Transcription ICANN Singapore
NCUC Meeting
Tuesday 25 March 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/#mar
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Bill Drake: Okay I have not had enough coffee or sleep to function properly here as the chair so my apologies. Let me start over. My name is Bill Drake. I am the chair of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency and this is Constituency Day for NCUC.

It is Tuesday, March 25, 2014 and we are here in Singapore with a room that is well packed I'm happy to say. And hopefully we will be greeted by some colleagues who are joining us from other parts of the world as we go along as well.

The agenda for today is been posted for some time on the conference Web site and was sent around to the NCUC mailing list. And our intrepid Web master is in the process of locating that agenda and putting it up onto the Adobe screen, at which point you will see it as well.

Essentially what we plan to do today - in many previous sessions we have had fairly packed kind of agendas where we have five minutes for this item and five minutes for that item. We had to rush through and it was kind of busy, busy, busy, busy, busy.

And I thought for today, since that we just organized a large scale conference on Friday that was fairly successful and led to a lot of good dialogue and

which will feed into the upcoming NETMundial conference that we'll have in Sao Paulo next month I thought it would be good to try to have some more unprogrammed open space to try to take stock of that conference and lessons that we've learned from it.

So we have some fairly open dialogue space today, which is good. Often we have many different visitors with different agendas. Today we limit ourselves to only two, but they are doozies as we say in America. That's to say they are fairly prominent and of the moment people.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for the U.S. Department of Commerce, Larry Strickling, who of course made the recent announcement with regard to the IANA function and the pulling back of the United States, the intention of the United States to pull back from its role vis-à-vis the IANA function, and also Fiona Alexander, who is his chief brain and runs the international office at the NTIA, the National Telecommunications Information Administration.

They're good people. They'll come by and hang out with us for a half hour at 11:00 to talk about their views about what happened and what goes on next. And we can exchange with them our thoughts about how we feel that transition might be best managed as well.

So that's the essence of the program. When it finally opens up in Adobe you'll see the rest. To get going, why don't we start with participant introduction because that often takes a few minutes. And we have a number of people here who are not our usual suspects, which is fantastic. We're really happy to have non-usual suspects here.

So if people could go around the room and introduce themselves just briefly and say - and I do mean briefly because otherwise it turns into an hour thing, so like a minute - who you are, your institution, your engagement with ICANN, your interest in NCUC or role with NCUC. That would be really fantastic. Why don't we start with the gentlemen over here on the right hand corner?

Pranesh Prakash: Good morning everyone. My name is Pranesh Prakash. I'm Policy Director of the Centre for Internet and Society and I'm a Resident Fellow with the Yale Information Society Project. And it's quite early morning yet for me. And I am also a member of the NCUC Executive Committee.

Carlos Alfonso: Hi there, good morning. I'm Carlos Alfonso. It looks like I'm the only Carlos Alfonso in this room right now. The situation probably is going to change as the day progresses.

I'm the Director of the Institute for Technology and Society based in Rio de Janeiro. And currently here at the NCUC I am part of the Executive Committee. Been around in NCUC for a while and doing a bunch of things like governance and other things.

Flávio Wagner: Good morning everybody. My name is Flávio Wagner. I am professor for computer science in a university in South Brazil and a member of the board of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee. And currently I am serving on the Executive Multi-Stakeholder Committee of NETMundial and also an NCUC member.

Joao Carlos Rebello Caribe: Morning. My name is Joao Carlos Rebello Caribe. I'm from Brazil too. I'm an (activist), (graduate activist), and I represent the Movimento Mega in Brazil. That's a movement for actions on Internet freedom. That's it.

Magely Pazello: I am Magely Pazello. I'm also from Brazil. I am a senior researcher in the Institute in Ibase, an NGO in Brazil, and also an NCSG representative in the GNSO council.

Stefania Milan: Stefania Milan based in the Netherlands, academic and member of the Executive Committee of -- I never remember the name - of NCUC, exactly. And I am also the one who coughs in the background.

Benjamin Akinmoyeje: Hello, my name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje. I'm an ICTD enthusiast, and I've been a few months NCUC member. I'm from Nigeria.

Walid Al-Saqaf: I'm Walid Al-Saqaf. This place reminds me of a déjà vu moment I had last year in Beijing with the same meeting here that started, kicked off my membership at the NCUC and I look forward to more. I am based in Sweden though I come from Yemen.

(Anam Miam): This is (Anam Miam) from Jordan. I'm project (officiate) for IET projects. I'm second time fellow, ICANN fellow, and a fellow member.

Woman: Hi I'm (unintelligible) and I'm a second time fellow, and I have no institutional affiliation.

(Buli Ana): I'm (Buli Ana) from Pakistan. I'm a second time fellow as well and I'm here at NCUC because it's my hope to participate in ICANN as a start as an individual. Thank you.

Bill Drake: I'm not letting (Farsad) get away with it. She used to run the internet governance forum, so she's not just like a floating person. But anyway okay.

Ephraim Kenyanito: Hello I'm Ephraim Kenyanito from Kenya. And I'm a first time fellow ICANN and I'm here with NCUC because of my background in regular research with non-profit institutions like AXIS and Transparency. So I'm very glad to be here. And I'm also an author with Global Voices Online. Thank you.

(Jung): Good morning. My name is (Jung) from Korea and I'm working in the Civil Society of Korea). And since the year 2000 I have been a member of the (non-commissioned and commissioned) constituency except for one time ICANN meeting which was held in Seoul. For last six or seven years I have never been in ICANN meeting and I came back again.

So once I was very active but now not so active and just an observer. So as an observer, I'm participant this year. Thank you and glad to meet you.

(Louise Nascat): Good morning. My name is (Louise Nascat) and I'm from the Telecommunications and Radio Communications regulator in (unintelligible) in the South Pacific. I'm here to basically learn about the civil society issues and how Internet governance.

So my role also is manager technical and Internet governance. I'm here to find out what the civil society is experiencing in terms of Internet governance or how it affected into the regulator aspects. Thank you.

(Pascal de Gamos): Morning, my name is (Pascal del Gamos). This is my second meeting with NCUC. The first was online one month ago I think. Okay. I'm a computer engineer. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

David Cake: My name is David Cake. I am currently one of the NCSG counsellors on the GNSO Council and I represent Electronic Frontiers Australia.

Bill Drake: I'm Bill Drake. I teach global Internet governance at the University of Zurich. I'm the chair of NCUC. I'm also on the board of directors of EURALO in the At-Large Structures and I'm involved in various other things.

I'm on the steering committee of the 1Net collaboration. I'm on the Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group or the MAG. And I'm one of the advisors to the high level panel that Fadi's running on global Internet governance.

(Mary Lemesiel): Hello good morning. My name is (Mary Lemesiel). I'm a researcher and coordinator of the Center for Technology and Society of Sao Paulo Vargas Foundation in Brazil. I'm actually now a member of the NCSC Policy Committee and a member of the Cross-Community Working Group on

Internet Governance. And I'm also on the executive committee at (unintelligible) in Brazil.

Grace Githaiga: Hi everyone. My name is Grace Githaiga from the Kenya ICT Action Network. I am a new member of the executive council of NCUC representing Africa. And I'm delighted to see my colleagues from Africa. And I will just add too that we need to be very active, participate. Let's not complain. Let's be there and part of the decision-making processes.

Brenden Kuerbis: Good morning. I'm Brenden Kuerbis. I'm with the Internet Governance Project at Syracuse University. I'm a former NCUC Executive Committee member and I'm the current appointee to the ICANN Nominating Committee for NCUC.

Rafik Dammak: Hello Rafik Dammak, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group chair and member of NCUC.

Kathy Kleinman: Hi I'm Kathy Kleinman. I'm one of the founders of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency. And it's amazing to see so many people here from so many places. Back in the old days we could have fit around one of the very small tables. So this is fantastic.

I'm an attorney in the United States representing free speech, fair use, and privacy. And I'm on the Proxy Privacy Accreditation Working Group working on privacy issues right now. Thank you.

Amr Elsadr: Hi I'm Amr Elsadr from Egypt but I am currently a graduate student studying telemedicine and e-medicine in Arctic University of Norway. I am an NCUC and NCSG member and I am currently serving as an NCSG representative to the GNSO Council.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi my name is Stephanie Perrin. I'm a relatively new member to the NCUC. I became active in ICANN because I was drafted for the Expert Working Group

on Directory Services. And so I serve on that committee still. And I am a member of the HLMC Committee that will be meeting in Sao Paulo. So if anyone has contacts of Internet governance I'd love to talk to you.

And I recently retired from the federal government of Canada after 35 years working largely in Telecommunications and IT matters, mostly privacy. So that's my focus and I'm a Ph.D. student at the University of Toronto.

Milton Mueller: We're going to skip to me. I'm Milton Mueller. I'm with Kathy one of the founders of NCUC and former chair and currently on the Executive Committee of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. With me here today are five students from the Net Mission Project. And this is a very sharp bunch so they have to follow me around and see what happens in ICANN. So I'll let them introduce themselves individually if we have time.

(Jung Cho Li): My name is (Jung Cho Li) and I'm from South Korea. And I'm majoring in technology management and computer science. And actually it's my first time to visit here about ICANN so I want to hear a lot of experience from you guys. Thank you.

(Roxanne): Hi my name is (Roxanne) and I'm a student from the University of Waterloo and I'm currently on exchange here in Singapore. I major in computer engineering. And I appreciate being on this table right now and just being a part of this conference. Thanks guys.

Eiichiro Okuyama: Good morning everyone. My name is Eiichiro Okuyama. I'm an undergraduate student at Keio University and a research member at Keio International Projects for the Internet Society. Yes I'd like to take this opportunity to listen to your all discussion and hope to take something back to Japan. Thank you.

(Ruby): Hello everyone. I'm (Ruby) and one of the (unintelligible). And we are holding the next (intelligible) at ICANN to elect the youth to get into the discussion in ICANN. So thank you. (Unintelligible). Thank you. Thank you, you guys.

(Charmaine): Hi everyone. I'm (Charmaine) from Hong Kong as well. Thank you Milton for taking us to this meeting. I will have to learn from you all and would like to invite you to maybe attend our (unintelligible) report meeting on Thursday at 10:00 to 12:30 at (unintelligible). But today I would like to learn from all of you. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. How about the people behind us and around the edges? Could we have some introductions? We have members here. Would you just come on up and grab the mic and... Oh we have a roving mic. Even better.

(Joanne Avaron): Hello group, morning everyone. I'm (Joanne Avaron). I'm a researcher at the Center for Technology and Society Fundação Getúlio Vargas. I'm also part of (ONET) Steering Committee and for the NETMundial in Brazil.

(Neil Sanuver): Hi I'm (Neil Sanuver). I'm the acting head of Digital at Article 9C, and I'm also active in the Netherlands with Bits of Freedom and a new time member to this posse and I'm very happy and grateful to be here.

(Averwal): Hi I'm (Averwal) from Taiwan working at the Research Institute. And this is first time being there and (unintelligible). Thank you.

(Valentina Pulza): Hi my name is (Valentina Pulza) I'm from the Association for Technology and Internet in Bucharest, Romania. And I'm a first time fellow in Singapore.

(Zarq Al-Zaid): Hello good morning everybody. This is (Zarq al-Zaid) from Pakistan. I'm the head of market research (unintelligible) Telecommunications Council and first time ICANN fellow this time. Thank you.

John Berard: My name is John Berard. I'm a GNSO counsellor from the Commercial and Business Users Constituency and a first time visitor to the NCUC meeting.

Rob Hoggarth: Good morning. I'm Rob Hoggarth from the ICANN staff.

Man: Good morning everyone. I'm (unintelligible) from Beijing Internet Institute. I'm a newcomer to ICANN meeting and I hope to learn something from here. I always heard the NCUC is an interesting committee to attend. So that's why I'm here.

(Hannah Nduti): Hello everyone. I'm (Hannah Nduti) from Tunisia. I'm an assistant professor of computer science and I'm a first time fellow in the ICANN.

Woman: Morning everyone. My name is (unintelligible) from Morocco and I'm an at-large member and I'm a newcomer, first time fellow in Singapore.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you and I'm Glen de Saint Gery the GNSO Secretariat.

Bill Drake: Glen is, for people who are new to the world, the GNSO, the den mother for all of us, who makes everything happen. And we have a new person who's coming in - two? And oh we have some others over here, okay.

(Shil):   Okay good morning. My name is (Shil) from Nigeria. I work with (unintelligible) University of (Yukatin) Nigeria and I'm an NCUC applicant because I haven't got a response yet on my application. So...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Shil):   Two weeks ago. So I don't understand the process and application and so good to be here. I am a newcomer to ICANN, so (unintelligible) fellow.

