issues that we need to tackle are the problems with the visa.

We have our colleagues from the Excom, Olevie (unintelligible) who is the communication committee chair who was not unable to come because his visa was not accepted. So that's really an issue that we have to solve.

In that sense I have proposed during a talk yesterday with (unintelligible), who is the finance guy from ICANN and with some other people, I sent this morning already a mail to (David Olive) and (Robert Target). I made a proposal that eventually could help solving the issue.

The idea is to start immediately after a physical meeting - ICANN physical meeting with the process of trying to discover who needs a visa to come to the next meeting and start elaborating a procedure and some template documents that would help in defining what the process is and in fact document the whole process for everybody, not only staff but also the constituency itself.

Because we have the best contact with our member in the constituency, normally we have a daily contact through email and we can help the person to get it done in the correct way.

And in time because I think most of the issues are that it's too often done too late. And ICANN - when the people that I have been talking to agree on this idea and want to work together. I have a meeting in the office on Friday and I will try to talk to Glen already to have a meeting with her Friday afternoon and check if we can elaborate something like a template or other process that will help getting our people in the meetings.

Because you all know, you can always connect remotely but it's not the same as being physically in the room and how to get changes - body language quite often helps us, having an impression or the idea if somebody is - I see Klaus' hand raising. You have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I would like to make a comment with regard to the practicalities of the visa applications. I think we have to stress two points. First of all, those who are applying for visa should apply for a visitor's visa and not for business visas and things like that.

That means people need to be educated what is actually realistic, not realistic, we can't apply for a six-months visa for four or five day visit.

And the other thing is the - which the much more important is the - is the approach ICANN has. ICANN puts up letter which everybody who wants it can download and I expected to give that to the visa issuing embassy or whatever. And this is just not valid because everybody can just download it. It's a generic letter which you just download and print out.

What needs to happen is very simple, straight forward, is that if somebody is making - wants to come to an ICANN meeting they need - ICANN needs to get in touch with the respective embassy or consulate before and send the letter directly from ICANN to the consulate, that is the whole difference. And this is, by the way, also how the UN tackles - deals with this. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. Rudi speaking. I see (Martin) putting his hand up. you have the floor, (Martin).

(Martin Slovak):   Thank you. (Martin) here speaking. Yes, I also would like to add something I think is - you mentioned before (unintelligible) meeting or in the - (unintelligible) public forum is when a country is - nominates for being a host and agrees to be a host I think there should be some sort of obligation to make sure that the people are - that are going to ICANN are not going to fall in bureaucracy holes that most of times means that the time to get to the visa is too long in order to make it practical.

I mean if you're going to be a host then you have to guarantee that everyone is going to be able to go. That happened in London and happened in the US, that people that were from staff, members that are always going to ICANN meetings, they couldn't make it. And it was clear that the host has to make sure that they could go. I don't know if...

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Martin). I see some hands - hand up.

Sam Lanfranco: Just a comment about the procedures by host you mean the organization, not the host country.

(Martin Slovak): I mean both.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, well, the host country will respond - the applicant has to respond early, that's a behavioral thing we have to push. They have to apply for the correct visa, that's a thing we have to make clear.

But the consulate, the embassy, or the high commission should have a separate message from the host saying this person will be coming to apply and we are supporting this, this, and that. So when the person walks in they don't - they're not sitting there saying, you photoshopped all this stuff and you're really not Sadam Hussein. They say - the person can say you've got the documentation.

And the person has done this early enough that they've dug out the documentation. When we do that the refusal rate falls to almost zero.

(Martin Slovak): That's exactly what I was talking about. But I think this did not happen, for example, in London.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam again. It hasn't been a policy of ICANN to do it that way as of now but we will change that policy.

Rudi Vansnick: I see (Joan)'s hand up. You have the floor, (Joan).

(Joan Kerr): Great, I think those are really great suggestions. I'll even suggest something a little bit further. A lot of times you send a letter or a communications to an administrator but it doesn't get down to the people who are at the desk. So I would suggest that there's a confirmation response and CC'd to the

administrator so that when a person actually goes in it makes it a lot easier as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Indeed. Rudi speaking. And that's one of the reasons I propose that there will be a close collaboration between ICANN staff and the constituency because we are close to our members and if we have a view on what is going wrong or what fails or what is missing as a constituency we can also take actions and assist our members so that it goes in the right directions.

The more people you can put in contact with official bodies sometimes political ways or helping much faster than all the others. So I think it's a work that has to be done in collaboration between ICANN staff and the constituency and I think that we will find solutions for the problems that are pending for several years now.

So I'm not going to take any longer on this point but I - NPOC is showing by doing this that we are willing to help where we can if they can help us. I think we can close this point two of the agenda if you will and go over to work in progress, work that we are doing in NPOC or as NPOC members.

And one of the first items is participation in working groups, which is in fact the real work that we have to do. And we have several members in several working groups. I was taught myself with the co-chairing of the translation and transliteration of PDP working group, contact information and the Whois database - that is the full name.

I learn a lot and I'm really happy to have a co-chair that is a specialist in languages and brings up terrific paperwork that enables the (unintelligible) group to go in depth in discussions and find ways to try to get the basis for consensus. I can tell you that actually it has been very intensive. It was - we started early this year and it was based on weekly calls.

So it's quite intensive. We have a very good group of people, good representation of almost everybody in the GNSO. I mean with that everybody from the constituencies.

And we are - actually we presented yesterday a draft of initial report and I would rather say it's an intention to a report - (unintelligible) report because it contains a lot of elements that we gather during the discussions.

And we are now going in the direction of trying to find a full consensus on the yes or the no to the question - the first question that is, is it desirable to have translation and or transliteration of contact information? That is the primary question.

If it's a no, automatically it cascades in recommendations that can eventually - if it's a no, for instance, recommendations could be that we help people to find ways and offer them tools that allow them to do the translation themselves. So that goes to - translation and transliteration has a cost anyway.

If you say it's mandatory you're putting a burden on the operations of registries and registrants anyway. And they will certainly go against having extra investment and costs to cover.

If you're saying no you're damaging somehow registrants, users, and so on. And if you want to give them both the solution then you have to find a middle way, which is give them solutions, give them tools that they are able to do the translation without putting extra burdens on it.

So that's actually a bit there - the way I'm trying to find - the way out of a blocking situation. Yes, I see Lori. You're first and I have Sam. Anybody else on this point?

Lori Schulman: Hi, I'm curious as to whether you've discussed the specifics of the tools. Like, how that would work? There'd be, like, some sort of universal translator or a translation clearinghouse or something like that?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi speaking, well, we already have been looking into existing tools and what are the difficulties with these tools. Anyway, it will be a guidance, not a rule, not a recommendation - strong recommendation, will just be some guidance which tool to use. Actually up to today we didn't have a perfect answer to that.

But yesterday Klaus came up with even an idea to use Google Maps. Problem is if you use Google Maps and you say, okay, I'm pointing to address, you have the wrong address anyway so it doesn't work. Sam, you have the phone.

Sam Lanfranco: Three points here. Anything that would be attractive in Google Maps could be used in Open Street Map and is open source and you own it and they don't own it, small technical point.

Two other points, one, the agenda item is participation in working groups. And I wanted to say two things about that. One is in some areas the working groups and the dialog works on things that ICANN simply doesn't hear. For example, yesterday in the discussion of the new new gTLD round the one that is coming down the pipe some day, the entire discussion in the sessions about that was do not raise expectations.

Keep expectations low because you don't want people investing in now and then it takes, you know, 48 months for the thing to happen. But the what's going on today thing that ICANN put out last night that was in our mailboxes has wording that makes it sound like the new new gTLD round was discussed yesterday and is just around the corner.

So that's a - an endemic problem with the way in which ICANN presents itself to the world.

The second point I want to make - and it comes back to (Joan)'s question about membership and that's - and it's a problem. It's a problem that NPOC itself is going to try to address within NPOC and that's that the main benefit of membership for many of the people who are involved in the constituency groups in ICANN is that you get to give your volunteer labor to do the kinds of things that Rudi was talking about.

That makes sense if your constituency is registrars or registries or whatever. Within the civil society constituencies there has to be a benefit going back to the member. And in those other cases the benefit going back to that member is frequently they're being paid to do what they're doing, they're employed.

So we have - one of the challenges and we'll talk about a little later in terms of outreach activities is that civil society and especially NGO constituencies have to say what's the flow of benefits going the other way, not just - you can put input into things that worry you about the Internet ecosystem and we would certainly like no more than 40 or 50 hours of free labor a week from you. We have to have the flow going the other way too.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. I see in the queue Klaus Stoll and our member from Bangladesh. First Klaus and then you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: I actually got three reputation - three points I would like to make and the first one is to rescue my reputation. I didn't suggest to use Google Maps.

What I suggested was instead of translating one address into another address in another language is to go through geo points and saying, okay, this is the geographical point and the name of that geographical point in English is that and in Chinese is that. It's just simply instead of translating is using geo points.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Yes, secondly about the topic of this thing is - with the working groups, I'm at the moment in active in four working groups and on the one side it is really a pain in the backside because you think about - not only getting up in the middle of the night, doing that weekly.

Sometimes you are - you are basically discussing the same things again and again and again and again. And the working groups are very slow and often not very effective. On the other hand, they always come up with a product, which I find - I mean amazing.

And there are staffing initiatives, for example, I know Marika is doing something with basically you're trying to bring new people into the working groups. It's a question I think also for our members and now we're coming to the membership is to make it relevant for the members what's actually going on and what is actually - is a reward for the participation.

And that brings me to the other point, maybe we will discuss it later in outreach but I think we are also in the unique situation that as the non-profit sector that we actually can make a contribution to the financial (unintelligible) of the non-profit organizations.

And for example, with talking about the new gTLD program. We have business models, for example, with community based gTLDs, which are there to - as sustainability of not for profit organizations and things like that. What we have to get used to is to communicate these clearer and bring them more to practical point.

And you heard me harking about it 10,000 times. It's all about relevance. We have to make ourselves relevant to the member not coming to saying all the

time, like in church, come to Jesus, yes. What we have to do is it pays to come to Jesus.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. You have the floor.

Man: Hello.

Rudi Vansnick: Don't forget to state your name before you speak.

Man: This is (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) I think we need to make the thing that (unintelligible) NPOC within GNSO and ICANN (unintelligible). And also find out the benefit for our members as they said, have opportunity to make business and register option. So why we do not show that in this benefit information to our members.