(Carroll Douglas): Hello good morning. My name is (Carroll Douglas) from Trinidad and Tobago. This is my second time to ICANN as a fellow. I'm quite interested and excited to be here.

Some of the issues that are being discussed are very near and dear to me. So I look forward to a very interesting conversation/discussion today. And of course I too hopefully will join sooner than later NCUC.

(Shakeh Lahamad): Good morning everyone. My name is (Shakeh Lahamad). I am from Pakistan. I am second time fellow. I am here to know more about NCUC. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Okay then. Well a very warm welcome to you all. I cannot tell you as somebody who's been involved in it, ICANN for a while, how gratifying it is to go to a meeting and realize that as a U.S. citizen I'm such a distinct minority. It's actually, it's really extraordinary and it's a real testament to the development of NCUC and the ways in which we have been pressing on issues that I think are of broad interest to the global community.

The proposed agenda that I submitted to the mailing list some time ago and did not receive any disagreements we can amend now if anybody has any thoughts just briefly. We are 15 minutes behind, but we'll get caught up, it's okay.

Let's just start with a brief overview from the Executive Committee. Our meeting on Saturday we met all day. And then to talk mostly about, as I said in kind of more open and unstructured way - not entirely - about the conference that we just had and what we learned from it and what the takeaways are, how it might affect our further engagements in global Internet governance issues beyond simple management of domain names and so on.

There is obviously quite a lot going on at this particular moment catalyzed by the NETMundial Conference and all of the various doings that have been put

off in light of that from expert committee that Fadi Chehadé has initiated to the new Multi-Stakeholder Collaborative mechanism of 1Net and on and on and on.

So we want to think a bit I think together about how we want to work in that space, to what extent do we want to engage, how do we want to engage. So I thought we could do that until the coffee break. And then after the break, as I say, we have Larry Strickling and Fiona Alexander.

And then I thought we could conclude with a little bit less than an hour of sort of operational matters related to constituency, some planning issues coming up for the next year, our work cycle, some proposed meetings that we may participate in, some things that are priorities for us to try to tackle together, and then there's any other business.

And there's one item there already. Brenden wanted to mention something about the Non Com, the Nominating Committee. Are there any other amendments to the agenda that anybody would like to suggest - additions, so on and so forth? No. Okay then. So let's go straight to the beginning. Yes Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Kathy. Before the deputy Secretary of Commerce of the United States and his assistant come in, are we going to prepare kind of our thoughts or concerns? Will we be doing any preparation together before that meeting?

Bill Drake: Sure if you'd like. That certainly fits entirely with what is our engagement with IG issues and so on. Again, he is not here to discuss the full range of U.S. domestic policies or things like that.

We're very much focused in this case on the IANA contract and the move he has made and what that means. But anything's fair game. And I don't know if people know Larry, but he's from Chicago like me. He's very open.

He's from the South side, which is the wrong side of town. He's a White Sox fan and I'm a Cubs fan and so these are two entirely different baseball worlds. But otherwise he's very open and I'm sure he'll take any kind of questions addressed to him forthrightly.

Kathy Kleinman: Great, thank you.

Bill Drake: Sure.

Kathy Kleinman: Didn't know you guys were so close.

Bill Drake: Yes. And okay, so why don't we hear just a little bit about what we did on Saturday from the Executive Committee members if they could perhaps just give a couple minutes of update to the rest of the membership and points that are relevant to know, some main takeaways that they might have about either the group in general - it's a new group.

We have an election every year. These folks were just elected with 150-whatever-it-was votes in December. And we're trying to pull together a cohesive group that will engage in a lot of work together over the next year and so anything that they may have about that process or the specific things that we approved in the formal one-hour meeting that we held as well.

Who's going to do that for us, Carlos? Is that you? Go ahead. Tell us about it.

Carlos Alfonso: So I have (unintelligible) over it. So we have a new executive committee for those who are in the room and are not familiar with that. Let me just go through our executive committee as it stands now with Grace being our representative from Africa, Pranesh, our representative from Asia, Stefania, our coughing representative from Europe.

Unfortunately, Roy Balleste is not here in this meeting, our representative from North America, and myself from Latin America, South America - sorry. And of course Bill Drake.

So we met on Saturday when we had like this whole day to do a retreat on the issues of the Executive Committee. This was our first face to face meeting of the Executive Committee, and we have been done for the last two months sort of a division of labor on the activities of the Executive Committee for this year.

Secondly, a couple of issues that we have in front of us such as the improvement of our Web site, inreach, outreach, and a couple of other issues. We spent the first time of our meeting going through some general GNSO operations overviews since a couple of our new Executive Committee members are somewhat new to the whole ICANN structure and functioning.

So we had (Rob Rodox) with us to talk about GNSO activities and to explain to us the wonders of PDP and other acronyms that are so dear to GNSO activities. We spent a good amount of time dealing with some the strategic and organizational procedures, especially dealing with our events that we conducted on Friday.

Let me take this time just to make an announcement, sort of announcement and sort of invitation. One of the activities of the Executive Committee for this year is the revision of our by-laws. So this revision of our by-laws, this is long overdue.

So this is an activity that it seemed like every two years it happens to be in front of us and we try to come up with a good wording that everyone end up agreeing in the wording of our by-laws. But we are not putting it forward.

So this year, that will be definitely something for us to work on. I will be leading this by-law revision throughout the year, so this is me inviting you all,

especially those who have little practice or some sort of willing to torture yourself with craftsmith of wording of this by-law for I would say the next two or three months.

We are conducting those activities, and this is a formal invitation for you all to join us to see if - because if you look here on the time that they asking us to have the by-laws approved, we will have to come up with the wording in the next three months, or three or four months.

So that means that we will have a discussion about that in London and try to put it forward for an approval by the end of the year. So that will be one of our goals, and this is an invitation to all of us.

So not sure if the other Executive Committee members would like to add something on our agenda and the activities that we conducted on Saturday. Any of you? Pranesh?

Pranesh Prakash: I'll just add a few words about the Executive Committee official meeting. The parts without Robin and general discussions about (unintelligible) going about ICANN itself, which is what we had, because many of us are actually newcomers to ICANN.

Apart from the discussions on by-laws we also had discussions around internal working methods, on division of labor within the Executive Committee, about financial requests and how we're going to go forward on that, about how we're going to arrange finances from ICANN for different activities and the opportunities that lie ahead for that, about the (CROP) funding program and lastly approval of budgetary expenses within the EC as well and updates on that.

Anything else to add Grace or Stefania or Bill?

Grace Githaiga: We also were concerned for example, the East Indies has over 300 members, but in terms of communication online, we hardly have people responding or discussing issues with. And we were concerned at why the lack of participation by the over 300 members and would be interested in just finding out what your concerns are and why you are not participating and what ways you think you can participate effectively because we don't get to mix face to face.

And therefore we have to embrace the forms of communication that are available to us. So again it's something that we'd be interested in hearing from you. But if you also don't want to read it like in a loud voice you can talk to any of us so that then we know how to move from there. Thank you.

Bill Drake: We definitely want to encourage participation and we want to be able to develop groupings that are so appropriate to particular interests of members. And we need the members to take a lead in doing that, but we can facilitate and we very much hope that that can happen. Just - yes?

Carlos Alfonso: Just a point of order. I believe this is being recorded, right? If so you should probably all announce our - we should all announce our names before speaking.

Bill Drake: That would be good form. And I'm given to bad form. I'm Bill Drake. I just made that comment. Okay anything else? Yes sir?

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr, and just to add to what Grace just said, I think this would be a great initiative for the NCUC Executive Committee to take on. And if I'm not mistaken there was a Google doc that I believe Bill and Rafik had worked on a little over a year ago on an NCUC inreach plan.

If you guys could pick up where it was left off at that time, I think that would be a great thing, just increase our membership engagements, especially in

the area of policy development in the GNSO. And yeah that would be great, and I'd be willing to work with you guys to help that. Thanks.

Bill Drake: That's a good - you know, one of the ongoing problems - I'll come to you in a second, Steph - this is Bill. One of the ongoing problems that we have is that our membership has been growing quite robustly and becoming more diverse, and at the same time we have a challenge of connecting people.

One they join the group, they get out to the list serve, but helping them to find others with shared interests and then find ways to get engaged in either working groups or participating in public comment periods or doing other kinds of activities that feed into the policy process is a bit challenging.

And we really need some folks who are willing to put some time and energy into inreach. We don't need - we're growing so rapidly that I don't think outreach is our biggest concern. It's coming. Inreach is something that we've got a problem with, with making use of people that we've got and getting them fully engaged.

And we'd hoped to have a membership affairs team that would be a bridge between the Executive Committee and the regular membership that would play a role in helping to try to do that. And we've just not been able to find somebody who wanted to play the role of facilitator and put the time into - we have a list serve. We've got people signed up from last year who joined a group. And the group has never been active.

And so that's just one of those things that's just sitting there. But we definitely need a mechanism, and I would think that that member's team is a way to do that. And so I would encourage anybody to think about whether that might be something they'd be willing to spend an hour or two a week on, and if so to talk to me offline and see if we could reach some agreement about that.

Okay, Stephanie and then Stefania, yes.

Stephanie Perrin: It's Stephanie Perrin. I have a whole lot of thoughts on this and that was my question. Who do we talk to about this - you? You're a busy guy, Bill.

Bill Drake: Inter alia.

Stephanie Perrin: Inter alia, okay.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Stefania Milan: It is just to develop further what's been said. If you go to the Web site and the participators and entry for working teams, there are I believe - I was trying to open it - like five mailing lists or six. And you see some names. These names are maybe a little bit outdated but in any case there is room for everyone to get engaged.

So just go sign up. If you go to each of these working things, you see "join the mailing list." Just click on that, insert your e-mail address, and there you are and your name will appear on the Web site more or less automatically.

And there's, as Carlos said, the most urgent is perhaps the by-laws. The reason there are many which are a bit dormant between events. But yeah, maybe that's a way for engaging in something which is not extremely time consuming. There's very little traffic and most of it's mailing lists, not on the policy and (unintelligible). But yes, everyone is welcome to participate.

Bill Drake: Okay. And again as I said, not to blame the technology, but our previous Web site had a Ning, was a Ning that had an option to create little social networks around particular issues.

So somebody could say I want to form an interest group on development and then six people would join and they could start their communications on. We've lost that. And we want to try to find a way to rebuild that capability.

Certainly one thing is that we've got all these members. We should - unless people want to be private and they can always opt out - when we have like URLs on people pointing to home pages, we can at least provide links so people can see who each other is.

And maybe we could find some way for folks to indicate particular interest areas that they have on our member Web site so that folks could find each other more effectively. That would be a good initiative for a members team to take on. Pranesh.

Pranesh Prakash: Hi this is Pranesh Prakash. I just want you to know that one way forward for those of you who ever used IETF's, Jabber servers or any other Jabber servers is from Jabber that allows you also to create ad hoc chat rooms that anyone else can join.

And anyone can create those. You don't need one administrator to be for mailing lists, etcetera. You need someone to actually have the admin password to create a new mailing list, etcetera.

So we right now have a Jabber server running on NCUC.org. It's right now still in the testing phase. And I'd welcome those few who want to help test it to approach me so that I could provide you an account.

And eventually what I hope to do is provide everyone with an - if there is actually a desire to take this forward, provide everyone first name dot last name at NCUC dot org account to access this so that they can actually have a functioning chat server.

Man: I would love to work with you on that to ensure that all communications within NCUC and the (unintelligible) clients are open and transparent for all members. I find it quite important.

(Neal Sanuver):   (Neal Sanuver) from Article 9C, Bill.

Pranesh Prakash: This is Pranesh and...

Man: A new member to NCUC who spoke at our conference the other day.

Pranesh Prakash: Excellent. This is Pranesh, and the one of - I had a point which I very conveniently have forgotten.

Bill Drake: I find that works for me in all kinds of settings. All right, any other last points on this, or shall we move to a substantive discussion of the event?

Pranesh Prakash: Last point on this - this is Pranesh - if needed, login can be established on these chat rooms as well so that automatically logs of the chat rooms can be published and depending on which chat rooms you want public and which ones you want private.

Bill Drake: Fantastic. So once that gets scaled up, that seems like that could be a real possibility for helping people find each other and engage in kind of spontaneous dialogues on a number of different issues, so this is good.

    Okay, so turning then to our next item, number 3, reflections on the NCUC conference. How many of - can I just see a show of hands? And I'm going to guess that it's fewer than I would expect, but how many people were here on Friday for the conference that we organized?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Well no because I think a lot of people didn't come in early. So I think we're like at a half maybe. So just to overview a little bit what we did there, can you call up, David, the Web site for the conference?

The purpose of the conference, when I applied for the budgetary support back in March to organize an NCUC conference, this was simply an extension of what we've done previously. We organized conferences at the Toronto meeting and also the San Francisco meeting and for a couple of workshops.

But the Beijing meeting, all was an effort of trying to promote dialogue on our sorts of issues with different parts of the community. And in this particular case, the idea when we started to do something sort of more similar, perhaps focusing more on global Internet governance issues.

As it turned out in subsequent period, Fadi Chehadé decided to throw 100 things up in the air. Internet governance become a hot topic across the ICANN sphere. And suddenly we had this NETMundial meeting which nobody knew what it was going to be about and what its agenda was going to be.

And a lot of people in the private sector were quite worried about it and asking questions. What's the purpose of this? What's going to go on? Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

And so I thought it would be useful - we thought it would be useful - to have a discussion where we sort of look forward to the agenda of the conference and help the community walk through what are the main topics that will be on the table and to facilitate some cross-community dialogues on areas of agreement and disagreement on the substantive topics at hand.

If you view the program - and so we had four main sessions, a sort of setup session that was intended to sort of get the juices going and bring on to the table a number of these different initiatives that have been made in recent years, these presidential committees that have been convened by Fadi Chehadé, the 1Net steering group, the Cross-Community Working Group on IG.

All of these have been putting forward ideas about Internet governance and the relationship between ICANN and the IG world. So just to get that framing out there and to hear voices from different parts of the community about that was the main point there.

Then we went into sessions on each of the three big topics that have been proposed for the NETMundial conference which again is 23, 24 in Sao Paulo, Brazil, co-sponsored by the CGI.br and the 1Net committee, and the 1Net Steering Committee apparently.

And so we did a session about principles and the notion that there had been these 25 principles have been adopted, 25 or more, statements or principles have been adopted over the past two years by various inter-governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations on how to govern global Internet.

And there's a desire, I think, for this meeting in Brazil to come out with a joint statement, a multi-stakeholder declaration of principles. So we wanted to talk a little bit about what kind of principles, procedural principles, substantive principles and so on.

Then we had another session - David could you rotate it please - then we had another session on globalization of ICANN and the IANA function. And that was pretty much taken over by the recent announcement of the IANA changes from Larry Strickling, as you might guess, but it was a very interesting discussion about what kind of way path could we follow going forward to institutionalize the IANA function on a better basis, whether it should be internal or external to the ICANN nexus and so on and so forth.

And then finally the last panel, which was about one of the themes that has been running through the past decade of negotiations in the United Nations, and which will undoubtedly be a subject of some concern of the NETMundial

and is a concern I think of the Brazilians, is the question or whether or not there should be some sort of new institutional mechanism or home for discussion of Internet public policy issues and for dealing with policy questions in the Internet tapestry.

The view is that we have an ecosystem that is missing from key components, that there are a lot of issues that are so called orphan issues that don't fit within the institution aegis of any of the given existing decision-making bodies.

There's a desire on the part of many countries, particularly from the G7 Summit in China to have some sort of a space in the U.N. setting. This is of course controversial and divisive and hard to reach agreements on.

There's a second set of questions of well if we can't do that can we strengthen the Internet governance forum, which is a truly multi-stakeholder body, and encourage developing country participation there through some innovative steps and so on? And there have been some suggestions from the Internet Society and others along those lines.

And then finally there was this notion that's been floating in the wings quite a lot and I guess has come up in the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation as well, that there should be some sort of new mechanism, a light information, knowledge sharing expertise sharing mechanism, which wouldn't necessarily meet all the demands quite obviously of governments that want to be able to sit and talk and make decisions with other governments but would serve to help to direct governments that have trouble facing particular problems to sources of expertise, to correct institutions and so on and so forth, that would serve sort of as a clearinghouse, something like that.

And there have been a number of different ideas about that, and I know that this is something that Fadi Chehadé's in particular very interested in seeing happen. So those are the three issues that we talked about there. And then

we had Larry Strickling give a keynote and then closing from some of our colleagues.

So that's the overview of events but I should say also we spent a bunch of time at the end. If you haven't looked at this Web site, at the end of each session description - this is all on the main NCUC.org Web site - at the end of each session description, there's a link to a set of further materials you could look at - NETMundial, inputs that were written on the different topics as well as other relevant materials.

So it was I think a fairly structured way of trying to promote a dialogue around some of these topics. So enough of me. What did people think of the meeting? How did it work? Yes sir.

Milton Mueller: It was...

Bill Drake: Who are you?

Milton Mueller: I'm Milton Mueller at Syracuse University. And I think the common take was that all the panels didn't deal with ICANN stuff, everybody started talking about ICANN.

So for example, your attempt - if you could roll up the agenda - your attempt to deal with the broader landscape, you know, makes a lot of sense to kind of scholars like you and me who have broad overview of understanding of the landscape. But I don't think your panelists delivered.

And the only reason I'm saying that is not to criticize the conference because the programming and the intention was perfect. But I think the issue, the question to ask is how do we get people in ICANN to look at what they're doing here in this broader context and what is the broader context?

How does ICAAN intersect with it? And what is the tail and what is the dog, you know? I think I'd like to have that discussion with you guys.

Woman: First of all I'd like to thank and congratulate everybody that participated in the organizational seminar. And people have no idea how it can be heavy to organize something like this, especially Bill, our chair. So many thanks to you, Bill.

I think it was a very, very valuable initiative to organize the seminar. I always had the feeling - I've been following Internet governance for seven, eight years, and I always had the feeling that community in ICANN usually looks very much inwards.

And NETMundial and the announcement and even though it's not (in revelation) gave us the opportunity to make this community think about as Milton said what is the role of ICANN in this broader context? And I think that the meeting helped them to understand that.

And even though issues were not touched upon very complete in terms of what is ICANN's role, I think that there was a very good mapping and setting the scene of what are the key issues, what are the main proposals on the table, and I think that it is an opportunity for people to get more informed and move forward.

And I think that ICANN does have a very important role to play, responding to Milton's questions, for several reasons because it is part of the ecosystem and it manages a critical resource but also because the model that is developed here and the way that the multi-stakeholder model has been structured in terms of procedure in my opinion is something that is really important to have in other spaces as well.

It's nice to have Internet governance, but some procedure needs to be put in place, even to protect the interests of those that have less resources to

participate and the financial resources, human resources. And I think that ICANN has done that fairly well. So it's an example as well to the broader ecosystem.

And I think it was very positive to discuss here and even to realize that even though I can perform the very, very, very important function for the Internet to run and work, this is a small part of policy issues that concern the Internet. So make people understand that. I think that was a very important point of the seminar as well.

And I think that even in the corridors, people are much more open to discuss broader Internet governance politics. And this is a (unintelligible).

Kathy Kleinman: Kathy Kleinman. I wasn't at the conference had been at the predecessors but apparently this one was an enormous success. When I hit the ground, that's all anybody was talking about. So congratulations Bill and all of the conference organizers and session organizers.

I know huge amounts of time must have been spent and dedicated, and the timing couldn't have been better and thank you. And it was standing room only. That's what I heard.

Bill Drake: (Unintelligible). We had a room for 150, and it was basically full the entire day, from 10:00, which was kind of unique. And I'm sure Larry Strickling contributed to that. Nevertheless, that they were there was a good thing. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking, Avri Doria speaking. I'm not going to sort of repeat what everyone said about it being good. It was good, however, I've got to bring up one thing that I think is a problem with these kinds of conferences. And I think it's wonderful that everybody was there at the end. And I actually stayed beyond Larry for the final three, so it wasn't just Larry.

I think that there was way too much talking of people sitting in the front. I think panels were too big. I think that we need to think about having a few panels that distribute information is a good thing. But I really think that when we look at next year's we have to come up with a few sessions that are just more dynamic, that actually pull people in.

And I don't mean splitting into groups and going off and doing stuff, but there are ways of making less panel, looking at other things, looking at one where there's an actual debate, looking at one where you're actually getting people to discuss with each other in the house.

And so I just want to sort of put that on the list that yes this was a good panel conference. However I think that next time we should look at doing something that isn't just panels.

Bill Drake: Okay.

(Neal Sanuver): (Neal S.) Article 9C. I would like to build on what is being said by Milton and Avri is that indeed a lot of broad topics were discussed that I missed during other parts of ICANN up to now, but a lot of the panels were indeed people delivering their statements and not really reacting to each other or the room.

It would indeed be a great addition if it could be real debates where real new ideas were formed and not people restating their own positions that they've already had for a certain time.

Bill Drake: As you might guess, I have answers to all of these, but I'm going to wait. Pranesh.

Pranesh Prakash: Pranesh Prakash. Just one point to add. I thought the questions laid out were absolutely fantastic. And I think some of the panels worked really well in addressing those questions. Some of the other panels didn't work as well in terms of actually pointedly providing answers to those questions.

And so perhaps next time moderators could not just pointedly provide these questions to the panelists in advance, which of course they did this time -- not just put them up on the board - but while asking them, while introducing them, specifically ask them to respond to the particular questions as well. And hopefully that will egg them to provide more specific responses.

(Malco):   Hi this is (Malco) I forgot. I think that something really useful was the background resources that were put online. People referred to it a lot. And this is something that if we manage to keep those background resources updated, and I think Roy's working on a library of NCUC or something, could be useful to the community and also to show what community members are producing.

So I think it was very positive and just to remind everybody that the session is online. So if you were not here, if you missed it, you can watch how it went.

Bill Drake: Indeed it was - ICANN was very good at providing all of the logistical support we asked for. We did it with Adobe Connect and phone grids and it was also YouTube sent out by one of our members, (Jolie), and it's been videotaped and it's all up there so people can consult it later.

Other suggestions on the operational considerations and lessons learned, things that we might do differently, better, next time and so on and so forth? Things we did right, things we did wrong, any thoughts? Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yes I think my last comments were meant to open a discussion but let be more pointed this time and say that I think the session that worked the best was the one that was most directly related to ICANN and attempting to influence the course ICANN takes.

And I think that the panels on the broader landscape were not successful and that in the future the lesson that I learned would be that we should use these

conferences to try to influence things that are happening in ICANN, that ICANN does. And we will have the most success when we are much more closely focused on ICANN policy issues.

Bill Drake: Okay. Other thoughts, anyone? Okay can I use my chair position to respond? Just a few points.

And I think the first point you made, Milton, is really what this is all about in a way. It is true, you know for those of us who worked - and I look around this room and I know many of you have been involved in both the ICANN sphere and the U.N. Internet governance debates.

And we're all kind of plugged into the two different worlds and think about how they intersect and so on. But the fact of the matter is you find out over and over that there are lots of people who live in the one and don't live in the other.

And there are a lot of people in the United Nations type discussions of IG, who go to WSIS meetings, go to U.N. Commission on Science and Technology and Development meetings, go to IGF meetings, who really don't know what's happening in ICANN and its internal operations and so on, its organizational culture, etcetera, and hence therefore make sweeping statements about ICANN which often insiders seem a little bit odd.

Conversely, there are lots of people in ICANN who just couldn't give a rat's patootie about Internet governance generally. They're here for domain name business. They sell domain names. They make a lot of money. They don't see what they do as being Internet governance. They're very focused on their immediate environment. And you could understand that.

The idea of the meeting was A, to say there's this big thing coming up that everybody's been freaking out about. Let's talk about what it is, which is the Sao Paulo meeting. But then B, within that context, let's also foster dialogue

and maybe some cross-fertilization and grow to mutual understanding and get people who are very ICANN centric to at least be exposed to some of the stuff that other people are engaged in.

And I know that when I was on the GNSO Council for four years and I would try and raise issues of development or developing country interests or things like this, people would stare at me like what the Hell are you talking about, like this is so outside the boundaries of what we're doing here at the GNSO Council.

And so I think it's an important thing to try to do that even if the uptake on it isn't always well. I would disagree with you Milton when you say the sessions, that the panelists didn't deliver. I think the panelists delivered by and large.

I think that the audience didn't hear it as well perhaps, although I'm not as pessimistic as you because I did have conversations with people after the fact like (unintelligible) where indeed people who are totally focused on domain names were talking to me about what's happening in the U.N. and what is this push and why is that about? What are they trying to do? And why should anybody care about principles and things like that? People were asking me.

So I think the process of collective learning is a slow incremental and uneven one. But I think that there was some cross-fertilization there. But certainly no question, when we set this thing up, we didn't imagine that Larry Strickling was going to announce the INIA changes the week prior.