So if we ensure our (unintelligible) I can (unintelligible) as well as if we make some document or information to show our members. I think NPOC would become (unintelligible) in the future. So we need to make a markup how to become a (unintelligible) NPOC within our number and as well as our GNSO platform. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much. Rudi speaking. To conclude the point of participation in working groups, what I think is essential also is that to add to the comment you just made is that participates in the working group from NPOC should try to document their participation in the working group in such a way - in a very similar way so that every member of our constituency is aware of what the discussion is and when they think they can add something useful or important to the working group discussion that they can - if they don't want to be present in the working group itself can help the person that is from NPOC in the working group in bringing these points up in the agenda.

So that it - that we are representative for our membership, that it's indeed a very high level element of discussion that actually we are not able to really put in place but we need to do that.

I see Sam. Sam, you have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, I would subscribe to that and I - Sam Lanfranco. Part of being in the working group and it wouldn't be much of an extra burden is to do very short - three or four sentence reports back to NPOC voice so that you know what the issues are.

Just copying back to NPOC voice that there are all these documents available somewhere and there is a chance for public input and so forth is a bit daunting for somebody who is out there.

I'm on the discussion group. It's not a working group for the new gTLDs, the proposed next round gTLDs and in the areas of concern to us they are almost not on the agenda because it's almost - it's the business. It's the GAC. Everybody who's got a direct vested interest in making money on the new gTLDs is there.

And about the only thing they've said thus far about underserviced areas is they don't want gaming the system to take place there.

And the other thing is their issues that come up for the not for profit sector that are outside the ICANN remit but should be inside ours. For example, the consequences of second level domain names on the applicant - the NGO and civil society applicants. The problems have come up with the .NYC in New York. And it's at a level where the constituents that are being hurt are our constituency but the way they're being hurt falls outside the ICANN remit.

And so we - what we should be able to do there is carry on a dialog in which they are informed on how better to handle trying to get their own domain name.

And I talked to the new compliance - the chief compliance person, (Alan), yesterday and he's agreed that what ICANN could be doing is trying to put together best practices for registrars that would be of use to the registrants.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. I have a queue again. I see - I'm forgetting your first name always.

Man: My name is (unintelligible). (Unintelligible), you can call me (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, and then I have (Joan) and I think Lori has raised her hand too. So you have the floor.

Man: (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible). Based on (unintelligible). Some of our members, they have a good experience how to show up (unintelligible) but I believe most of our members, they have no good experience how to (unintelligible).

As early as how to show their benefit, how do they get that benefit in and (unintelligible) NPOC as early as (unintelligible). They also did not know. So I think we can make some information to send them our member that you can do this this way and get some - (unintelligible) we can show (unintelligible) GNSO platform.

So I believe - as like me, we don't actually - in our view, we don't actually know how to get NPOC's - there's (unintelligible) participating in GNSO platform. So I think that needs to come (unintelligible) so NPOC - sorry, NPOC members. So how to get their information and (unintelligible) to NPOC. Thank you.

I think it's a very initial view actually but I think this is important. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you for the input. And we will come back to this because we have some interesting information about what we are trying to put on the table in the near future. So I have (Joan) now in the queue.

(Joan Kerr): Just going back to the participation. I think that when you want to raise your profile within an organization you have to showcase what it is that you're doing. Because people are not going to read papers, they want you to tell them, right. So that's one good thing.

The other thing is that you're going to bring your point of view to the working groups if it's not being addressed as Sam was indicating. But there's a finer point as well for members - and you guys can correct me if I'm wrong. It's almost like we're not just representing the not for profit sector.

We're protecting them by safeguarding them and they need to know that we're looking out for them in the governance, that's our job. And I think that in itself is a huge point that we need to sell.

Rudi Vansnick: Absolutely. And that's why I'm enjoying having additional people on our committee because the more hats we have the more intelligence we bring to the table and the better we can help serve our members.

Next in the queue is Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I had a question for Sam. When you say that there is a - outside the remit of ICANN but inside ours, do you have specifics? I haven't been following - yes.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, the nonprofit groups in New York City that applied for second level domain names under .NYC are being forced to go into a blind auction competing against each other probably using New York City money because

they're health groups in New York City for the domain - for the URL mentalhealth.NYC.

If it's a private ICANN auction or an ICANN auction all of the applicants know each other and are allowed to negotiate among each other any way they want, okay.

These various boroughs in New York City have - and regions have different mental health groups. They are not allowed to get together and bid and ICANN's position is that a second level string is not their issue. But it is an issue for our constituency.

So what we can do is inform our constituency to say when the city is negotiating with Neustar for the contract - Neustar manages the registry for them, that the citizen groups are there and the NGOs are there saying we want to see terms of the - you know, what kind of auctions are you going to have, what kind of sunrise, what kind of land rush, and so forth to make them more knowledgeable so they don't get the short end of the stick as they have in New York.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. To summarize, many points have been raised. It makes clear that we need some more people in our constituency being able to join working groups.

I will try to work on a list of working groups that are really important and we can then summarize this list and try to find out where we absolutely need presence in the working groups and where we can occasionally participate as it should not be on our high priority list of activities because we cannot be everywhere.

I've tried to be in so many working groups. I think in total in six but at the certain moment you're just crashing because you cannot - as a volunteer stay on all the time and be awake day and night as Klaus was mentioning.

Working groups participation is interesting. You learn a lot but it doesn't help if you burn up all our values by just trying to be everywhere.

So I think we can jump into the next item in our - sorry. Lori, you have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes, before we jump - this is added to the working group on curative rights for NGOs and IGOs. And I believe these issues are directly relevant to NPOC and I would have a point of contention as to whether or not the second level was a concern of ICANN and that was the whole intent of the curative rights to begin with.

The rights protection mechanisms are in place due to concerns from the business constituencies and the IPC on the second level. And I think that it actually part of the remit or at least ICANN certainly is responding to it in terms of its right mechanism. So I think it's not as cut and dry as ICANN's saying it's not in their remit.

Sam Lanfranco: Just to clarify, the comment that I received was that the contract between the managers of the registrar and the registrar in that case, New York City, that those elements of the contract are beyond ICANN's remit.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you for the additional comment. And I'm welcoming some new members in our - participants, sorry, in our meeting as well - physically as online. I see several new names popping up in the online.

You're all welcome and if you have anything you want to raise please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect and we will allow you to speak up. If necessary we can do it through the chat and bring your question up in the meeting here.

As said, I would like to go to the next item in our agenda point three, which is the NPOC manifesto. And I would like Klaus to make some comments and

announcements on the manifesto. I will - for those being online, you will get the link in the Adobe Connect so that you are pointed to the manifesto and you can follow it online too. Klaus, you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much. I think - it's a little bit difficult for me to start, where do I start talking about the manifesto.

Let me try to - let me try to start somewhere very close to home and I'm talking about NPOC here as an organization and as a constituency. NPOC as a constituency had a very, very difficult start. Not only did we have a lot of problems with regard to personnel issues, we had dear leaders dying, we had problems with other constituencies and things like that. And it really took us three or four years to find our own feet and our own identity.

Thank God, we found our feet and the manifesto is one of the signs of what we are doing.

The manifesto comes back to everything we are doing. It's just simply says, why NPOC is there, why NPOC is important for the not for profit sector. The reason why NPOC is serving the not for profit community and ways - how to engage with us.

And the manifesto is just one part of overall engagement of the not for profit sector. And we have to do something. Let's be clear about it, it's not - no longer a secret that the ICANN emperor has a lot of problems in the - this recount that this emperor has no clothes.

If you look at - for example, we're talking about the multi-stakeholder model and if you really look at how many organizations or how many groups actually represented in the not for profit sector or - you realize there is nothing. It's an absolute small minority talk for a lot of things.

And in order to support ICANN, in order to support our own consistency we have to do one thing is to engage more organizations through outreach and capacity building with NPOC. And this is now what we are doing.

And the manifesto is something which has been developed over the last few months. It's a living document, that means there will be better and better - more to the point versions from time to time.

The manifesto is one expression of overall master plan how to get - how to get the not for profit organizations globally engaged. And Rudi, do you want me to talk already a little bit about that master plan or not?

Because it sounds a little bit mysterious but on the other side I don't see there's anything - because outreach plan is separate on the agenda. I don't know where we start.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. Well, I first - Rudi speaking. I would first go around the table to see if there are comments or additional remarks or ideas to this manifesto. I know it's a bit early to ask you to have an impression of it but maybe it's good if we go around the table and see if there are other impressions on what we are proposing.

And we have the outreach and the master plan. I would like to discuss that in our agenda point five where we talk about the outreach because that's the - the master plan is also the full outreach plan that we have in mind. Not only in mind, on paper.

I see several hands going up - the queue. Sam, (Joan), and (Janice) and maybe (unintelligible) we'll go around the table and then summarize. Sam, you have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, as one of the scribes helped putting this working together for the master plan, let me give you my vision of what we're trying to do here. The not for profit constituency is basically the organized portion of civil society.

It represents civil society in a whole bunch of different ways and it has its own mission and vision. It can be health, human rights, agriculture, education, you know - I said human rights.

What this manifesto is about is NPOC saying we want to reach out in two ways. We want to help civil society and NGOs understand what are the issues within the Internet and governance system that should be of concern to you, A.

And B, giving what you do, what your mission and vision are, what are the issues with respect to the Internet ecosystem, not just the governance system But the ecosystem that you worry about. Some of that can be helped from this end, some can't.

But raising the level of awareness about both of those and allowing those constituents - NGOs and civil society groups to carry on a better dialog among themselves around the issues, whether it's at the global level or the national level is extremely important here. If not they're just - civil society is going to be marginalized as it has been in the growth of the Internet to this point.

It's a wonderful vehicle for doing things but if you're a poor farmer a truck is a wonderful thing for taking produce to the market but if you can't get a truck it's not much help.

So this is a two-way street. It's a reaching out to help create a better NGO Internet citizen, a more informed Internet citizen so that that citizen can be more engaged, either within ICANN or elsewhere. This is not just a recruiting drive for ICANN.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. (Joan), you have the floor.

(Joan Kerr):   I just wanted to - (Joan) speaking. I wanted to clarify if there were any consultations done with the member organizations to come up with the master plan.

Man: Quick comment. It's not a master plan. It's a manifesto. The first step is going to be a large querying both of members and as much of the rest of the civil society constituency out there as we can get to to move - to make the list of what a master plan looks like.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you. We have (unintelligible).

Man: This is (unintelligible) from Bangladesh. Actually Sam already mentioned my issue, (unintelligible). So we need to (unintelligible) so that (unintelligible) NPOC. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible), I'm from the GRC, and I'm really happy to be in this room this morning. I'm a newcomer, a fellow, so I'm still learning and I think I'm interested in the work that NPOC is doing because managing a not for profit back in the GRC and this is really important for me.

                   So I don't - I'm sorry, I came a bit late but I would like to know whether there's a possibility to have a copy or where can we access the manifesto so that I can read and then maybe I can have more comments on it? Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (unintelligible) give you a straight answer. You have the document in front of you on paper but secondly you go to the NPOC.org website and you will find it immediately in the links and navigation menu.