So of course all the ICANN people came in and all they wanted to talk about was IANA, IANA, IANA, and everything else was just kind of tertiary to them. That was inherited in the process and so I think that that's kind of just the way it went.

The too many panelists issue, that was a function of simply trying to make this a real - NCUC hasn't always had the warmest and closest relations with all parts of the constituencies in ICANN. And I made a real effort to try to reach out.

I invited intellectual property constituency. I invited the business constituency. I invited the registrars, the ANSO, the (RSAC), the (ALAC), the (GAC), every part of the ecosystem to participate, and some speakers.

And people either said yes I really want to or goofed around for a long time and then said yes please add me. So I ended up with panels of six when I would have rather had panels of five.

I also sent to all of the moderators the detailed - I'm the master of very long, boring e-mails - and I sent the detailed suggestion saying why don't you do like three to five minute opening statements and then go to an interactive discussion where you get the panelists talking to each other. And I posed those questions as a baseline of something that you could default to in looking for something then to talk to about.

Well, at the end of the day, no matter how many times you ask moderators to do that, panelists come in and give a ten minute talk in their three-minute time allocation. And you can lunge across the table and tell them to shut the hell up, you're not doing what we asked you to do, but it's not always convenient to do that.

So we did end up with some people who went on, and that was unfortunate. And I would only hope that in the future, we go with fewer people, make it much more clear, much more up front, that there's got to be a dialogue oriented discussion, and so on. So I take all those points as I think those are things to learn from.

And the last point about Milton said we should focus on ICANN stuff. I guess you know if you want to really appeal first and foremost to an ICANN audience, you talk about ICANN stuff.

But I guess my question is - and I throw this back to you Milton - this part of ICANN, we're the part of ICANN that has always been very human rights oriented, civil liberties oriented, public interest - I don't like that term - but public interested oriented with a lot of academics and so on.

If we don't raise those issues and push people who are here for the money -- who are all about domain names and making money - if we don't push them to engage with that space, are we doing a disservice? Would we be missing something?

We could get a - definitely we could get a bigger event by just doing ICANN, ICANN, ICANN. No question. The question is do we have a social responsibility to try?

Milton Mueller: No, no, you're creating a false dichotomy. It's not that we don't do important broader human rights issues. It's just that they need to intersect with ICANN's agenda. So for example, the Expert Working Group on Directory Services raises all kinds of issues about privacy and freedom of expression, but it's something that ICANN actually does.

So my statement simply we use those conferences to try to shape and influence a discourse around policy issues that are actually live in ICANN. I actually think you made a very good case for some kind of broader perspective because yes your typical ICANN domain name domainer will not really buy into a human rights argument unless they're aware of some of the broader issues.

So I'm not saying we should never touch on that stuff. But I think in terms of actually accomplishing something with these panels, we need to have kind of an output or a bottom line that relates to ICANN's policies.

Bill Drake: Yes, I take your point. This meeting of course was focused on the NETMundial, which is not all about ICANN. And so that's inherent in the proposition this time. But going forward it's something to take into consideration.

I raised a second question -- assessing points of substantive consensus and disagreement within NCUC in the wider community. Do people detect from the dialogue that we had that we are moving? Is there anything that we can leverage?

Do we see in the expressions that came from different parties, both within NCUC or other stakeholder groups areas of commonality that we might be able to work on on some of these issues, for example on the IANA stuff, for example on any of the other matters?

Or are we all just completely all over the place? Is there any kind of takeaway in terms of emerging areas of consensus or was it just too dissolute for that? Any thoughts? You were a panel chairman. Did you have any thoughts?

Were there areas of agreement and disagreement that you noticed that might be useful to think about going forward?

Rafik Dammak: Okay I guess from the panel - this is Rafik speaking - I guess from the panel that I moderated in the morning, which was featured to talk about IANA as an - as I explained to panelists that it's not about it. But I guess we may move towards some agreement in several parts.

Even sometimes those kind of discussion, like when one of the panelists, he really talk about the Congress of Versailles and so on. But I think we can

move for some common ground, and that's the thing that we may have to work on it in the next months and weeks and that's kind of the cross-communique work that we need to focus.

I don't think that there's so much agreement in the important matters. And so we should keep continue working on that. It's not necessarily through conference but maybe in other, in different way maybe kind of informal meetings and so on.

Bill Drake: There's a lot more people here that weren't at the meeting than I was expecting, so perhaps it'll be a little bit difficult to press this point too far. But yes did you have a suggestion? (Marialias).

(Marialias): This is (Marialias) speaking. One thing that I have noticed on the first panel I think is that there is a very strong reaction in the community. I'm feeling that the bottom up process has been somehow trumped by some initiatives, by the board and (unintelligible). And people seem to be particularly uncomfortable with how the high level panels and the strategic panels were set up - what are the goals, what are the results.

And I think that this is something we could definitely work on. My concern is not only that it trumps the bottom up process in a way but also that a lot of money and resources were invested in these initiatives and I'm not sure if the results in the community are going to pay off everything that was invested. And even about the quality of the document...

If you think - I did not read them all. I read two of them -- one that called my attention more was about the role of ICANN and internet governance.

And to me it was a little strange to notice that for instance the text about Briggs had two pages. So in two pages you explain everything about Briggs.

Briggs are put all on the same area like Brazil and China are the same internet governance. If you spend one year dealing with that you understand that it's not the case.

And the position of countries were treated like very recklessly. Like the position of China comes from something that was read in the China Daily.

So the China Daily published it so they come to the conclusions that this is the position of China. And this is something that is going to inform the community.

So even another point to say how seminars like this that we make an effort to reach out and to bring more people to the discussion it's very important. And I think that this was something that I really took off.

And I think that many people are now engaged on the IANA transition. And it seems that in our community that there is more broad agreement that a transition should take place and be supportive of that.

Man: Anyone else on this? Okay then I have a reply.

I have very strong feelings about this and I recognize them to be minority feelings. In a lot of discussions and a lot of context I find myself talking to a lot of American business people telling me how horrible it is that ICANN's becoming very top down and not bottom up enough.

And I think for a lot of them that is a game of trying to undermine (Fadi) and the leadership because they don't like globalization and they want to push back against that. And so they're using this whole attack (Fadi) thing to say way out in front you're doing things that are not supported by the community.

We don't want to let it go to IANA. We're very comfortable because we're Washington, DC lobbyists who make our money scaring people into believing

that they have to cling closely to us and we can go up to Capitol Hill and make things happen etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

So for them there's a certain amount of I don't want to say hypocrisy in those claims. But they have mixed answers.

And at the same time I will also admit readily that the way the strategy panels were launched and so on was pretty ham handed and could have been done a lot better. And that their outcome is fairly uneven.

A suggestion -- there is now a public comment period opening up. We have a whole bunch of members who are highly verbal writing oriented kinds of people.

Why don't we write come replies to these public - to these things? I don't personally view that strategy panels as a massive threat to the bottom up process particularly in the GNSO when I was - we had a meeting in the GNSO the other day an somebody who was behind me I think - he left from the business community made a big point about how we need to examine the CEO now because it's so inappropriate.

He's doing this - we need to have an immediate group grope and assess him. And I got up and I said can you outline some ways in which the convening of these panels have undermined the bottom up GNSO process?

And I got nothing. Fact of the matter is most of what they're recommending is not directly related to the GNSO process or the bottom up process or so on.

But nevertheless they could have been handled differently. And fine.

So we might want to consider making some joint statements. Coming to a view about these things and making some joint statements about them.

That would be entirely useful. ICANN is looking for feedback.

Exactly - despite the fact that we've got 300 and something members and fairly active in doing stuff we don't participate in public comments a lot. And it's a pity.

You don't have to write a lot. You can write two paragraphs.

But you get it on the table. And then when the staff writes a summary of something they have to say range of views were expressed, the people at NCUC said they thought that such and such, etcetera.

You can write them as individuals who are affiliated with NCUC or you can try to come to an NCUC joint position and do it that way. But I think we can intervene, you know, any - that (Fadi) would appreciate that would be construction, that would help to say here's some issues to think about the way you did it.

And here's some takeaways that you might consider going forward to make this process more effective. Yeah.

Woman: So in the ancient past -- and I realize it was a long time ago -- we might have taken - just to suggest to follow-up because I think it's very important that we engage in written comment. And there are just so many people here -- there are decimally we have the talent around the table.

But in the past what we've done is schedule time during the NCUC meeting with people briefing what the issue was that was on the table, what some of the pivotal issues for the noncommercial users constituency were. And maybe what some of the controversial issues were so we could debate it.

And that gave whoever was writing the comments a basis for going forward with writing the comments. And they would wind up with a small group around them to help edit.

So for future meetings we might think about that. Because that's a way of launching comments much more quickly.

Man: When does the public comment period close on the strategy panels?

Man: (unintelligible)

Man: Mid...

Man: (unintelligible)

Man: April. So we would have to move quickly to put some stuff on the table there. But we could have some kind of synthetic discussion in London where we drew on some of our main observations. Yes?

Woman: And let me share an observation to start with as we look at some of the results of these panels. One thing that I was seeing and I was only reading parts of them was a lot of talk about global engagement but not necessarily balance.

And whenever I don't see the word balance -- I like checks and balances. I like multi stakeholder.

I like balance. So if other people as you're reading through the results of some of these strategy panels and new panels could look at that and see whether you have the same questions.

In the old days there used to be a talk -- we'll just put the right people on the right panels and we'll come up with the right decision. But I - the multi

stakeholder model to me is about balance -- that you have people coming in with one interest like intellectual property.

You have people coming in with noncommercial interests. And together we work out policies because we balance.

WE argue. So the intellectual property people argue trademark.

And we argue fair use. And together we balance.

If you only have one side and not the other you will not get the balance. So if other people could read through that and see that - if I'm right or if I'm wrong or if you share the concern let me know because that could be (unintelligible) that we write comments on.

Man: So then maybe one thing we could do in a way of using this technology with the jabber and the ability to create ad hoc groups -- maybe we could identify a few people who would want to review each of these reports.

You know, if three people wanted to read a report on X and devise, you know, just like two page comments. And three people wrote one on Y and we could put those together and get those out there into the public comment period and then use that as a basis for fostering some discussion amongst ourselves that would be a really good thing to do.

And taking into point that account the precise desire for balance that you're talking about. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: I guess because we tried to do more policy at the level of NCUC we've (unintelligible) of NCUC members. And last - I think yeah this month we replied to three public comments.

So we tried to improve. And about the strategy panel we have it's the end of (unintelligible).

So I think we have that. Again back to how we can improve the process -- what we - I'm trying now is try to - for each - I mean public comment to list this in the wiki -- it is better to have someone to follow-up.

I mean it's not (unintelligible) BC chair or something. I mean to help a little for each public comment.

And Brenden suggested another tool. So maybe he can talk about a little -- that we can put as a proposal the comment and we can get the votes of members.

It can be much more easy just to have discussion and maybe. So to have everything in the same place and people can vote and so we can see what kind of support.

Maybe Brenden can expand a little bit about this.

Brenden Kuerbis: I think you're referring to the liquid democracy tool? Yeah right.

So there are several experiments going on out there to use platforms to help develop amongst a large group of people. So there's basically two phases to it.

There's a collaboration phase where a position or proposal is developed. And then it goes into a kind of support gaming phase where we can take advantage of ideas like allegating one's support of a particular position to another group.

And basically scaling up the support for a particular proposal. So in short we're experimenting with some of these tools.

And if anyone's interested in doing that, helping look at them, evaluate them just contact me and we can go forward.

Man: Great. Thank you. (Stephie)?

(Stephie):   just a short comment that a reality check on these platforms which are very, very useful. But a platform as you know very well doesn't make a community.

So those people that are going to volunteer to take on board specific topic and draft something for the public comment period should read ideally also take charge on (unintelligible) the discussion. Really going, you know, knock on people - doors and try to have them contributing a specific timeframe.

I did try similar process exactly within governance principles. And it was very difficult conversation going.

So whoever takes those possibilities should take the whole package ideally.

Man: Okay thanks. All right let me move briefly to the next agenda item four. And we don't need to spend - obviously we're not going to spend the kind of time that originally envisioned but that's okay.

That - could we put the agenda back on the - (David) on the - just to ask going forward, I mean recognizing that not everybody was at the meeting but given what we have heard about ways we could do it better and what we've seen there and so on. How do we want to think about taking forward NCUC's engagement in the space?

There are a number of different things going on right now with regards to internet governance that are beyond the typical GNSO and - but which definitely tie into ICANN and its role in the ecosystem and which I think appeal to a number of us. There is the cross community working group.

And there is - Avri just made a horrible face. Which Rafik is (unintelligible) so you two could take it outside later.

Which submitted an input to the net mondial and was the first effort on the part of the ICANN community to come together and try in a very short compressed time to say something reasonably jointly about broader internet governance issues. And one question is do we want to continue to engage in that more?

We have four representatives there now on that group. Do we view that as something that we want to put time into.

There's the One Net initiative. The One Net initiative is - a lot of people run down the One Net initiative and say that it's garbage and the listserv is full of cranky trolls and junk like that.

And that's undoubtedly true. It's also true that you're seeing debate between people who would never have talked before.

And collective learning is taking place. I Mean I think it's undoubtable.

You've got like hard core techie guys talking to really radical, you know, anti U.S. kind of guys. And they're sorting through some things.

And I think that's potentially useful. We are having a steering committee meeting on Friday to try to figure out really what the hell our objective is with One Net.

But it's an open question whether NCUC - NCUC has always been very focused purely within the ICANN space. And then there are these other self-society coalitions that are working on the broader IT stuff -- the internet governance coalition caucus.

There's the best bits network. There's various types of groupings out there.

We have not sought to play a role in that larger space. And I don't know whether we have the (unintelligible) to do so.

But the question is that larger space is impinging more and more on what we do here. And do we want to think more about how we might interface with it.

Whether in net mundial, the IGF or other settings going forward. We do workshops at IGF every year.

They've been quite successful. And they attracted a number of new members last time.

And we hope to do it again this time. But do people have any thoughts about this/

How to leverage that linkages between NCUC, an organization born and bred internal to ICANN, into wider internet governance world. How do we want to engage it?

Is there anything there for us? Should we stay very locally tightly focused just on the GNSO stuff?

Or should we try to be involved in some of these other things too? Do we have any thoughts about any of these matters?

(Walid)?

(Walid Zackoff): It's (Walid Zackoff). I've come to ICANN through the fellowship program which is also important.

And many of those fellows are actually connected to those organizations. I'm a member of the dynamic coalition of the freedom expression of the IGF, an internet society.

So there are many aspects in which we can communicate as a common bridge to those organizations and from those organizations. I did mention a year ago that this is a deficiency in NCUC that it lacks this coordination with those elements.

So I'll do - embolden its position. Particular that the brochure has a very wide mandate and it includes human rights.

And when you look into the real action there is not much about it honestly speaking. So there needs to be a way in which we can leverage that support.

And I am ready for my part to help in connecting you.

Man: So much going on with rights con, with the meeting in Estonia, so many things going on around internet issues that have a governance component where we could be bringing some real understanding of, you know, ICANN from the inside into that other environment.

But again it's a bandwidth issue and so on and so forth. Any other thoughts about this? Carlos?

Carlos Alfonso: Interesting the title of our topic -- no implication for any (unintelligible) engagement from IGI think we should put here justifications for any COC engagement on IG. Because the noncommercial users constituency is composed of entities mostly that are fighting for (unintelligible) rights throughout the world.

And fighting for social justice and similar social development issues. And everything to do with us to tackling issues of internet governance as a whole regarding rights based issues and the other issues.

So not only restrict ourselves to the domain of domain names. No and the implications of the domain names or any other issue.

So I think it's everything to do with us going to broader internet governance issues with our vision (unintelligible) inside the organizations mostly, no?

Man: Other thoughts from (unintelligible) or no I see new people. Yes?

Woman: Hi. Sorry (unintelligible) ICANN fellow. So when I look at this brochure you have you - the name is the noncommercial users constituency.

I would say a noncommercial concerns constituency. Because you may be from the private sector but you may have some noncommercial concerns.

And especially from the part of the world where I'm from civil society's not that strong. And sometimes they are actually classified as private sector.

So if you restrict this to civil society which I see that you have this like to the road to the civil society. If you restrict it to civil society it will - you are not going to be able to cover as much as you can.

Like different regions. And also I have another comment on the regional division that you have and you have Asia.

What does that cover? That covers Iran and Japan and couple of other countries.

Yeah so this - yeah.

Man: The regional divisions are set by ICANN.

Woman: Yeah so that's what they use at the UN as well. So it's Asia-Pacific I guess.

             It's even wider than what...

Man: I'm (unintelligible) from the UN.

Woman: Yes that's right.

Man: That's quite a category.

Woman: WE are other.

Man: Yeah. But the ICANN has set for regional - for - you know, it's an ICANN policy that we don't get to change what the regions re.

Woman: Maybe you can have focus groups on like different...

Man: (Tarzana) I take your point. It does say in the brochure and what we've tried to do while civil society is kind of our bedrock we say we're for protecting noncommercial users and uses.

             And the uses -- we have lots of members who work for the private sector, who work for government but who have concerns with maintaining a net that's not completely commercial. And so maybe we could emphasize that more, make that more direct as an outreach point.

             And I think that's a good one. Okay I know we're probably all desperate to take a coffee break.

             And that's fine. Larry Strickling and Fiona will be arriving in 15 minutes and we should definitely be here on time for them.

It'd be not good to have the Assistant Secretary of Commerce walk in and the room is half empty. There should be coffee like right outside.

Kathy had asked whether we needed to really prepare first. I think in terms of preparing I think we could probably wing it is my guess.

If we can make - I think we all know how to talk with Larry. But let's do try to be back in our seats at 11:00 sharp so that he's not here alone, okay?

[Break]

Bill Drake: Okay folks let's get ourselves reconvened. We'll get started in a second.

So there's (unintelligible) as well. Adobe has to be reloaded.

They told us that they had a coffee break but they didn't tell us where it was. And it wasn't outside our door so we had to all - there was a no coffee so we had to run to the other side of the building.

That's why everybody is kind of coming back in a little bit asynchronous manner. But we'll get there.

How long are you staying?

Man: WE go back tomorrow morning.

Bill Drake: And when do you imagine there'll be hearings?

Man: Next Wednesday and Thursday. They're already scheduled.

Bill Drake: Under who's (unintelligible).

Man: House Energy and Commerce on Wednesday, House Judiciary on Thursday.

Bill Drake: Point that out so that they know how to weigh in.

Man: I know all the republican (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Well you know, good to know. All right ladies and gentlemen we're going to get started.

      Is the remote participation on? Ready to go?

      Okay we are back at the NCUC constituency day meeting. I'm Bill Drake, I'm the chair of the NCUC.

      And we are delighted to welcome to our midst for the next half hour two people who have been much in the news here at Singapore and beyond in recent days, Larry Strickling who is the assistant Secretary of Commerce and Head of the NCIA who made some very important announcements just recently about the U.S. being prepared to assess - begin a process of transitioning control over the IANA functions that have long been held. Those parts of the IANA functions that have long been subject to U.S. authority.

      And with him is Fiona Alexander. Fiona is the head of office of International Affairs.

      She is the person who's most directly involved on a day to day basis with a lot of the international institutional and related issues pertaining to these kinds of issues. WE thought we could just ask Larry and Fiona to just offer a few quick thoughts, start us off about where they see things after having been here for four days now.

And obviously gotten quite a lot of earfuls from a lot of different directions about their announcement. I'm sure that they've got some observations about the status of the ICANN community's "preparedness" to move forward on this.

But then we want to also talk about ways in which I would think NCUC and other sole society (unintelligible) support, the globalization initiative can be helpful to that effort. And way - other kinds of synergies that might be possible.

So open Q&A after a few minutes. They've go6t a half hour.

So without further ado Larry you want to start off?

Larry Strickling: Yeah.

Bill Drake: Okay great. Thank you very much and welcome.

Larry Strickling: Well thank you Bill and thanks to the constituency for inviting us to stop by today. I am glad to see many of you who we also saw on Friday at the very successful conference that Bill ran on Friday.

And I'll try not to go over in the first set of remarks too much of what we covered at the front end then. But Bill reminds me that not all of you maybe were here on Friday and are as familiar with our proposal as others.

So I probably ought to do a little level set here. Although I'm not going to refer it - refer to it as the 3M proposal as I did on Friday which is the Make Milton Merry proposal.

But he's gotten enough air time I think from us on this. But I thought maybe you'd like to Tweet that one too.

In any event I will start maybe with some observations over the last couple days and then track back into the substance of the proposal. I think overall I'm quite impressed and pleased with the response we've seen from the community here in terms of the reaction to the proposal.

I think every group we've visited with has been supportive of what we've announced. In general we've seen good support fort the conditions that we laid out.

And that doesn't surprise me because frankly we thought what we were expressing were long held consensus views of this community. And I think that has been represented by the response we've seen.

I think the discussions yesterday were quite good as a way to start the process of getting the community to start discussing the proposal. But obviously there's a lot of details yet to be worked through both in terms of setting a process and then getting to the merits of it.

But just to review quickly what exactly we did. A week ago Friday we announced our intention to transition out of our role -- the U.S. government role in the IANA functions.

Our actual role is quite administrative or clerical in the sense that root zone change requests come through us, we look at them, verify them and pass them on to Verisign who actually implements and updates and maintains the root zone. So it's a task that is not that difficult to perform.

It's a task we think we can step out of without in any way undermining the IANA functions. But at the same time we recognize the symbolic nature of our role in all of this which has been both a source of comfort and confidence to a lot of people. But a great source of irritation to other people particularly foreign governments and some country code operators.

So we felt the time was appropriate now to begin this final transition which has been envisioned ever since ICANN was formed. It was never intended that the U.S. government would play a permanent role in this space.

It was always envisioned that the U.S. would transition out of it. And so what we're doing now is this final evolution.

And I've made it clear in other remarks that this is not revolutionary, it's evolutionary. And I think that's an important thing to keep in mind.

We did as I mentioned earlier put four condition around the - our request. And let me back up by saying that what we specifically requested was that ICANN as the contracting party for the IANA functions convene the global internet community to develop through the multi stakeholder process the transition plan to replace our role.

And we've only put our role on the tale. We haven't suggested that there's anything about the work ICANN does at the front end of this or any of the work that Verisign does at the back end that has to be changed by virtue of what we're doing.

We're not teeing that up although, you know, already we hear people in the community saying they want to be looking at those aspects of that. But we haven't asked for that.

We've been trying to focus specifically on replacing the United States' role. The conditions we've put on the process are four in number.

We have said that the plan presented back to us has to support and enhance the multi stakeholder model. It has to maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

It has to maintain the openness of the internet. And then it needs to meet the needs and expectations of the customers and partners of the IANA services.

And then we went one step further and was very specific in stating that we would not find acceptable a plan that basically turned this over to a government led organization or an inter-governmental organization to take this over. And that stems directly from I think a near unanimous resolutions of both houses of Congress back in 2012 that endorsed the multi stakeholder model of internet governance and made it very clear that it is the policy of the United States not to see the internet ruled by a inter-governmental organization.

Now that statement in and of itself led to questions about well do governments have any role. And we've made clear since that we were in no means saying governments couldn't participate in this process.

We've always believed that governments are stakeholders like any other group. And therefore there is a role for them to play in terms of participating.

But it has to be done as one of a group of stakeholders not as the group that's going to end up controlling this or in some way make the decisions on things. We've also made clear that while the contract expires on September 30, 2015 things will be status quo until then.

Nobody will see any changes in what we do unless and until we get that consensus plan delivered to us. And if for some reason the community can't get a plan put together that in time to meet the September 30 date there's no cliff.

There's no disaster, no train wreck facing us because the contract is - can be extended by us for up to four years through two two year options that we have to extend the contract. So rest assured that we will do nothing to impair all the stability and security of the internet through imposing unrealistic

deadlines on people or by basically saying we're going to walk away at any given point in time.

So again when we look at what's happened here on the ground we wanted to get the announcement out in tome for the community to have a chance to get together and talk about it. And that I think got off to a good start yesterday with two public sessions on first the technical issue of the IANA functions.

And then secondly an issue that we certainly thing is related to our announcement which is this idea that this role that we play in giving confidence to the system or in some people's minds a disservice -- something of a disciplining function on ICANN. We certainly understand the community wanting to talk about that.

And we were glad to see that that was the subject of a public session as well yesterday. I know there have been some questions raised about well is the issue - are those issues going to be dealt with together?

Can they be dealt with together? Do they need to be kept separate?

And I think our view on that is that we certainly expected that this issue would emerge as part of our announcement. We certainly don't want to discourage any discussion of it.

I think the only advice we would give would be let's do it efficiently. And so if there's a way to focus on the technical aspects of the IANA functions perhaps in one work stream and at the same time take on these broader questions of accountability and, you know, what does it mean for us to step out of the IANA functions contract we think it's fine for those to go on in parallel if that makes the most sense.