On top you will find the link to the manifesto and you will see in the near future we are going to open up a lot of documents to our membership where we can - maybe to wikis start working and extending the work we have been doing through wiki system so that you can all participate in it.

You're very welcome among our membership, just go to NPOC website and you can also there find the document to get a format of what is required to be a member. And we will always be there to help you - getting you among us, thank you.

(Martin), do you have any additional comment? Okay, Klaus, you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: I would just like to repeat this is - the manifesto is not a finished product. It's a starting point. We have put it up as a starting point to start the discussion and to get into it. It's - we basically saw - to start with nothing is - to consulate - to do consultation on nothing is not very good.

So we basically created a starting point and now it up for the members and including the master plan, the outreach plan, it's all completely member inclusive and I would even say member dependent.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. I think this manifesto is one of the first documents that NPOC has been brought up to the public and the community and so far I've got very positive signals from the participants here in these meetings. It looks like we nailed down the essence of what has to happen and we have already solutions to implement the manifesto, that's in the agenda later on.

If we don't have any further discussions - I've seen also, Olevie trying to connect and we will join us. Olevie (unintelligible) is our communication committee chair but could not be here due to what we already talked about, visa issues.

So next, on the agenda is the membership issues and I think it's a quite difficult and annoying one. But it will clarify - reasons why we are not - or have not been able to have a full room here, that's the basic question.

Up to today the whole mechanism to become a member is quite complex. You first have to go to the website or NCSG. You have to become a member of NCSG anyway, that seems to be the rules today. And then you can - in addition you can become an NCUC member and/or an NPOC member. And I know that for many people this is very weird.

They don't understand why they have to be in three constituencies to be able to raise a voice, that's really, really complex. So we have been trying to think about possibilities and solutions that would help us and the membership to be up and running. And I think that the best way out of this problem is that we have a charter.

We have a definition. We have the requirements to become a member of NPOC in our charter that first of all a candidate member of NPOC is addressing NPOC first, fills an application form in, and NPOC validates the membership.

And then we can pass on the information to NCSG because otherwise I don't see the reason why other constituencies have to define if our member - if somebody can be member of our constituency.

They are not part of ours so I don't see any legal elements that are defining that you have to be approved by somebody else first before you can be member of - so that's really weird. I see Sam raising and (Martin), you have raised your hand first. Yes, go ahead.

(Martin Slovak):   Yes, thank you. (Martin) speaking. I feel it's really, really important that (unintelligible) intellectual comment is about how things should be. It's about how things are, not even (unintelligible) the problems but just how things are.

It took me six months, about roughly 1,000 (unintelligible) to understand literally how the institute was (unintelligible) and the basic reasons or the basic dynamic of the things in there. I think that's in part because the names are misleading, because - when we compared them to other places in ICANN we found that they don't function the same way.

So just to make it really, really brief for people that are not (unintelligible) familiar with it, the non-commercial stakeholder group is nowadays the stakeholder group and the constituencies inside it are meant to represent a group of interest. But they're not entirely given the work as in other stakeholders have.

And I think this is one of the main issues we are having because exactly as Rudi said, it should be reasonable that NGOs have an entry point in the non for profit operational constituency. And it's also reasonable that the non for profit operational constituency is part of a non-commercial stakeholder group. I mean that should be a reasonable part of it.

If we follow that the non-commercial stakeholder group is part of the GNSO. It makes sense at how the - a change - we go from bottom to up. And I think that knowing this it is clearly conceptually that the bottom in this case is NPOC (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) is up of them.

But that is not reflected in their rules right now or at least (unintelligible) interpretation of rules that are being made. So I hope that may clarify some doubts for people. If not, I want people to correct me or do question about it because it - I still confusing. I'm still discussing.

I think I discuss even with people that weren't supposed to want to build this and they're not entirely agree on this thing.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Martin). And there is a reason why we're putting this item on our agenda for the end time because we want to get rid of this. It's taking too much energy and effort away and doesn't allow us to really focus on the real work. And we need to do the real work but we need to do it with all the NGOs, not just a few of the NGOs world. We need them all.

And if it's too difficult for an NGO to enter into the process of being able to raise voices in ICANN then we need to change that first and then we can get all the rest on the table.

I see Sam, you have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, first comment is for the new persons from the GRC. If you feel we've stopped speaking in English for the last five minutes because it got very confusing that's understandable.

It took me - when I applied and submitted my application it took the process eight months to process my application. The good news is that NPOC is only about three and a half years old. We are a young organization.

The better news is that the two issues, how to handle the membership database and how to handle the application process, I have already signaled are going to go on the agenda of the NCSG, the umbrella over NPOC, which is organizational concerns and NCUC, which is individual concerns about the Internet. It's going to go on that agenda and these issues are going to be driven through that agenda. And if not, you'll be all coming to my wake.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Sam. When you say eight months, it's an early born baby so that was just one month too quick. I see Lori. You have the floor, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I think it's important to remember when we talk about this here insularly in this room and on the phone - I mean on the stream that the position that NCSG executive committee members, not Rudi and myself, but the executive

committee members that come out of the NCUC, they take the position - and this is where the knot is and I mean K-N-O-T that NCUC says, well, we're organizations and everybody and because we're everybody we don't see the need for a separate NPOC, that's always been their story.

And I think that's important that we keep reiterating this because they haven't convinced themselves that they're individuals. They don't look at themselves that way, they don't present themselves that way when Bill Drake introduced NCSG and NCUC at the civil society engagement and ICANN session that we had over the weekend.

The statistics that he put on the board, he was very careful to call out that they've got 95 organizational members according to them. And then NPOC has 50. So then that would - the way it's presented calls to reason why do we need NPOC? And that's been their whole argument all along.

Rudi Vansnick: I see a queue. Sam and then (Joan). Sam, you have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: There are two points of clarification there. At the moment NPOC exists. In the two agenda items coming up after Los Angeles, if they want to mount those issues, those are charter issues.

The issues we will be addressing have to do with the management of the membership databases and the application processes as they are now. Those are not charter issues. We deal with those if part of the house is not happy with how we deal with them they can say we want to raise charter issues, that's point one.

Part two is that of the total of 400 or so members of NPOC and NCSG only about 116 of those were verified as being alive for the last election process and a good third or 40% of those were ours. So that even their - of their 300 - 400 people, there are no signs of life.

And there's a third one, which is going to haunt us - probably starting at the outcome of this meeting in Los Angeles and that's that many of the stakeholders are not accountable to whom they represent. They're speaking on behalf of whom they represent but they are not accountable to whom they represent.

And there are people who would like to change the stakeholder model who say, what is your accountability to your organization? And that - that's the very dicey issue and it's one that NPOC hopes to address gradually but representation requires accountability at all levels.

And so there are a whole bunch of - in the multi-sector - multi-stakeholder governance model, there are a whole bunch of issues in the background because this is a new model. And there are forces out there trying to jockey the outcomes in their favor.

So we're both trying to work out structure of an organization but we're also dealing with power relationships there. Nobody who works in the nonprofit sector is - says there are no power relationships. There are and so we have to be very strategic in how we do things.

And I have deliberately kept - for example, and then I'll shut up on this, I've kept the membership - management of membership database which currently is physically managed by the head of NCSG personally handled on a Google Docs site.

This makes no sense in terms of how an organization house keeps its membership database. But so those things we will sort out. The bigger issues, they're going to be very similar for NGOs to the kind of issues they fight at home.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. We have (Joan) next in the queue.

(Joan Kerr): (Joan) speaking. I won't address the accountability representation issue because that was one of the things I was going to bring up. The larger message to civil society is that we have some authority - not just that we're representing them but there's some authority.

A lot of time civil society's really diminished in - when there are multi-stakeholders at a table. I mean that's at least - and I think that we have to signal to them that this is something that we want to change. That's the larger message that - you know, the membership should understand is that they're equal at the table.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Joan), for this point of view. And indeed, quite often civil society is represented by individuals and individuals - certain individuals have such a strong voice that they push their opinion rather than representing the civil society. When I go back to the recent civil society session it was all about privacy, (unintelligible) rights, freedom of speech. Great, great items, great topics.

But sorry NGOs are not concerned about the privacy and first they have other issues that they want to have solved. And by the way, as Sam (unintelligible).

Yes, Klaus, I see your hand's raised. You have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: I think we have to be also very much aware about a very fundamental problem. We are here in ICANN. ICANN is trying to gain the transition of the (unintelligible) contract and there is a lot of, let's say, talk about the multi-stakeholder model and we've seen it already at the (unintelligible) and we will see it much, much more; a very simple fact.

The government of India, for example, go into the microphone and will say, multi-stakeholder model, forget it. And they will argue very simply so how many organizations are actually represented in ICANN as civil society? And

the answer it will be basically nothing. I mean we - what Sam mentioned is actually the point.

I mean you can register as many members as you want. If you do annual headcount and ask who is still active, who's there, and it turns out there's only one-third for the organizations or even this is worth replying so that basically even membership wise in ICANN there are no more than 50 or 60 noncommercial or NGO represented even in the loosest sense.

Basic huge, huge, huge legitimate problem, that is something which can really damage ICANN.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. (Joan), your have the floor.

(Joan Kerr): (Joan) speaking. Have we addressed or looked at the issue a lot of countries - I shouldn't say a lot but certainly in the US and Canada, a lot of not for profits are going to what they call a B enterprise, which is a social enterprise. Yes, so have we addressed that? Do we consider them not for profits?

Klaus Stoll: I have to say something here and I know I will get a lot of flack, what I'm saying now and some people will hit me in the corridor afterwards. We have a situation where one or two people nilly-lilly randomly decide who's a nonprofit or not.

It's basically the executive committee, somebody says, I don't like him, they are not a not for profit. They received money from them or they're making money or anything and nobody's accountable for it. It's nilly-lilly decisions.

Lori Schulman: I want to follow up on some of that because I've been part of the (NCSGEC) for the last year reviewing applications and I will say there's been a disappointing few that have come through for nonprofits.

But I will tell you I have vociferously argued for those few applications that have come through that are perceived by the NCUC representative as being trade organizations when in fact they have educational components, community components and in these cases these were American organizations that had clear nonprofit status under US tax code.

We went to the extent or I had gone to the extent of actually while we were in these meetings going online and finding the tax status, going on - because I came out of the gate of the US system because I'm a US lawyer obviously. But in terms of how do I navigate that globally and properly represent the rest of the world that may be applying is a difficult problem but is certainly one that is worth tackling.

And this goes back, I think, also to a charter issue. Our - I am definitely a bottom up person in terms of feeling right now that there are true deficiencies in our charter that we could fix today that I would like (Martin) and I maybe to join heads together with our backgrounds to look at the charter and fix our own charter - get our own house in order in terms of how we define nonprofits.