And that frankly is an issue for the community to decide about. So I think with that maybe I'll pause and get going with your questions and try to get at

whatever issues have emerged in your minds since you got here on the ground.

Bill Drake: Thank you very much Larry. I've got all kinds of questions.

But let me turn first to my colleagues and see if anybody would like to start us off with thoughts on the process or the substance as it's been announced so far. Anyone?

Yes (Grace). And please say who you are when you introduce yourself.

(Grace Givega): (Grace Givega) from (unintelligible) action network. I appreciate the fact that you've come to speak to us.

And I will tell you one of the concerns that have had people talk is the level of commitment by the U.S. government. And whether the level of commitment or whether this is not to preempt Brazil.

Larry Strickling: Preempt Brazil, how do you mean?

(Grace Givega): Net mundial would of course have discussed some of these issues multi stakeholder and therefore the timing of this announcement and the level of commitment.

Larry Strickling: Well I think those are two separate questions. But I assure you we didn't undertake this process without intending to see it through.

Now it's time for the community to do its part and get together and put together a consensus proposal through an open transparent, inclusive process -- I'm sorry transparent proposal developed through an open and inclusive process to deliver to us. But so there should be no doubt about our commitment to this.

In terms of the timing we felt it was important to make this announcement in time for there to be a discussion on it with the community that's most directly impacted from it which is the ICANN community. Because the IANA functions are performed here by ICANN.

So we felt this was the appropriate place to start the discussion. In no way does this preempt anything at Net Mundial.

And I'm frankly puzzled by how people would think that would be a question. I'm sure this will be discussed in some fashion.

But as I said on Friday and I've repeated it to other groups the Net Mundial conference is a very important conference this year. It's important because it needs to take up larger questions of internet governance such as in particular how do we deal with the needs and concerns of the developing world.

And attracting them into this process. Figuring out their issues, their problems, finding solutions for them in a way that they feel comfortable participating in - more in the global internet community.

And I'm hoping that the two days in Brazil we'll have a lot of attention focused on those issues. Because at the end of the day those are more important than the question of who's reading root zone change requests to determine whether they're accurate or not.

So I don't understand the idea that somehow this is preempting Net Mundial. If anything if this opens the field to having the broader discussion we need to have I think that's a good outcome for Brazil.

Bill Drake: Perhaps if I may just the thinking that perhaps she's referring to - because I've seen this in some discussion spaces as well. There are those who put forward more radical kinds of proposals for how the U.S. might be moved out of this role.

And by taking the first step and saying okay we're doing it you have in a way taken some of that - some of the steam out of that discussion. So that - I think that's just a reasonable thing to draw.

I want to...

Larry Strickling: Everybody should say thank you right?

Bill Drake: Yes right. So that said have you looked at any of the submissions that have been sent -- because there's quite a lot that people have had to say on the IANA transition in their Net Mundial submissions.

And I'm just wondering have you looked at that and have you thought about how you would leverage the Net Mundial in support of what you're doing, how - what you would expect to come out of Net Mundial around this issue and so on?

Larry Strickling: No. Honestly I haven't had time. Sorry. That's plane reading going back tomorrow.

Bill Drake: Fair enough. Kathy and then Milton?

Kathy Kleinman: Hi Kathy Kleinman. So my question to you - of the functions that will be turned over once the multi stakeholder proposal...

Man: Transition?

Kathy Kleinman: Okay. Of the functions that would be transitioned...

Bill Drake: Let me - because words are important here. When you say turned over that - some people say oh that means ICANN's going to take it over.

Or it means that there's absolutely something that has to be created to replace what we're doing. And we're trying to be as non-judgmental as possible about the range of options that should be available for consideration by the community.

That's the only reason I reacted to your statement. So we use words like transition because we aren't dictating that there has to be an organization crated to do what we did.

We're not saying you don't need an organization. We're not saying anything.

We're basically saying community you decide this based on getting input from all affected parties.

Kathy Kleinman: Makes sense. Okay. Of the functions that will be transitioned -- thank you -- what do you see as the most complicated or the most difficult or the most political of these functions?

I think the oversight of the Department of Commerce is something, you know, it would help to understand better actually. And so what do you see the functions that might be again the most difficult or political?

Larry Strickling: Well I mean the basic operational function is the one I described which is the fact that we are interposed between ICANN and Verisign in terms of verifying the accuracy of root zone change requests. To me that's a pretty straightforward technical question.

And it's a question that I again hope that the customers of IANA functions on the naming side are, you know, should have a lot of input into that in terms of what they would be comfortable with. Because maybe the community would conclude they're quite comfortable with it going machine to machine without some new person or organization, you know, taking on what we do.

Again we're not pre judging this. It's an opportunity for the community to look at the service they're getting and say we can get it just as well through this mechanism or no mechanism.

We don't pre judge that. I do think the larger question is this related question of the extent this kind of amorphous idea that we provide some level of confidence to the community or some amount of disciplining of ICANN.

I've heard people refer to that. And that's again that's almost symbolic as well.

And but I can certainly understand why the community would want to talk about that. And I'm glad that ICANN appears to be creating a process to allow that discussion to happen.

Bill Drake: Merry Milton?

Milton Mueller: Just wanted to get your attention because I have two students here who want to ask questions, okay? So the simple one will go first and then the complicated one will come second.

Woman: Okay it's a simple question. Why did Bill Clinton criticize us?

Larry Strickling: Go read the full transcript. He didn't.

Woman: Okay thanks.

Man: Hello my name is (unintelligible) from KU University in Japan. My question is with the recent passing of (unintelligible) a little bit sort of separate from the IANA contract.

But recently ICANN passed the universal acceptance of international domain names. And now the U.S. - I guess the U.S. government is sort of transitioning the IANA functions to ICANN.

So from my perspective it seems like ICANN is becoming more of an international organization. And my personal sort of fear is that by becoming an international organization actually internet is going to become nationalized.

So each country will have its own say. And sort of internet will become separate by borders.

What is your perspective or am I sort of I guess understanding the situation incorrectly?

Larry Strickling: I'm not sure I agree with your idea that there's a cause and effect there. Individual governments may do things within their own borders to meet their own national interests and I don't know whether ICANN totally, you know, as it was 10 years ago or ICANN as it might evolve to in five years is going to have any ability to change any of that.

So I, you know, if that's your question I'm not sure that any of this really has a big impact on that particular aspect of it. I don't think there's any question though that our involvement in the IANA functions has been a source of irritation to other governments.

And it's probably led to some of the calls that we've seen about well, we need to have an offset against the United States government. And the best way to provide that offset is to turn these duties over to another group of governments or to an intergovernmental organization.

Presumably our announcement takes some of the steam out of the concern some of those governments had for that. I think notwithstanding that there's

an important task which again I hope we talk about in Brazil at Net Mundial which is how do you get the developing world comfortable with this multi stakeholder model of internet governance?

I think it's a multi-faceted problem. It's partly because they don't have a lot of experience with it.

It's partly because their civil society and business communities aren't as well organized to provide the other parts of the multi stakeholder process. So there are a lot of issues I think that have to be dealt with in that regard.

All of this stems from our belief that this form of governance to the internet has been a very strong contributing factor in the growth, innovation and wealth creation of the internet and our desire to see other nations -- particularly those in the developing world -- find a way to share in that same growth and innovation. And our belief that the way to do that is to bring them into this global internet community as supporters of this model.

Bill Drake: I see three people waving at me - four. But I want to abuse my position to follow-up directly on what you're saying before I go to them.

Because for those of us who have lived through the past decade with (unintelligible) and all that stuff, I mean we - I mean 10 years ago whenever the people in this room were sitting around governments saying, you know, America because of the IANA stuff America could press a button and you fall out of the root. You know, and America has got this - I mean they would talk about the IANA like it was - something was going on behind a fortress with machine gun turrets and bats flying around and a moat and dragons.

And, you know, which always made me laugh when I think of the person I know who works in your office and actually presses the button. But nevertheless...

Larry Strickling: Sent to Verisign. Let's be clear about what the button is.

Bill Drake: Yes exactly. So nevertheless my question is now I mean I know that you've got a lot of people lauding you in the GAC meeting the other day. I wasn't there.

But in terms of responses you're getting from developing country governments your putting forward an approach that is saying we're keeping this out of the hands of government, we're putting this into some sort of multi stakeholder model. ICANN has got the lead in the dialog and so forth.

Are you getting - the consulting role. Are you getting pushback on that specifically from anyone?

I mean it's - are people like saying okay that's all right with us? Or are you getting people arguing back no, that's not the end of the story and we need to have a different kind of model and so forth.

Larry Strickling: What kind of governments...

Bill Drake: Yeah on the governmental side.

Larry Strickling: So the - we had a long discussion about this at the GAC meeting on Sunday. And in general the - those nations that spoke -- and it was a wide range from all continents -- that spoke were all very supportive of the announcement.

Many directly expressed their support for the four conditions. And I would say there's a consensus on the conditions because no one raised a single concern about them.

At least one government made specific reference of support to the statement about no government led or intern governmental organization. And again

there was no objection raised in the room by any other government to that particular condition.

So that I think combined with the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations when this came out that they - that the Secretary General supported this and made again specific reference to the multi stakeholder model of internet governance I think gives us a fair amount of confidence that the governments want to participate in this process and will do so in a productive way.

Bill Drake: Yeah so this is off the agenda as the ITU. This is off the agenda for the (unintelligible) and so on you think?

Larry Strickling: I'm sorry say what?

Bill Drake: You think this is off the agenda for the (unintelligible) century meeting?

Larry Strickling: Well I mean we don't control that. That in large part will be determi8ned by individual governments and their contributions.

                   So I - we're hopeful that enough countries will want to engage in the process as it's run as a multi stakeholder process that there won't be any need for it to come to (unintelligible). But I can't say for certainty that some nation won't attempt to bring it back.

Bill Drake: Okay let's take a bunch of...

Larry Strickling: But maybe one that's, you know, got some issues in Crimea right now and maybe people won't be too disposed to listen to them this time. I don't know.

Bill Drake: Right okay. I know you have time constraints to let me take a bunch of questions in order. Then you can respond to them together.

So Brenden, Carlos, Avri, Rafik and Pranesh.

Larry Strickling: I think that's a (unintelligible). Sorry. It'll be easier this way.

Brenden Kuerbis: Great. Thank you for coming today to speak to NCUC. So the IANA functions are composed of three areas -- names, numbers and protocol parameters.

And in two of the three the policy aspects are structurally separated from implementation, right. So for instance the IATF decides what the protocols are, they determine the assignments and then ICANN actually implements that.

With regard to names however policy and implementation are part of the same organization, ICANN. Although the DOC requires through its contract that the activities be functionally separated.

I'm curious if the department thinks that structural separation between policy and implementation would be considered a desirable feature of any new arrangement that might be proposed?

Bill Drake: Okay. You knew that was coming. Okay Rafik? Or no Carlos did you have one?

Carlos Alfonso: Not necessarily a question but a statement. I - well I am a Brazilian.

And in light of the recent revelations regarding surveillance, etcetera I was - I have an interesting position. Is that I am reading the U.S. government submission for Net Mundial.

I read phrase by phrase, word by word and I couldn't find any disagreement. I agree entirely with what you - with what the division says.

Just a statement.

Bill Drake: And this from a Brazilian (left). So well done. Okay Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks for the clarification that I mean the dialog will be just facilitated by ICANN. Because I think there was some confusion that it's - ICANN may have kind of controlled how things will go for this consultation.

In particular when I saw the timeline it's really around ICANN meetings. We ask that that should not be just an ICANN meeting - it should be outside.

I'm not sure what are the plan. There was nothing suggested.

And let's also come to the question how - I mean the (unintelligible) have an oversight in this process how to be sure that it was really open, that all parties were consulted. Maybe some people say consultation looks more top down approach.

But how to ensure that the community and also outside the community are participating. What are the mechanism that you are meaning to put which for that?

Bill Drake: Third question. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah thank you. And this is Avri Doria asking.

I guess the question I'm asking is there seems to be - and it may only be my interpretation so perhaps you can tell me I'm wrong -- that there's a difference between what you're saying and how it's being interpreted by much of the ICANN leadership. And certainly to the extent that I've had conversations with root zone operators and the NRO folks that sort of feel that there's a sort of an ICANN appropriating authority to themselves in the words and phrase they're using and the approaches they're taking to it.

So it seems that they're actually starting an approach down a different road than the one that you're suggesting. And I'm wondering whether that perception is indeed erroneous.