Because if you look at it now it's an extremely loose definition and there's a lot of room for bias. Now there's always going to be some room for bias because these are the questions that very famously being addressed by .NGO and ONG, you know, how are you going to define what is a nonprofit in a world that has extremely unaligned standards.

So I think one of the best things we could do as a community is really offer the right direction for this, become the place that says this is what it means, folks. And if you're going to have new gTLDs that are supposedly community-based on a nonprofit community the input's going to come from NPOC.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Lori. And I see, again, hands raised so I have a queue. (Joan) first, (Martin) because he was raising his hand earlier already. First, (Martin), (Joan), and Klaus.

(Martin Slovak):   (Martin) speaking, thank you very much for the floor. I will try to address the three things that brought my attention. The first one is that it is true what Sam said. There is a common argument that I've been hearing about that this is a charter issue - what NPOC is trying to make (unintelligible). This is a charter issue.

We are not discussing charter issues. The (unintelligible). if you want to get the votes and change it, you know. I think we should try to address it because that's our behavior, that's our repeated behavior. (Unintelligible).

There is an (unintelligible) especially for people that are new or for people that do not have the time to address the 1,000 (unintelligible) that are being processed everyday.

So it might be a technique - a negotiating technique or a distracting technique. I think it's fair to make that (unintelligible) more public, you know, to - we may, just like, making the public lower that kind of attitudes that are not productive.

Second in connection with this, I raised this in my experience that there are also personal attacks going on sometimes in the NCSG and I think that's making it a little bit public, not a lot, it will maybe prevent that from happening because it's also very, very unproductive. It makes no sense. It's a waste of everybody's time.

To get that away is the less interesting thing for me - are there to - the second one, if I'm really, really interested in is the use of the work of the (unintelligible) when we are talking about accountability, that they're not usually put together.

Everyone - 99% of the people talk only about accountability. When for me - and I agree, it is legitimacy what is the point. Accountability is only a part of legitimacy and that's the real issue and that's one of the main reasons why the NCSG and NPOC has to come through because we are not only talking about if you're ongoing to be accountable or not.

It's if you're going to have legitimacy to do the work we have to do, and that is a really broad point. I'm not going to expand more on it but I think it deserves more attention. I know that lawyers may catch up a little bit easier to the term legitimacy but it is - in my opinion, it's a fair distinction.

It's not I am not saying accountability doesn't matter. It's mainly legitimacy is mainly about accountability but I think it's broader.

And the third point, and not to make it too long, I agree when discussing on the definitions about NGOs. It's really, really important specifically because we have so many anecdotes, some of them really embarrassing on how NGOs are a not - characterized or verified as NGOs so my two cents.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Martin). Indeed, you have highlighted one of the elements that very often are forgotten, not only us but everybody is forgetting that legitimacy is the key to get things done in a decent way.

Actually there's so many other reasons they're used to say that somebody is an NGO or not an NGO but they are not based on the normal way of doing things.

I have in the queue (Joan) and Klaus has dropped off. Okay, (Joan), you have the floor.

(Joan Kerr):   (Joan) speaking. Just to say that NPOC could take a leading role in the definition as it was stated. And the other thing too is NGO is a term that is

mostly used in Europe. It's not widely used in North America. So it's a - it becomes a selling point - or a marketing point for us as well in addition to the definitions. So we could actually use it to our benefit as an education.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Joan). Klaus, you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: Maybe I - let me take us back to the absolute basics, what's the name of NPOC?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: No.

Man: Not for profit.

Klaus Stoll: Operational concern, not for profit operational concern constituency. And let us remind us what we are actually supposed to do, operational concerns. And up until this summer I didn't understand what that actually means in the context of ICANN.

And now I know - and I can tell you why. I did research on 17,000 global NGOs, which registered their domain names in three - over the last three years with the UN. And I checked out on 17,000 NGOs if they still have a website, if it's still operational and so on, and it turns out that 75% of the 17,000 lost their domain over the last three years.

And then I did the research and - to find out why. And operational concern is means if you believe it or not it's too difficult for NGOs to renew their domains. There are a lot of NGOs who absolutely no idea how it works.

They are getting a (unintelligible), getting a website, and technician does it. A technician does the registration. A technician goes away, they change the telephone number to - it's done. This - we are with a not for profit operational

concerns in the heart of the mission and vision of ICANN. We have to do - concentrate on that point and remind us again and again this is what it's all about.

We are serving the NGOs and we are serving ICANN at the same time. And they are very straightforward solutions and you will see other things we have to talk about. I would like to make another point about the membership issues.

I can't understand why is this possible to say that the university, which is selling courses in the US for a lot of money and take in a lot of money for offering their service - profit whilst at the same time and foundation in Ghana, which got $5,000 from the Bill Gates organization is profit. I don't get it.

And I think it is absolutely damaging to ICANN's reputation that these things can even happen because if you really - if somebody really looks into what's going on here it's not only us who looks bad it's ICANN who looks bad.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. This is indeed a very hard point that we probably have to think about coming to the mic in the public forum and highlight - in fact, your last remark because that points very heartily where the system is failing.

By the way, it's not only people here in the room that are active participants but I see the hand from (unintelligible) Africa, from (Akimbo). You have to (unintelligible) if you can come into the Connect. You have the floor. You may unmute your connection, your mic but you have the floor now.

Actually don't hear you yet so please try to speak into your mic. I see him typing in the chat room. We have a second person in the queue and that's one of our members and previous Excom. It's (unintelligible). (Unintelligible), you have the floor. It looks like the floor is not working. You have the mic.

I've just been informed here by the technical staff that the Adobe Connections don't have audio which is very strange because normally they have. And if somebody wants to speak please send us a phone number and we dial out to you or - that's right?

Man: Yes, or they type the message.

Rudi Vansnick: Or type the number on the screen and you will be dialed in. I didn't know that the Adobe Connect didn't have the - normally we always have the Adobe Connect possibility to have audio. The working groups it's always worked for us. Okay, fine.

By the way, it's not the fault of the technical staff. It's just how it's set up. by the way, I have a third person in the queue and I see the mics so it should work. I see the mics on the Adobe Connect screen now and most of our participants are of the regions that we really want to be part of our club and our constituency.

I see (Eduardo) among here also and (Eduardo), do you have - are you capabilities? We can't hear you. If you are speaking - and I see that the mic is not muted. (Eduardo), it's not - (unintelligible). You have - you're used to this platform. Can you speak eventually? Well, anyway, we will solve this technical issue as soon as possible and we will come back to you.

You're not lost, certainly not lost at all. We want your voice here and I will go into this room here and I see (unintelligible) has raised his hand. You have the floor.

Man: Thank you. (Unintelligible) speaking. As I was saying, there is a lot of work I think that NPOC has to do regarding the NGOs, especially in Africa. The way NGOs are operating with websites and their online presence is really important and I think the NPOC has a lot to do in Africa.

I would like to say this, so many organizations - not for profit in Africa, when they are starting creating their online presence they usually create a website. And then when they start using that website most of the times after a certain time of - after certain period they forget all the information about how they need to manage that website.

And that's why you would see so many people have websites. They are writing on their - I don't know, on some of their brochures they are giving to people. And then after a month or two, when you come back to that website it's no longer worker.

So I think that's one of the issues. NGOs and not for profits in so many places in Africa needs to know how they need to deal with that, those websites, that's also one of the comments I wanted to put in.

But also lastly, the discussion about what is not for profit and who is a profit organization, I think that's a long debate and there is a lot actually to do about it - about that issue. I don't know whether any ICANN role to define who is a not for profit, who is not - who is not or I think NPOC may be is dealing with those (unintelligible) organizations should may be set a number of - don't say (unintelligible) but yes, currently being able to distinct - distinguish who is not for profit and who is not. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much, (unintelligible). You have brought up two elements that are really, really important. First is indeed, the presence on Internet for an NGO is critical because that's the marketing value that you get offered by being connected on the Internet. And without that you're just losing a lot of money anyway.

And it's a topic we'll discuss later on in this meeting and we are going to come back to this because this is one of the items that we want to raise in the near - in the future during the ICANN meetings. We want to get this on the

table as issues where ICANN has a mission to solve that problem. They cannot just push it back and say, well, it's content or whatever. No, it's not.

If you're losing your domain name it's in the DNS space so it's a problem that ICANN has to address. And we will raise that voice as long as needed so that they will listen to us. And then we can act. And we have the advantage being in the GNSO. We are not in the AC at large for instance. We are given full seat advice but that is almost never mandatory.

In GNSO we are working on policy development, policy implementation and that's more mandatory. So I would say we are writing with the laws and the board is (unintelligible) and validates, yes, that law goes through and is executed. And that - that's where we have to use this space.

I see Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: I just want to make a very simple point. Thank you, thank you very much for what you said. To put it very straightforward into one sentence, 75 - it looks like 75% of NGOs are losing their domain name over three years because of a system ICANN has set up.

So it is ICANN directly core problem and we are here to tackle and to manage that problem. And this is a real operational concern goes directly to the heart of ICANN.

Man: We lost the chair.

Rudi Vansnick: I lost my chair. Thank you, Klaus. And thanks again, we will come back in a - later on in this meeting on this initial critical point. I hope that we meanwhile we can have our people in the Adobe Connect - I'm checking (unintelligible).

Can you speak now? If you cannot, please, type in the question in the chat room and Lori will assist you in bringing up your question. She will speak for you here in the room and we will be able to address your questions.

I would like to round up this membership issue. We have maybe not covered everything but the most critical ones have been discussed I think and we will work together on a plan. I'm summarizing that in fact we have defined two principle areas where we have to work on.

It's getting cleared out what the not for profit is, not only for us but for the whole NPOC - ICANN community because too often it's abused rather than used, the definition of not for profit is quite clear.

And the second one is how to get members more involved and have their issues addressed, that's for me the second one. And that's where we will come back later also in our discussions here.

How can we help our members? They have helped us by allowing us to be here and be able to raise a voice in ICANN. But we need now to have the critical elements as soon as possible.

And then I'm coming to - in fact, the next point that we want to work on and it is the NPOC's outreach activities where Klaus is in fact leading person and has worked out a quite impressive master plan that brought already a lot of very positive reactions in this community. Klaus, you have the floor.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you. What you hear - you hear a lot about the master plan but master plan is just simply - is simply a way how we actually practically engage with NGOs worldwide. And you will - there is a document where you (unintelligible) that and please allow us not to publish that document immediately because there are some changes to be made in light of this meeting.

After this meeting we will publish the document and you get the whole spiel. But what's going to happen? What's going to happen, actually beginning next week is that there will be regional questionnaires and outreaches done.

There will be in the email going out to - going out to NGOs regionally so we are starting with Europe. We're having an address list of NGOs in Europe. We are sending out an email which basically says why Internet governments is important for NGOs and how to engage. It's basically a short version of the manifesto.

And attached to this email is a request for those who are interested to fill out a very, very, very simple questionnaire. And the questionnaire only has about eight questions and it's all about the needs of the organization. We need to know what you need.

Those organizations who will reply but we won't tell them that in that email, those organizations that will reply will be contacted by us. We are trying to set up regional meetings so we're trying to get the people together, for example, in Brussels or whatever. But before I go to this meeting so we will do Europe, Latin America, North America, Africa twice, Asia twice.

So these - and then the next phase will be to get these people together into meetings and to planning meetings. In that planning meeting space on the organizations and what we know about the needs is that we say, so what can we do in capacity building to help the other organizations who lost - who have a problem with that whole stuff to actually solve that problem on the ground.

And if that means we have to do training calls and training the trainers and all that stuff so we will do it. The hope is that after this is happening that some of these organizations will say, okay, it might be worthwhile really engaging with ICANN and with noncommercial stakeholder group.

And it will be not done as join NPOC, join - no, I can join the NCSG. And hopefully that in the - for ICANN fairly short period of time of one to two years, instead of thirdly organization representing the civil society in ICANN hopefully my goal and my vision is that we have 250 or something like that engaged.

So we are trying to do - we are implementing this straightforward. We've got resources for it. It will be depending also on regional organizations to help us to implement it. That means, for example, if we've got already some organizations who are strong in their regions.

But for example, we are hoping that - like it happens here, some of the members come forward and say, I would like to coordinate my regional effort in my country or whatever.

And also that that - that's why the master plan is a stupid word for the - I didn't find a better one. The thing is that you regionally adapted. You're saying, okay, the question is how the group comes together and hopefully when the group meets they say, okay, we change it, we need that and that and that and we go in that direction.

Or another group says, okay, religiously we do exactly what the master plan does. But it's up to the members and up to the thing. What we are providing with the master plan is an organizational framework but we don't provide the content. The content is up to the members.

So I think I said most of it.

Rudi Vansnick: You - I know that Klaus can provide us for maybe an hour or four, there's a lot of details on this. I think he is - he gets awake in the morning and goes to sleep with the master plan. It's his plan to survive - and I hope it's not really a plan to survive for him.

Klaus Stoll: I just want to add one thing without taking a big (unintelligible). I'm pleasantly, pleasantly, pleasantly surprised about the guys who we talked about the master plan inside and outside ICANN.

Until now we haven't found one person who said it doesn't work, it won't do. Really people who normally are not very on the adventurous side and came and said this is exactly what ICANN needs and needs to be done. And it's a very, very simple straightforward plan, nothing else.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. I see Lori's hand.

Lori Schulman: I think one of the tasks that we have - and I had suggested at least in the chat room maybe we call it a blueprint. This master plan sounds too ominous but either way I think it's really important to get from you and hopefully from those who have been previously silenced on NPOC voice, what do we know we know in terms of coalition building and reaching out?

For instance, I'll give myself as an example. I'm a US practicing attorney. I have a background in intellectual property law in the commercial sector. And I have a background in general practices in the nonprofit sector. So I have a unique skill set probably for what we're trying to do.

But I can tell you personally I'm on five different listservs for groups of nonprofit lawyers. I can reach out to them.

But what can everybody in this room - who do you know? What do you know? I would like us to start writing it down to get it either in the chat or on NPOC voice or have Rudi set up the wiki. But who do we know today that is involved in coalition building in each of our regions because this is about building coalitions.

Individual nonprofit organizations, if they don't have the resources and knowledge to keep a website up what makes us think they're going to have

the resources and knowledge to be participating on a regular basis in NPOC discussion and policy making. This is talking about grassroots at a super granular level.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Lori. I have seen hands up. And I have a queue. State your name before you speak. You have the floor now. Then we have (Martin) and (Joan).

Woman: (Unintelligible). Hi, my name is (unintelligible) and I'm from Morocco. With regards to you wanting to have a master plan, you know, to kick off, you know, the work of this group. I think the idea of having a master plan is good idea.

But then leaves a lot of room, you know, to interpretations and I feel like it's too vague so we have narrow it down a little bit, you know, our options and think in a systematic way to understand from where we can start. I think this is a global initiative and in my opinion the first step if we want to outreach to organizations, say, in developing countries we have to think on a regional - we have to think about regional representation.

You probably have an idea now where are the countries where you have organizations that lost their domain name. and I think the statistics, you know, that you run will give you an idea of the level of presentation - representation of each country.

So if you can have a map, you know, to map the need and based on that we can work on engaging these organizations in this work and so they can represent themselves.

In terms of capacity building, I'm not sure what you mean by that exactly because the issue is strictly related to registration of, you know, these entities. And I think the issue is occurring at the level of ICANN and how it handles, you know, the registration of these organizations.

So I'm not sure what kind of capacity you're thinking, you know, or capacity building you're thinking of doing. But when we do the mapping it would be very interesting to define the stakeholders involved at the level of the problem so we can solve it.

Because if the issue is just registration there are specific stakeholders involved and they should be approached, you know, in person to solve the issue.

About the content, I don't think we should be involved - I mean this constituency should be involved in content because you would be dealing with a huge era of issues and different disciplines.

So maybe they would need help at that level to have an online kind of presence but to handle, you know, the content part I think it would be very challenging, you know, for this group to work on. I can see that you wanted to - like, answer my questions.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, exactly. This is Klaus.

Rudi Vansnick: I'm sorry. We have a queue. You can just comment on it and we go to the other.

Klaus Stoll: First of all, you are 100% right. I never mentioned content. The mapping and these things - this is part of the whole thing and for example, regional grouping and representative - this is part of the whole thing. The point is quite simply what you heard from me is basically the 30-second version. There is much, much more to it, yes.

And we - you can have a look at that, there's absolutely no problem. The thing was quite simply what I want to come back to what Lori said. It depends now also on people and the organizations getting involved and engaged with the whole thing and picking it up where it is.

Just for your information, I have a prior appointment at 11 o'clock, which is very, very important so that's why I will disappear. And by the way, the last thing with Morocco, we are planning and we are asked to do outreach event for NGOs in Morocco during the next ICANN meeting. And if you could help us to get this going you - more than pleased. So get your contact to one of these or whoever.

Woman: I'm not based in Morocco but I can help you. I work for a global organization where we have, like, 12 offices all around the world and we have more than 500 partners.

So you can imagine the number of, you know - like local organizations that we deal with and probably some of them have this problem. But by all means, if you need help to map, you know, organizations in Morocco I'd be very happy to help you.

Klaus Stoll: To map and reach, we need to get - that comes back to what you said about - yes, that was another point I didn't answer you. Yes, it's stupid as it sounds, we have to tell some of the organizations how to renew their domain name. We have to tell - we have to come back to the strategic uses of the Internet for sustainability and for the mission of the organization.

And that goes, for example, so deep and even to the highest extreme what I - (unintelligible) capacity building is, for example, why did only three organizations from Africa apply for new gTLD in the first round? The answer is they are not stupid because they didn't have the business plans and they didn't have the money to do it.

Now instead of saying, okay, we are giving the money or something like that, we have the capacity and we have the proven capacity in NPOC to build up viable proposals for a new gTLD space on community building.

And...

Woman: I hate to interrupt you, what's PIR doing? You know, can you get help from PIR?

Rudi Vansnick: Maybe Klaus - Klaus, I'm going to cut you off because you have to be at the meeting. It's too important. The early you go the quicker you'll be back and you will be back in the discussion.

What PIR is doing to their plan of implementation of ONG or .NGO is a bit going into a sense of helping NGOs setting up a webpage and so on and so on. They are web services they are going to employ. They have also in mind to do a kind of certification of an NGO but that's a question where I want to see criteria and how to roll that out.

It's good to give a certificate or a label to someone or an organization that - okay, you're recognized today but what about tomorrow? If tomorrow you're not fulfilling your tax duties you could be scratched as an NGO or you start tomorrow getting commercial activities and become a profit so the certification is a quite dangerous element.

I would like to come to our participants remotely because we - I have seen hands up and if we don't allow them to raise their questions so there will be enough (unintelligible).

We are here until 12:30 so I think we have more than time enough to talk about all of this. I had a hand up from Olevie who is now connected on the - through the phone bridge. Olevie, you have the floor.

Olevie Kouami: Okay, thank you. Are you hearing me?

Rudi Vansnick: We hear you clear.

Olevie Kouami: Okay, Olevie speaking. As already (unintelligible) my concern on the chat room.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay, thank you. We will pick it up on the - I will ask Lori (unintelligible).

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible). I know (unintelligible) in Africa and (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) meeting (unintelligible) to Klaus to attend this meeting and (unintelligible) NPOC.

Rudi Vansnick: Olevie, I have to interrupt you because we have a huge echo here, Olevie. We have to interrupt you. We have a huge echo in the Adobe Connect.

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible) Africa.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olevie Kouami: That's my concern, thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Olevie. We will pick up your question here and Lori will try to manage to get it in the queue here. We have also somebody from Africa - DNS Africa, (Akimbo). I don't know if you can speak to - we can do a trial but if it doesn't work we will ask you to put the question in the chat room, please. Can you try to come into the audio?

                   He is sitting in another meeting, okay. Please (Akimbo), put your question in the chat room and we will pick it up and you will get answers from us.

Woman: He has done that.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Can you pick it up?

Woman: Yes, hello. We're being asked if somebody from NPOC can attend the (unintelligible) meeting. And I don't see why not. I don't know when it is but I

will look on the schedule. If you know when the meeting is if you could type it into the chat that would be most helpful.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. It looks like we have some technical issues of having echoes here. Maybe we are at the point that we first have a little break and check if we can clear out this annoying echoes. And we pick up the discussion in about ten minutes.

So first of all, thank you - those being online for following the discussion. We will have a break for about ten minutes. We will come back and pick up the agenda where we leave it now.

So...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: I would like to restart our meeting otherwise we have had the nicest conversations here but we need to start talking about the other issues on the agenda. And I know that some of items on the agenda are very important. I see (Martin), you have the floor.

(Martin Slovak): Can we finish the - may we have a few comments on the last issues before we broke?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, indeed. I'm not going to just jump off what we were talking about. We disconnected due to some technical things that we wanted to get discussed first and solved.

By the way, for the remote participants if you're on the phone bridge you can come into the meeting by audio but please mute your speakers of your laptop or PC because that's the reason why we are getting echo in the audio room.

So please when you want to speak raise your hand. If you are not connected by phone give us your phone number, we will call you in the meeting and you will be able to raise your question, not only by chat, by voice.