I'm sure you've heard from them much more than I have. But it does seem to be something that has a lot of people concerned. Thanks.

Bill Drake: Okay. And finally we have one more from Pranesh.

Pranesh Prakash: Thank you. Thank you very much for coming to speak to us. The NTIF statement is at the same time saying that you won't accept anything that is government led, not just governmental but government led and pushing the multi stakeholder approach or the multi stakeholder model.

But you yourself admitted one of the shortcomings just a moment ago, right, that in developing countries civil society just isn't that very well developed. That even businesses from developing countries aren't doing that much better either.

There are 17 gTLD applications from Africa, 24 from all of Latin America and Caribbean put together. And even technical participation from the developing world is limited.

Very often we find American, European companies are contracted to do much of the technical work around DNS. So a, do you think this poses a problem to the multi stakeholder model?

And if not how do we work to overcome this?

Bill Drake: And then finally (David). Sorry.

(David): Okay...

Larry Strickling: (unintelligible) to process? Okay good.

(David):   So my...

Man: (unintelligible) hard ones.

Larry Strickling: Okay.

(David):   My question when discussing the - some of the proposals around the
                     (unintelligible) there have been a lot of discussion about whether it is a, you
                     know, what - how - to what degree is this policy function? To what degree is
                     this a sort of accountability or a regulatory mechanism, that sort of thing?

                     And my - and, you know, without well understanding the multi stakeholder
                     process may come to its own understanding of this I'd really like to know what
                     your understanding is? Like what is it that you think you are currently doing
                     when you - what are your - and what criteria do you use to approve a
                     change? (Unintelligible).

Larry Strickling: Yeah so we'll take that specific back question first. Fiona can answer that.

Bill Drake: Okay can you - before you do that just let me double check. (David) there's
                     no questions from the remote participants?

(David):   There are no questions from the remote.

Bill Drake: Okay fine. Rock and roll.

Fiona Alexander: So on the specific question about the root zone processing so under the
                     current contract it's made very clear that the NI functions operator is
                     implementing the policies and processes developed regardless of the venue,
                     whether it's IATF, the RIRs or the CCTLD - CCs or GNSO space. So we have

a template and just a fact check to make sure that the technical checks are in place.

So there's no, you know, and that's worked out in the process. So in the current - when we did the NOI for the current contract we actually put out a question on the gTLD program as you all may remember and we had a lot of pushback from many people in the ICANN community that we were over stepping that.

So we made very clear that what the IANA contractor does is fully consistent and reflective of the process over here regardless of where that process is. And all we do is just make sure the process is being followed through a template.

Man: Essentially you just...

Fiona Alexander: Clerical.

Man: It's - well clerical but you - specifically looking at all the policy processes. It's - you are verifying that the policies have even followed or...

Fiona Alexander: We actually have the contractor self-certify the processes. So it's a template check.

I think each change request probably takes a couple of minutes.

Man: Yeah.

Larry Strickling: So maybe I'll start with in light of this topic we - it segues right into your question about separation. As you correctly noted when we did the last contract with ICANN in response to input we got from the international community we did requi9re a functional separation of the policy making personnel from the IANA personnel in the contract.

So the notion of separation is one we embraced. We recognized the internal community, embraced it and we reflected it in the contract.

Whether that should then go to the next stage of a structural separation we don't - express no view. Partly because I don't think it's my part put my finger on the scale of any of this.

But I do think that that does then introduce economic inefficiencies potentially into a process which might well be justified by some benefits you get by the separation. But it seems to me that's an evaluation the community would want to undertake.

So I know Milton and I both in previous lives did a lot of work out of the breakup of AT&T and the question there of, you know, the idea, the control of the local exchange monopoly allowed one to extend their monopoly and their market power into other more competitive services. And it was viewed there that improving the inefficiency first of the vesting and then putting all these separation requirements within these companies was offset by the competition gains you would get by being able to nurture a competitive - more competitive market in the adjacent services.

So there, there was a very conscious economic tradeoff made based on an evaluation. I don't see those same kind of considerations here.

So even though separation is appropriate you'd really have to understand what additional benefit you get from a structural separation. And then is it really worth the inefficiency you create?

But that's the debate the group should have. The community should have.

In no way are we saying don't have that discussion. Then there was the question of how to ensure - well let me to go to Avri's question because I - my notes aren't very good on the second question.

So I may have to get you to repeat it for me. I think at the front end of this process there's always a question of how do you actually get to where you have something that then goes and conducts the process?

And I think there's a natural tendency for a lot of people to have ideas about that. Certainly we may have complicated it.

And if so, fine. It was good that we did so.

By insisting that this wasn't going to be just an ICANN process, that it was going to be a process that had to engage the IETF, the IAB, the RIRs and other parts of the community. And we were pleased to see that reflected in the lineup on stage yesterday where they were all there and in a position to, you know, respond and be representative of the idea that this was going to be more than an ICANN process.

Still how all this gets narrowed down into what the process is actually going to be is still I think a question for the community. I'm sure lots of people have ideas about the way to do that.

I think what we would be concerned about is making sure that there's nothing wrong with having ideas, but they need to be presented and accepted by the community. And so we expect that to occur and we keep repeating that at every opportunity in meetings like these in the hopes that that message is very, very clear.

But I do think that the way at least the structure of the discussion yesterday to me reflected a good recognition by ICANN management that this is bigger than just ICANN. And that they have to figure out a way to be more inclusive.

But at the end of the day what we're asking the community to do I don't think has ever really been done before at the scale we're talking about. So it's not surprising to me that there are people who are trying to find a way to put some ideas about structure around it which is fine as long as it's all vetted and accepted by the community through the process.

But the idea that you're going to bring 500 people and put it in a room and actually design a process there, I mean you know and I know that's not going to happen that way. But there needs to be a way to pull in ideas and suggestions from people.

And then kind of reflect them back to the community with a little bit of structure around it. So we're sensitive to this issue and we'll continue to monitor it.

And certainly at the end of the day this will only work if we get a consensus proposal developed through an open inclusive and transparent process. Everybody has a stake in that from ICANN management down to every organization or person who is part of this ecosystem.

And so I think it behooves everyone to make sure that that's happening every step of the way. And we won't hesitate to give our view that we don't - if we don't see that happening.

Because that will mean - if it's not happening it means we won't get the consensus proposal at the end of the day. But in doing so we want to be very careful not to be signaling or putting our finger on the scale in terms of the substance of what that proposal has to be.

Because I think that undermines the multi stakeholder process as well. And we just don't want to do that. You will find just that everyone appreciates the domestic political situation we're in, you know, there have been a number of

articles written about how this announcement means we've given Vladimir Putin the internet.

And that free expression on the internet has been - will now be eliminated as a result of that. And I'd mention there are going to be two hearings in Congress next week where we can expect those kinds of arguments to be made.

And part of it is there's a certain discomfort that folks have that we didn't in effect say here's the outcome we insist on having. Now go agree to this.

Or that we didn't in effect conduct our own process and then present to ICANN the solution. But we felt that if we really want this organization, if we really want the ecosystem to evolve it's just as important to have the community create the outcome as well as administer it.

Because it's the capacity building that occurs by actually engaging in the process to come up with a solution that will then well serve everyone when you actually are transitioning to whatever comes after us. So we see those as very closely linked.

And we want to avoid doing something to interfere with the group really testing out different ideas and seeing the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches in again an open, transparent and inclusive way. Because we think that'll lead to the strongest proposal.

And I'm sorry I'm going to have to ask you repeat your question because my notes are unintelligible to me.

Man: So you just said that it will be an open, inclusive and transparent process. So how you will ensure that it will happen? What type of oversight mechanism that you will implement?

Because like for example you mentioned about the timeline. The timeline is really around iStars meetings. There is nothing outside that there.

So how you will really ensure that it will be in the wider community within ICANN and outside?

Larry Strickling: I think what's important is for you and Pranesh and everyone in this room to insist on a, being included; b, making sure that input is taken from more than just ICANN meetings. And I know there - my understanding is they're already working on that.

They're figuring out how to take in effect the discussion that was held yesterday and do it on a regional basis around different parts of the world. So I think there's an appreciation of that.

It's just that again we made this announcement a week ago. There hasn't been a lot of planning in terms of beyond getting the input from the community this week as to what comes next.

And so now is a perfect time for you all to make your voices heard to help shape what comes next. And I encourage you all to do it.

And I think that is also to your question Pranesh I understand it could be a problem. But to me it's an opportunity.

And it's an opportunity for people to step up and say we want to be part of this. We're willing to commit the effort and you need our views in order to reach a consensus view of this.

Because at the end of the day people ask me how will we measure the outcome. To me it starts with is it consensus and was it developed through an open, transparent and inclusive process?

And I, you know, said that I think three or four times in this room. And I've said it probably 20 times already this morning to the other groups we've been with.

And you all have to - if you don't think that's happening you need to speak up and say it's not happening, it needs to change. And say it loud and long.

Bill Drake: I know you guys both are busy and probably need to run. Can I just ask one last question.

How can - yeah. Well can I add to it?

How can we help? Civil society has been the most consistent and ardent supporter in the internet governance environment for doing this.

A decade ago we argued for this in the (unintelligible). We got very different responses back then from the Bush administration but okay.

Larry Strickling: They're not there anymore.

Bill Drake: They're not there anymore, yes. So people do matter.

But we've always been and we've told (Fadi) this as well. He's taken a lot of heat from different business constituencies.

But we've always been very much supportive of this. You're looking at a room in which Americans are in a very distinct minority.

We have members from all over the world. We would like to know what can we do that would help to advance the cause?

Make the political problems that you have in pushing this less of a problem for you?

Larry Strickling: So I'd say all those republican Congressmen that you send pack checks to, I'd call them up. Look but as a secondary issue I have to say I'm extremely puzzled and troubled by the idea that's emerged that somehow this evolution is going to threaten free expression on the internet.

And I think that's where you all could help us. To be able to explain why you think this is important for protecting free expression.

That this community is so committed to a free and open internet that it would never allow an outcome to emerge out of this process that would in any way threaten free expression. Because I think that the people who are expressing these views in the United States are not well informed.

I think they are trying to score political points. But it's an issue that certainly resonates with people in the United States when they hear these statements being made.

They take it personally and they view that as a threat. And so it's something we need to nip in the bud because it's wrong and because it might threaten the - not seriously threaten but it'll be, you know, constant friction that we're going to have to deal with over whatever period of time that issue remains in people's minds.

So we could use your help on that in terms of explaining why civil society supports this and think it's important for strengthening a free and open internet and not becoming a threat to it. If there was any way you could help us on that we would be very grateful.

Bill Drake: That only an American problem with the tea party types? I mean are you getting any parallel pu8shbak elsewhere or no?

Larry Strickling: I haven't seen any of that coming internationally yet. And I don't know that it would.

But it's absolutely an emerging them in the political debate in Washington. I mean just go look - I mean Sarah Palin has made a Facebook post on this.

Now I'm sure Sarah Palin is very well acquainted with the IANA functions. And I'm sure that, you know, if she wants to show up at an ICANN meeting or at Net Mundial to participate I'm sure she would be welcomed.

But she's expressing a viewpoint that is very troubling in terms of what we're trying to accomplish here. And I think what the world is expecting out of the growth of the internet.

And it's all being done not because at the end of the day she cares one bit about the IANA functions or ICANN. I doubt that she could tell you what any of the letters in the acronym stand for.

But it's all being done for political gain in the domestic politics in the U.S. And we're all going to have to be working together to push back against this.

Again I don't see it as a fundamental threat to what we're trying to accomplish here. But it's something we just cannot allowed to get out of control.

Bill Drake: This could be done. Did you - anything else that you wanted to share or ask us or anyone else real quick?

Or do we let these poor people go onto their next millionth mission - meting. All right well then Fiona did you have any closing comment? No?

Nothing. Neil do you have - you got something to - small one? You're okay?

Good. Okay. Good. Okay. Neal go.

(Neil Sanuver):   So could you maybe signify the importance of the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations in relation to the transition? And could they be called as a sub precondition or...

Larry Strickling: I - we - I've made it very clear that nothing about what we've done here should in any way distract attention from the need for the board to get on with implementing those recommendations. Part of our thinking in terms of the timing of this announcement were improvements in accountability and transparency that have occurred in ICANN over the last four years.

The ATRT2 report makes clear there's still more to be done, and frankly, there will always be more to be done. But having said that, I think this organization has made strong strides compared to any other organization that reports to be - operate like this, in the last four years. But there's always going to be more to be done and we've made it clear that we expect that the board will continue to move forward with vigor to adopt and implement those recommendations. And I have no reason to believe that they won't.