And I repeat, please mute your speakers when you're on the phone call if you want to speak in there - in the room.

So I'm going back to the master plan presentation and we had some discussions but I cut off the queue and I'm bringing up the queue again if I remember well. There was (Martin) in the queue. I think (Joan) was also in the queue for some comments.

So (Martin), you have the floor first.

(Martin Slovak):   Well, basically what I wanted to say about the master plan, of course, is starting point and is a guide. I think we have a really good opportunity to do some cross-community work but of course, leaded by NPOC.

I've been talking a lot with people I'm trying to engage outreach from different constituencies at large, the register group, the ICANN staff, the academic (unintelligible) groups.

They are full of people that are basically trying to reach out to NGOs as part of reaching out to originally. And I think we can cooperate with them, you know, to build this capacities in order to give us more broad context to the NGOs.

And I think that we can - if we work together - for example, registrars in Latin America and some of the different countries, this is a difficult issue because there are not many, that's something that might be useful to add to the master plan (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, (Martin), for these comments. Well, my experience from the past as I'm not - I'm no longer a newbie in the ICANN community, I've helped building of the at large, I have a lot of experience of working closely together with different organizations and structures.

I had the experience being two years in (unintelligible) liaison from (ALAC) to the ccNO so I start understanding how ccTLDs are operating and essentially thinking and willing to cooperate. We started building bridges between the ALS' at large directories in (ALAC) and ccTLDs and that worked well.

I think it's something we can pick up in our context here for outreach that we are reaching out to registries and as we are going to have several hundreds coming up in - across the world. That is probably also good resources to contact and join us in reaching out to NGOs because at the end NGOs are their customers too.

So an outreach plan is quite complex plan if you want to cover everything. I think that is the lady from the organization that has representation in Morocco too highlighted the point that there is a lot to do but we have to try to put some focus on what is today a priority and what is in the future an issue.

There will be always issues. I haven't seen anything else in my life so - but I would like to do is first try to focus on what is a priority. And for instance, just mapping it in geographical definition, which region is the most critical one, which is the one we have to address as soon as possible?

And I think it's quite clear that it's one region that becomes very vibrant. And we see that in - as well in ICANN as in other structures, the African region is really becoming vibrant. They want to really be engaged and participate, but quite often there is a technical issue to get them connected.

Access and connectivity is still a problem in Africa. And it means that for an NGO it's probably also an issue to reach out to (unintelligible) members if the

connectivity in their country is bad. They cannot have an electronic communication channel with their members, so already that's an issue for the NGO in itself. If we can try to solve already the fact that they could communicate in a decent way to us, we are solving half of the work.

I see some - you have some comments?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. I just want to make a couple of general comments about the situation in Africa. The first is that the world is probably not watching very closely that some of the African economies are some of the faster-growing economies at the moment, that there are significant changes taking place.

The other is -- and this is pretty particularly with reference to South Africa -- the civil society NGO community, which is a term I use which just - which captures the constituency we're concerned with there. Technically has good access, but it's the resource base and the organizational capacity that stands in the way of exercising that.

In this year alone, one-third of the registered NGOs in South Africa have been deregistered by the government. One-third of the NGOs that are registered have been warned that they will be deregistered, and only one-third have been able to keep even their documentation to the government current.

So we're dealing with a highly volatile - the organizational portion of this constituency is highly volatile. And any outreach we do should not only be aware of that, but in some sense say on the electronic side, "Here's the kind of support we can offer," so at least on that side we're helping you with capacity building.

The other dimensions to it that are beyond us, they're being addressed in other ways. But I think we have to recognize that the services to them have to be something that takes into account their own constraints as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. Rudi speaking. With regards the practical part of what we are willing to do with the master plan, and especially the outreach plans, we have several layers that we are going to go through.

The first one is that we are putting together the - a list of contacts of - to NGOs, NGO details in a database. And we will - and we are already - we have already done partly.

It's going to be finished next week - having a quite small survey, five to eight questions that we want to address to the NGOs so that we have an idea, an impression of who they are and what they want us first to take up as important issue or a requirement.

And that will be done region-by-region because we have this physical event that we plan to do in the regions. And it will be aligned with the region that we will prioritize first to handle. So that action is planned for the next few weeks.

We will collect all the information and try to produce some - a kind of analytical report that would respond to the questions that I've heard earlier about the mapping. That's probably something that we can add to the first question here.

The goal is to have a second longer question sent out once we have collected all of the details of the NGOs - the contact details in a decent way. And then we will really reach out to them, inviting them to participate first in what we are going to try to set up in a virtual way, because physical meetings are expensive, not easy to organize, and in some regions it makes (unintelligible) difficult to get people in a meeting room. So we will work on this anyway.

The second - the third step is that we will summarize the input we are getting and bring that to the table. And the first one would be the one in - ICANN meeting in Marrakech.

It's a perfect space because it's the region that we think is the hottest region to help forward. And Marrakech is probably also a place that will be quite accessible for many African participants. I see a new face in our room here from Nigeria. You are welcome and you're invited to participate.

And we already - I already discussed with him yesterday about an organization that (Hillary) presented to me having something like 500 NGOs grouped under that organization. So we - probably we'll have something to do in Nigeria too.

If you look into the geographical structure of Africa, Marrakech is in the north, Nigeria is in the middle. We will probably have to do something in the south, and we'll have covered the region in the first assay, if I may say.

So I think it's important that we start thinking of what are the questions we have to bring to the table so that we are getting their attention. We can think of any possible question, but if they are not interested in what I'm asking, I will probably get no answer at all.

So Marrakech is tomorrow. After this meeting, we start planning the - or ICANN starts planning the meeting in Marrakech. I've already been talking to (Glen) and I will be in close contact with (Lars), as he is living not far away from me. He is in the Brussels office quite often. We'll try to set up the requirements that we have - will have in Marrakech.

And it could be good if we could in Marrakech answer the first questions we are getting from them. I think that that's the criteria of success of our plan, is that in Marrakech we can give answers so that they feel, "Oh good, we have

to continue this communication and this interaction because they are responding finally to what we are expecting that ICANN needs to do."

I see some hands. You have the floor, Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, it's just a very short comment and it builds on (Joan)'s earlier comment, and that's that even the questions that are going out initially, we have to make some decisions about what those questions are.

And are we - and we're not going to answer this one here, but I'll give an example, and that's are we saying to them, "What is there about ICANN and Internet governance that you've got questions and issues about," or "What is it about Internet governance that you've got issues about," or "What it is about your relationship to the Internet in terms of your own mission and vision that you've got questions about?

And so even deciding at which level the initial engagement - in terms of a question, making decisions as to what that is - what level to engage in the first questions is a very - is a very demanding strategic issue for us.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. I think I heard half an hour ago already a quite good indication of what is going on and what seems to be an important issue for NGOs.

It's about how can they participate in the Internet ecosystem by having their domain name, first of all. Because that's the license plate they get, and if you don't have a license plate, normally you cannot drive a car. It's the same if you don't have a license to drive. You cannot drive the car.

But anyway, I think that to me, what is - if they don't have the car, that's the first issue. But if they don't have a license plate, they are excluded to come into the traffic. And that's where it happens today. People are taking away the

license plate, which doesn't allow them to circulate in the world. It's - I know it's a bit (unintelligible) point.

But I see several hands popping up, and that's one of the reasons why I'm sometimes putting things to the table that are against any rule, to wake up people and speak up. So I have a queue.

I'm going first to Sam, (Joan) and then (Martin).

Sam Lanfranco: I want to treat it - it's a follow-up because I want to disagree with you completely. A significant number of the civil society and NGO groups out there now don't have a license plate, but believe, act and think that at the moment if they're on the bus, that's okay.

They are using social media to the Nth degree. They're using the features of apps, they're using the features of Facebook, they're using the features of Google. They used to use something else, Myspace and whatever.

So a number of them are saying, "We can get on the bus and yell out the windows without owning the car and getting the license plate." So if there's an issue there, we have to explain to them what the issue is. We just can't say, "You don't have a license plate."

Rudi Vansnick: I completely agree with you. I'm not saying that I accept your disagreement. It's true, they can be on the bus. It's true they use social media. But they don't show their identity. They're losing their identity.

If you're among all the others in the Facebooks, you don't have your space. And it means that indeed you're on the bus and you will yell from the bus. And I will look at the bus, but I don't know who you are. And that's an initial point where they need their identity being represented.

And the only - I've used (unintelligible) by the - by using the license plate, but it was something that came up in my mind to look. It's an identity, and they are - don't have their identity. If they all drop in the social media, they're among so many others. And within five seconds, your message is dropped off the screen because others are posting on the same space. They need their own space.

Man: But our obligation to make that case (unintelligible)...

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. So I have (Joan) now in the queue and then (Martin).

(Joan), you have the floor.

(Joan Kerr): Yes. It's another - once again (Joan) speaking. Well when a not-for-profit or a (subsociety) organization has - purchases a domain name, I'm not quite sure that they think about how they're going to be involved in Internet governance. All they're thinking about is, "I need to have a Web site." It's as simple as that.

So what is it that we're trying to achieve? What is it that we want to extract from them? I think that's the question that we really need to ask, and what is it that we're going to address that they - one, is not in their universe in terms of thinking that they're important to the process; and two, what is it that we'll offer them in terms of services to address those issues.

Rudi Vansnick: Very good question.

(Martin), you're next.

(Martin Slovak): Yes. It's - exactly agree with what both of them said. And I will try to (unintelligible) value, how the NGOs are going to receive value of caring about having a domain name or caring about - have an opinion on how the domain name system works or is developed.

I - the - I think NGOs are always stressed about resources -- always. I've never seen an NGO that is not stressed about resources. So when you came up - if anyone goes up to them and tells them, "You need to be - you need to have your own DNS. You should worry about DNS. NGOs should form a coalition to worry together about that," they're going to tell you, "That's like a million and one in my position of priorities," you know?

That's not a priority for them because most of them, they don't understand that - the value it carries. So I'm - I complete agree with the both of you. I won't contradict. I will just add a summarized point.

That is value -- the value of addressing these things for NGOs so they can (unintelligible) understand that some - in some extent, they might have to use some resources. And sometimes it is just human - you know, just the brain resources of five minutes or ten minutes of our time to address that issue. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Martin).

Another thing that pops up in mind - and I've already been trying to find answers earlier to my question or concern with - first of all, how do we get their attention? Because if I send out a mail to them, they will probably say, "Well who is that guy? Who is NPOC? What are they doing? My goodness. They are going to sell me another product again."

So we need to have a very good message from the beginning so that we have full attention. And I'm just thinking about the fact that maybe we need to categorize depending on what origin they are coming from or in what environment they are working to get their attention. (Unintelligible) marketing stuff that comes to the table here.

It's not an easy way of getting the thing solved, but I'm - I would like to go around the table and see what are your thoughts. What - how do you think

that a good message would end up in having a good response? I think that that's critical for our mission. If the message is not good, nobody will respond.

I see hands up. You have the floor. State your name before you speak.

(Akimbo Abibim Abdel):   My name is (Akimbo Abibim Abdel). I'm from Nigeria, Africa. I work with DNS Africa and a lot of other organizations. And let me quickly do a brief intro before I go to your question, because I - while I was trying to call in, I had a (unintelligible) that we created and Europe should get the first (meals). I didn't get to know what others, so we need to define how the roadmap goes from one continent to the other.

Now in Africa, there's a peculiarity, and I'm going to bite example coming from Nigeria. There are NGOs, (CBO)s, (SBO)s that are registered and there are some that are not registered. Now those that are not registered are closer to the grassroots. They make more effect. They don't see any reason why they should have a Web site.

But because of the flair of the Internet industry and the fact that there is no mobile phones -- especially Android phones -- getting into Africa, there is a need to showcase themselves in the social media like (unintelligible). And they don't see why they should have to migrate from a social media platform to the Web site of their own.

Now what are doing in Nigeria - because fortunately I work in the (CCTRV) of an (NG), and I saw the need to market little (NG)s. So I had to go closer to them as an NGO person to try - and then I was the Operating Officer from (unintelligible). Now the gap has been closed.

We have registered organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and the non-registered organizations trying to come together basically because of the (MDG)s. And for you to be up-to-date on the (MDG)s, you have to be online.

Now that's a good selling point. If whatever you are doing, and you're doing it right, then you need to showcase it to the world.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Akimbo Abibim Abdel): Yes. Now there is something called (Beyond 2015). That is the new discussion. So the name of - the name of the group is now (Coalition of Beyond 2015) - bringing all of them together.

Now, our selling point. Now brining to your question, our selling point is that when we do the roadmap of how we move from continent to continent, we must consider the fact that awareness in different continents are separate.

So when you're coming to Africa or going to developing countries, what we should be focusing on is best practice and how to make sure the world knows what you're doing, you're doing it right. So we should be looking for a team language -- something catchy -- a phrase that could easily explain that we want to do what you do, not what we do. I think that would encourage a lot of NGOs to want to participate in our program. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much (Akimbo). I think you're - you have raised a good point of what we call the diversity of structures NGOs. And maybe what their objectives are is more important than our objectives. We can talk to them, but they have to talk to us essentially. It's the other way around.

Now just to point out a question of a domain name, doesn't mean that they need to use a domain name for a Web site. I think a domain name is also a very good tool for communication because there are several services on - in the domain names - in the Internet system. You have Web sites, but you have email. You have FTP. You have many other services you could use.

But I think already the email is a way of trying to start up having a communication channel with them - with their members for instance, also, but

also with the organization. It's very difficult for us to get an NGO in NPOC involved if they don't have the domain name because our charter stipulates that you need a domain name. If you don't have one, you have a problem. You cannot join - the basic criteria.

So maybe we have to review a little bit our charter and say, "Okay, you have one or you're going to have one?" But that - and it's something I have been thinking about and I'm going to put it on the table for our executive committee and our membership to agree on or disagree on.

I have an idea about solving that problem. If they don't have one, the cost of a domain name and .org is not that expensive. We'll provide them one. We will have to get them one, and we will have them to use it because that's another part of the job that we can do in order to get them involved and see what problems they have. We can do it in two ways.

But essentially, coming back to the fact that they have to talk to us. And I'm very happy that I see several faces popping up here. I'm bringing to the table their concerns so that we can take care of it.

I see (Joan), you're - no? Did Sam - your hand up? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, I think that as we explore the options - I mean, to follow up, you know, the observations and the situation in Nigeria, there are a lot of options that we haven't put on the table.

One that we used temporarily in the past was that people who could afford the domain name but that's about it just had - used the basic services of email and URL forwarding, and we just forwarded them to pages on a wiki. Everybody had their own wiki page that came off of their domain name, and it could be very simple or it could be very fancy. And the costs were per organization $3 a month and we absorbed the cost of the rest.

So there are ways of doing it that remove the financial. There are ways of doing it that say - if you're not keeping your stuff up, they will bug you and say at least get the phone number or the address right and so forth.

There are whole bunch of ways of doing it that don't involve somebody - and I've seen this especially in Africa where people are paying $3000 and $4000 to wait six months to get a Web site, that once it gets up, they can't change.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. I see reactions from (Joan).

(Joan Kerr): (Joan) speaking. Your question was, "How do we engage these people, these organizations?" We're going for organizations, not people, right? Although I'll argue that it's always the point person -but anyways, it's organizations. I think we have to take a leading role in a number of things from an ICANN point of view.

One is - we've already addressed the safeguarding issue. So I think that's a really good role. But a lot of organizations suffer from a lack of skills. They focus on their passion -- which is usually how a project is started or an organization is started -- to address a problem that they feel passionate about.

But what they end up lacking is building the organization -- the administration skills, the project management skills, the marketing skills. And, you know, they do a good job in terms of the social media usually ad hocly (sic). Like they'll sort of send it out there, "This is what we're doing. Hey, look at us."

But I think that there is a - we can define a role in creating - not that we do it for them, but that we create value in terms of what we're coming from to say, you know, "Here's some tips that you can do, here are some organizations you can" - you know, like build our membership where they could start to network with each other and work with us.

And I think a lot of organizations would really love that. And of course, there's a funding issue - connecting them to funding. So skills development, creating that value I think is something that would - they would really be open to.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Joan). Indeed to that.

Well first of all being the question of the funding, I don't see that as a primary problem. That can be solved. If there is value, there are organizations and structures and companies that say, "There is value, I will sponsor it." So if we have something valuable to present them, they will jump in.

I see Lori in my left-side corner of my eye?

Lori Schulman: Yes, I have a practical question because I've been thinking about the same thing. What we've been doing in the International Trademark Association is we actually started a nonprofit committee that - we're developing toolkits - actual toolkits where if nonprofits afford initial trademark counsel anyway, that they can come into resources and get what they need.

So what I wonder though about the organizations that we're trying to reach that aren't (unintelligible) maybe at that (enter) level, but at a more basic level where they're not online - so we're an Internet governance coalition, association, whatever you want to call ICANN organization. How are we reaching them when they're not online?

I mean, to me there's an enormous amount of boots on the ground for this. And that's the logistical issue that I'm having a hard time wrapping my mind around because the easy way, of course, people are online. You communicate online. But these aren't online. But yes, they may have mobile phones. I...

Rudi Vansnick: I have a queue here. I'm going around the table. (Martin), (Akimbo) and (Joan)?

(Martin Slovak): No, just a quick comment on that last thing. It's a great comment, I agree. But I think that's one of the - in the long-term plan, that's the original issue. You know? For example, I am from Argentina and I want to be part of the Argentina outreach team, I will have to manage, you know, how to get on territory if online is not available or is not enough.

I think it's really important that this has to be addressed. And I think it should be addressed in the regional grounds. In Europe, I believe that's - wouldn't be a problem for you, for instance, as it may be (unintelligible) longer in Asia, Africa or Latin America.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Martin Slovak): We have (Akimbo).

(Akimbo Abibim Abdel): Considering reaching out to them - to developing countries. Let me put it that way. I don't want to mention Africa all the time. So trying to reach out to developing countries, I think we have more than one platform that we could always run to - you know, Facebook and Twitter and spread the word, you know, about it.

And then, (unintelligible) also comes into focus and (unintelligible). I have NGOs that have been in Nigeria for close to 12 years that just got their Web site because they didn't think it's part of their passion. They're not skilled in that direction. So - but they have a Facebook profile by accident because they have a program and someone tells them, "We could tweet your program, we could tweet your event."

So reaching out should be simple if we can have a small platform that can avail you the opportunities of knowing how to open a wiki page for a starter, and then we'll give you an email related to the wiki page for a starter till we get the - them running on their (unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: You have a quick comment on this Lori? (Unintelligible).

Lori Schulman: Yes. I was going to say - and honestly I don't think there's any reason why we couldn't use social media. Why don't we use what the organizations are using? And even if we think that's not the best way to manage an online presence in the long term, if that's where the messages are being received, then that's where we need to send them.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Is (Joan) in the queue? No? (Joan) you have the floor.

(Joan Kerr): Great. It's (Joan). To answer your question, other than the Internet, this is where NPOC could work with itself to start to create its own partnerships with organizations that are on the ground and giving them marketing information that they can disperse. So, I mean, it happens all the time.

So, you know - you don't like that one Sam? Oh.

Sam Lanfranco: (Unintelligible) absolutely.

(Joan Kerr): Okay. Organizations actually cooperate a lot more now than they ever have. And they're willing to share when - their good news. And also good news spreads really quickly, so we start saying that we're going to be offering these services, they'll come to us. So thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Joan).

Klaus Stoll: Quick direct reply to that. It's actually at the moment I think happening. So for example, the (UMDP) came to us and said, "Okay" - because they have the same problem. They're seeing, for example, that the domain names still work for the - and they're saying, "Okay, let's work together on that one."

They are having already - as a partnership with a global - my organization was a global (unintelligible) partnership foundation (unintelligible). And it's a

beginning, but we have to also in the - with the outreach plan, we have to make more and more and get more and more of these partnerships going.

And to follow up with Rudi, believe me or not, it's really not a question of money anymore. It's you just have to have - it's - the question today is not having the money. The question today is having the right program.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Klaus.

Sorry, I was a bit distracted by a list of elements.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes it did.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay, I see (Martin) has some comments.

(Martin Slovak): Yes, just a quick comment on the - of, you know, the social media use. I agree, I think that we don't have to just run - we have these old tools that are available.

And I will ask Sam, has that providing the wiki tools and rejection- the Web page - I understand why we're using, but my question is, aren't there - is there a risk? And I don't mean it in a bad - necessarily bad way. Is there a risk that we end up managing a social media for NGOs by giving them these resources?

Rudi Vansnick: Well, Rudi speaking. Good question. Based on the rules that we as an organization are allowed to do and not allowed to do, that we set up channels and communication facilities for our members is not excluded. So I don't see a reason why we should not try to do it.

Anyway, it is something I will go back to, eventually the leagues. Because, you know, when you start doing things inside the structure of ICANN, sometimes it's better to first check off if there is no legal aspect that would damage even our work.

Because once you start having content in a space that is seen as ICANN, you have to be careful. But we have members of NPOC that we can say, "Okay, you do it and we help you and join you in doing it."

I see Klaus' hand's up.

Klaus Stoll: And also Sam, I find it extremely ironic that you are advocating the use of social media inside an organization which is living on selling domain names. I mean - and I would like to give a personal opinion about it out of experience.

NGOs using social media sooner or later regret it because they're - it's so prescription and with data harvesting and other things on, it's really not very beneficiary. And I think that the own domain name, the own Web page is still the better tool.

Rudi Vansnick: Klaus I agree. Rudi speaking. But it's based on what we heard from the floor, from the ground, people saying, "We don't have the skills to set up a Web page." So they use possibilities. And Sam was even mentioning they are (unintelligible) bus and yelling from the bus, that's the Facebook page. So that is something in between.

I know - now I triggered Sam. He raised his hand. You have the floor.

Sam Lanfranco: Yes. I've got three points. The reference was made to the (unintelligible) development goals. The language that's probably going to replace it is sustainable development goals, the (SDG)s.

And within that, there's been a fight in the back room -- so I don't know how the fight's going to turn out -- to explicitly include the Internet and access issues and so forth in the wording of those goals. Whether that's going to happen or not doesn't matter. The fact of the matter is, the electronic space is integral to social process. It's going to be part of what we do. That's the first point.

The second point is that sort of routing what the entity does as an organization, as a community group or an NGO with a presence of its own in the Internet is important for two reasons. One, it then gives them a stake in the governance of the Internet...

Woman: You've been placed on hold. Goodbye.

Sam Lanfranco: ...two, separates that out from the issues that they are already beginning to encounter by free riding on social media, and that social media are not giving them a free ride. Social media at various levels is mining the data of themselves and their users for its own financial gain in ways that probably will begin to compromise human rights issues and privacy and security issues.

So they - the social media has those risks associated with them, and they also mean that you don't have a stake in the governance of the Internet. And we have to - we have to somehow craft the message in a way in which both of those parts get across, but also at the technical level, learn some more from the (millennium) development goals.

The two only lessons if they've been able to identify coming out of the first decade of the millennium development goal -- and I keep saying they're the two lessons that they've relearned and fail to learn -- are one, you have to involve the stakeholders in planning and implementation in what you do. We have to do that here in our mission, A. And B, you collaborate with others.

The lack of collaboration between the executing agencies and projects and programs and so forth - and the first millennium development decade, we're dreadful. And if we're going to do some of these things, we collaborate with others.

We don't build a Web site inside ICANN and fund it and run it ourselves. I don't call (Martin) and 3:00 in the morning and say, "You've got to go to Page 400 in the wiki and there's a typo." We're already doing that stupidly enough inside NCSG where the chair of NCSG manually makes the changes in email addresses for people on the membership database. I mean, we don't want to follow that stupidity.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam. It's three minutes past 12:00. We are coming to the end of the meeting at 12:30 and we have still A or B also to handle. I think we are in Point 6.

We shifted from outage planning to what the NPOC members want us to be focused on. This is what we have been discussing now. And I've made a list and it's a quite extensive list. I thought we had a very simple mission, but at the end, it's going to be a big mission.

Have lots of things that - things to be important. And I think it's good that we in the next few weeks try to get a summary of the most important ones so that we can really start getting them out to the community and have them to validate if - to have a weighted impression of - because we are just a few here, but maybe there are other concerns out in the world and that's the reason why they are not here.

By the way, I have to state that we have a very good participation - remote participation. That helps us also to get in touch with them later on and it looks like they are interested in being involved in what we do.

So I think that we need to try to summarize and get some priorities done before we send it out, and try to evaluate as quick as possible, but by a sort of weight of category or prioritization so that we are able to have the setup of the agenda of our first meeting in Marrakech so that we are not going to start discussing things that they are not really liking. So I think it's something that we have to put on our agenda.

I've seen (Joan) raising her hand. You have the floor.

(Joan Kerr):   Are we going to Number 6? It's (Joan) speaking.

Rudi Vansnick: We are on...

(Joan Kerr):   Okay, good. Just want to make sure. So this suggestion is going to sort of tie Number 5, outreach plans, with Number 6, what do we want to do. Yesterday at the opening, there was a presentation by a third party.

And I was just thinking since I read it, wouldn't it be really wonderful if we could send out an email to our members that says, you know, we have access to this software program and we want to encourage our members to - in the Internet space, and want to take a role in helping to raise money for a particular project that it might have, provided - and give some guidelines around the project so that we can have some successes to report, if not in Marrakech, certainly at the next (54)? Just putting it out there.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank - yes, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Sam and (Joan). If it's indeed something that we have to put in our communication channel, it looks like we are going to extend our team with another four or five heads to do all what I've been listing up today. And that's

really good, and I'm happy that finally we start having a list that is longer than we expected.

So it's good. It will probably attract more people and give incentives to say, "Hey, I want to do that. I want to jump in that space and help you over here." If we only have three items on the list, then that reduces the incentive.

I think that's something Lori that we have to take up in - with (Olivier), who is our communication committee chair. Maybe it's good that we start selecting items that are important for our members.

And I would propose that those who have good items to be posted to our membership that we send them to (Olivier) and we try once a week (unintelligible) and validate and put it in a kind of newsletter so that has nice touch and is not too ugly to read, but not too fancy, because sometimes it gets stuck in the filters. That's maybe an action point we need to take up from now to the next few days and such ideas are really great to add into it.

I don't know if there is other proposals as - things that we could really do to (unintelligible)...

Woman: Can you repeat the precise action point, like one sentence?

Rudi Vansnick: It's trying to communicate to our members the software tool that has been presented during the opening ceremony...

Woman: Oh okay. Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: ...to our members. We first have to validate if we are not going to have any obstruction from anywhere, but it's probably a good idea to help them having a look at it.

I see (Olivier) having his hand raised. So (Olivier), you are allowed to speak. You are still connected through the (phone bridge) I hope. And if you are connected to the (phone bridge), please mute your speakers of your PC or laptop before you start speaking, otherwise we have an echo here. And I love your voice, but four or five times in one second is just a bit too much.

You have the floor (Olivier).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: (Olivier) you have the floor if you want to speak. Please unmute your phone and - he's not on the (phone bridge). Oh, sorry. So (Olivier) post your question into the chatroom and Lori will raise it immediately.

Okay, back to the room then. I think we have been covering a lot of the discussions about what can be done, what should we do for the members and essentially (focusing) ourselves on the next meeting in Marrakech that will probably require from us a lot of energy too.

Setting up an event means that we need to reach out to a lot of people. And I would like to ask you if you have any proposals or ideas of individuals, persons that we should invite to come and speak in that event, because I think it's good if we could find people from inside the community that are willing to raise their voice in that event. Because then it's not just NPOC talking, it's the NGOs talking. As I said, they have to talk to us, not us to them.

I see Lori, yes.

Lori Schulman: I'm not answering the question, but I'm asking (Olivier)'s since he had typed it first, and that was, "What about our idea to have an African workshop for registrars? Where did that idea go?"

Rudi Vansnick: Well I - that's a question that in fact is a bit outdated in the sense it's a question that we have been tackling earlier - in earlier meetings.

And - no, sorry. We stay till 12:30. We have the room booked till 12:30. Sorry for disturbing.

Yes indeed (Olivier), it's something we will certainly...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rudi Vansnick: ...integrate in our plan when we do the reach-out. We will certainly try to have a workshop in that event that allows us and others to bring up proposal for having more registrars in Africa.

I would say - I would rather ask you. Put something together. Put it on a piece of paper and no longer than a page with the intro requirements and your proposal of who we should invite, a little bit of format and the agenda of the workshop.

And we will work on - the next monthly meeting, we will try to work out a session during that meeting in Marrakech. So I think that - I hope that I have answered your question with that.

Lori Schulman: I also have - are we down to any other business yet or are we still on - because we have 15 minutes.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, well I'm trying to round up to see if there was any other item that we need to talk about, and then we can go into the last point of the agenda, any other business. And I think that (Cintra) has a question.

Lori Schulman: (Cintra) actually had three questions and they're all about NPOC administrative issues. So the three questions she had were one, what is the status of the NPOC (NOMCOM) seat? Has there been any follow-up?

Second, what about NPOC participation in IGF? And the third is her suggestion that we have an NPOC rep on the ICANN budget and finance committee to make sure that our proposals are being heard and acted on.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Cintra) for these very interesting questions. I will take up first the question about the (NOMCOM). I don't know if you have seen the W - no, the BWG report from - on the (NOMCOM)? It's a report from in fact the board working group.

And it looks like they were going to scratch even seats in (NOMCOM) and increase at other places (NOMCOM) seats. So it's an issue that we will try to bring back. We are invited and I am invited as an (SOAC) leader to have these discussions also. I can guarantee you I'm not taking it away from my personal agenda and certainly not from the NPOC agenda.

We are going to raise the question again, and we have some alliance. There are others that are concerned about the fact that they are losing capacity, so we will bring that back to the table.

With regards the participation in the IGF -- and I think it's a bit related to the third question, finance and budgeting -- as you know but maybe others don't know, in the past two years we had a difficulty by having this problem with the chair staying on or not staying on and we lost track of capabilities to enter requests for budget.

And I discussed yesterday with (Savie) that NPOC wants to get a slot because we were not able to have a valid budget for our operations and it's something that we are going to bring up again.

For the next IGF - and I would say - I would rather speak to the IGF not in global, but regional. It's part of what I think should be in our outreach approach, is that eventually we could help or we could participate in the

regions - in the regional IGFs with our master plan. Because I think that's the space where there are possibilities to take up.

We still have the (CROP). The (CROP) is a special pilot project by ICANN that allows to have regional travels, five a year. So we will pick up that possibility too to help us getting us in a good position and be able to send representatives of NPOC to these meetings. So I hope I have been able to answer her questions. Any other questions?

Lori Schulman: I just want to follow up by saying I put the link in the chatroom to the information about the FY15 (CROP). So the link's in the chatroom. You can also speak to (Rob Hogarth) if he's still behind me. No he's not.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi speaking. And an additional information is the following. NPOC - sorry, NCSG has a finance committee, at least on paper. As the treasurer, I have been allocated to that NCSG finance committee. We are four members -- three members and one observer. I have never seen a meeting of that committee -- never. And I am going to raise the question this afternoon.

We have the NCSG open meeting and I'm going to raise a few questions about what about the committees that officially are required and should be functioning inside the NCSG and how are they managed and organized and what are the criteria far as - let's say the finance committee, what are the criteria to launch activities in that finance committee.

Because that finance committee should also be able to address budget issues for the whole NCSG and we need to get that immediately on the table. So it's my priority to put that on the table for NCSG.

Any other questions? Well it looks like we are ending up our session here. I would like to thank all those in the room, but also - and especially all those not in the room being connected remotely, because some of them are

probably in nighttime. So thank you all very much and we keep you informed on what the next actions are going to be from NPOC. Thank you all.

END