Bill Graham: Larry, Fiona, there was a time when it was very, very frustrating for those of us who (unintelligible) and it was very hard to get people from the US government to really come and engage with civil society and we found ourselves talking a lot of times to Brazilians and the European Commission and so on. And I saw Fiona personally because we know each other but we didn't have organized dialogues much. And it's a notable change and it's really, really appreciated. We're really happy to be here.

Woman: All you had to do was ask.

Larry Strickling: Yes, I did ask (Dick Barett), I did (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Graham: (Unintelligible), well. Anyway, so we're really happy to have had you here.

Larry Strickling: It's always a pleasure to come and talk to you. You guys are clearly the fun crowd here and so we welcome the opportunity to talk with you all. Thanks.

Bill Graham: Okay, well thanks much. Okay, so I'm going to step out for just one minute. Could you lead a discussion of the board seat election just briefly, to update people?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Graham: I mean we want to continue to go through the dialogue but I have to step out for one moment.

Woman: Okay, I suppose I can. Kind of a strange thing for me to do since I'm the candidate, but hey. Maybe it's time for me to do a campaign speech. No. No campaign, no, no campaign. So anyhow, having been asked to talk about the board seat - oh why should they?

                 We have the - it's basically a three-year term. Bill Graham is in seat 14. Seat 14 is basically selected by the non-contracted party's house, which means that the CSG, the NCSG -- so the commercial stakeholder group, the non-commercial stakeholder group -- and then you'll have the NomCom appointee to council it to the non-contracted party's house -- NCPH -- are responsible for electing someone.

                 Now the election is by laws determined to happen by mid-April. The reason for - even though the person does not take their seat until the annual mentioning at the end of the year. The reason for that is part of the NomCom's task is to balance the board. If you look at the bylaws on the board, there's certain rules about not more than this number for any particular country, I mean from any particular region. And then there's a sort of an unspoken requirement that, you know, you need to balance skills.

So if seat 14 was filled by a person that's knowledgeable in this, but that leaves a void -- let's say Bill Graham was knowledgeable in Internet governance and we happen to elect a seat 14, someone who was totally not knowledgeable in Internet governance -- then that would mean that the NomCom would be faced with, "Okay, now we have a void in the board on this topic and that's something that we need to take into account."

So that's why the elections from all of the supporting organizations come mid-year and then the person just basically waits a half year until they take it. So we're in the process of that now. The CSG -- the commercial stakeholder group -- nominated Bill Graham for second term. A board member can have up to three terms of three years and anybody that does that is particular. But anyhow, so that is possible. So he's standing.

And as is policy, in terms of the NCSG charter, the policy committee is the one that's responsible for making nominations for the various roles nominations, putting people on committees, fulfilling all that stuff. With the consent of the group and, you know, and there had been some discussion of candidates on the discuss list several weeks ago when I had put myself forward as available for nomination.

I got nominated in the PC meeting and there was another nominee, (Sam Lanfranko) from NPOC and the committee decided that I would be the nominee going forward and we'll see what happens in this vote. You know, there's all kinds of chances of deadlock, so it's going to be an interesting process.

We also did something rather remarkable in that the NCSG operating procedures by and large leave the councilors free to make their own determination in how they vote in meetings. And we specifically say, "And then if we don't like the way you vote, we'll yell at you, we'll vote you out, we'll get rid of you, but you make your own decisions."

In this case, there was a vote in the policy committee to constrain our vote to vote for our candidate with only one vote against that constraining. I voted against the notion of people being constrained to vote for me. And so I'm a candidate and I guess that's what I have to say.

Woman: The process moving forward?

Woman: Okay, the process going forward, I guess that would be Rafik, you'd have to fill that in because you talked to (Glen). (Glen) makes up ballots. There will be a vote. The vote is by the council members. So it's - there's 13 people voting. Oh, and just to explain, the rule that we've got on it is that -- this is a bylaws rule -- that there has to be at least - and with (Rob) in the back there I'm sure will correct me , there has to be at least a 60% vote to win, not a 50%.

And that's because when the rules were being made, at less than 60, one stakeholder group plus the - basically what it did is it gave the NomCom appointee the deciding voted. So if you had two houses that stood against each other with a candidate, you had one person that got to make the decision -- the NomCom appointee. By requiring 60%, it forces any candidate to get at least one vote from the other stakeholder group.

(David):   Yes, and just (unintelligible) for people who weren't there, we discovered the most - the best misprint in the bylaws ever, where instead of saying "...the vote's comprising the non-contracted parties house," it said, "...the votes compromising the non-contracted -." But the question really yes, what is the process going forward? I actually think we made a mistake in our motion we moved yesterday in that we didn't specify when we stop finding the councilors, so we'll now have to make another motion to unbind them if we want to do that.

Did we?

Woman: I thought it was (unintelligible).

(David):   Yes, I thought it was - well, no, I mean not for the - I mean, I - we should have - basically the problem is that we're not going to - we're going to bind our councilors if the CSG are going to bind theirs. If they change their mind and start to have a different process, then we will do the same.

Woman: Can I correct that? The CSG does not bind. It's each of the constituencies can bind, and that may be an important point.

(David):   It absolutely well may be, yes. But - well anyway, which complicates it of course because then we will have to - if say two of the CSG constituencies remain binding their council, as well we continue binding ours and so on is a discussion we will have to have. And the intent clearly to - just to tell you, everyone, we bound our councilors only to make it very clear that we were - this was a strategic thing that if they were going to make - if they were going to adopt a process that we couldn't win, then we were going to adopt a process that they couldn't win and let's go back and talk about process.

                And of course pretty much instantly, we've had calls from - we've had "Oh, we've got to talk about the process now," sort of approaches I think, so.

Man: I just wanted to make clear that there were events leading up to this where there was a discussion on a list -- an e-mail list -- for the non-contracted party house leadership on how to - an attempt to - for both the commercial stakeholder group and the non-commercial to agree on a process where we can have nominees and an election.

                We didn't hear from the commercial stakeholders, we got no feedback until they came to us with a unilateral decision to have all the councilors' support their candidate effectively, as (David) said, make it impossible for a candidate of our own to win. So that's why we took this position. We tried to talk to them, didn't work.

Woman: If I can add more, I guess I'm following Bill's lead of taking Chair's prerogative to put in my own comments. One of the things about the processes is if you look at the - not only do we have the funny wording in the bylaws of compromises, but if you look at the GNSO working procedures, procedures guide, it basically states that in annex - that each of the party - each of the houses needs to define its own processes, and those processes will be documented in the GNSO procedures.

So I went, you know, when we were having all this conversation, I went to look and at which point I remembered that we actually were never able to come up with a decision on how to do it, and therefore the annex that is pointed to by the operating procedures does not exist.

And that's all stuff for (Rob). So anyhow, I don't know if anybody else has anything - am I sure about what?

Man: That the annex didn't exist?

Woman: Oh yes, I went and looked for it. Maybe - am I absolutely sure, no. You know me better than to ever be absolutely sure, but when I went and looked for it, I could not find it. So that ends - now Bill entrusted me to talk about board seat 14, which was kind of weird when I was a candidate, but hey, I hope I did okay. I don't know if anyone else has anything to say about it.

The next thing we had was a proposed non-contracted party house meeting and I have no idea what that's all about. Other than we're meeting at the (unintelligible) party tonight to talk, but I don't think that's what he meant about, you know. Yes, Rafik, it's yours.

Rafik :   I think we have straight to meet with our counterpart in the non-contracted party house and I think we have the cocktail at 7:00pm -- I'm not sure, I need to check. But at 7:00pm (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, so it is (unintelligible).

Rafik: Yes, there are drinks. But the (unintelligible) so -

Bill Graham: My apologies, I had to step out and take care of something and I was hoping
                    to get to the restroom too, but that didn't happen. So -

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We finished board seat 14 and we didn't really know what to say about the
                    proposed non-contracted party house other than there's drinks -

Bill Graham: (Unintelligible) people know that this may happen. So some people here will
                    remember, but others will not, that in January of 2013, ICANN staff brought
                    the non-contracted party house, all of the elected people -- I forget how many
                    there were, like a dozen from each side -- from NCSG and CSG together for
                    a couple days of brainstorming in Los Angeles. And they're proposing now,
                    we submitted a budgetary application to do it again, probably in Istanbul or
                    Singapore, we're not sure.

                    And I wanted people to know that that will happen and if so, talk about how
                    we might strategically leverage it. So I just wanted to put it really on your
                    radars to know that it was a live issue because there was a proposal made
                    informally to the staff and they had said, "No, you've got to come back with a
                    formal proposal." And now that's been done. So it's entirely likely that this will
                    happen somewhere in the next half year and it will be a good thing to try to
                    use it to bring in input from people.

                    Last time, we found ourselves being lectured to by the staff on a lot of points
                    which made everybody really freaking annoying. And so we said if we're
                    going to do this thing again, we want to have it driven by the community. So if
                    we do this, we want to have, you know, (unintelligible) with community

agenda issues. We want people to start thinking then about what we want to talk about.

We've accumulated a whole range of issues with the CSG -- how the houses run and what our standing in ICANN is and so on -- and we would want to begin to evolve a dialogue about clarifying some things to bring to the table on that. Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: How many people - (unintelligible) commercial and non-commercial together again?

Bill Graham: Commercial and non-commercial together again.

Kathy Kleinman: And how many people are being envisioned for coming in? Because just a note that ICANN pays travel expenses.

Bill Graham: Yes.

Kathy Kleinman: Okay.

Bill Graham: I imagine it will probably be like 25 people.

Kathy Kleinman: From us or altogether?

Bill Graham: Altogether.

Kathy Kleinman: So 12-1/2 from either side?

Bill Graham: Okay, I should have said 24. You don't know exactly what the breakdown will be, but it will be a comparable effort to last time.

Kathy Kleinman: So that's a lot of us. I mean that's a lot of people that can go.

Bill Graham: Hey, you were there.

Kathy Kleinman: I was there. Yes, I - but there had been talk about different changes of sizes at future meetings.

Bill Graham: Not in the most recent versions, no. But the main point is we went into that meeting - the reason I'm raising it other than to just share information, we went into that meeting kind of like going, "Well let's just go and see what goes on." And in part that was justified, because the staff had engineered the agenda in such a way that everything was very structured and we were responding.

                 We made it very clear to him that if we do it this time, we want it to be very much community driven. That means the different perspectives of NCSG and the CSG will play a larger role in shaping the whole agenda and so on. So we need to start to think about how - why are you looking at me so perplexed?

Woman: (Unintelligible) moving my eyes (unintelligible).

Bill Graham: Oh. So -

Woman: But it was a lot of fun because in some ways we found overlaps with the CSG we hadn't expected. They're just as frustrated with some of the processes and procedures and timeframes as we are, so it was a very - I thought it was a very interesting experience.

Bill Graham: It's almost always the case in my experience that you can build - the low-hanging fruit in multi-stakeholderism is to work on the process stuff first, you know? Because everybody has the same frustrations to then move from there to substance agree/disagree.

                 But anyway, I just want to let people know that that was happening. We should start to think about how we might want to start to position to it. The

second quarter priorities bit, we talked a bit about this on the last executive committee meeting call, which was open to everybody. And so I'll just briefly overview a few points to put them on your agenda.

In the second quarter, what we hope to do is to focus on A, budgetary manners. Apparently the budget submission deadline was accelerated from last year. We put in one proposal for sport for the IGF to get a few people from the IGF again, and it doesn't look like we can do more.

But there is a separate bid, which is that the staff is coming to us again and saying, "If you wanted tech support - if we could lend you some staff support to make your life easier because you're doing all this pro bono, administrative crap, how would you want it to do?" It would be helpful if we could get some people to sit down together and just isolate those items that we think would be worth asking staff to provide support for. That well could happen as a separate point.

A third point I wanted to flag to people, I made this point to the executive committee meeting, but it doesn't have to be just the executive committee people who know this either. There's this program called CROP -- community regional outreach pilot project -- which will provide funding for representatives of NCUC to go - up to five times to go to meetings in their region, where they will fly the flag and say that they are representing NCUC and da, da, da, da, da, okay?

I'm going to - we've never applied for one. People (unintelligible) have benefit taking quite a lot of advantage of this apparently. I'm going to apply for one to go to the (unintelligible) meeting, but there will be four other opportunities in this fiscal year. So next few months, we could submit others. So I would encourage people to think about whether there's a meeting in their region -- particularly if it's not in North America -- that is pertaining to Internet issues where one could plausibly go to ICANN and say, "We want to go there with a

bunch of NCUC brochures and talk up NCUC and blah, blah, blah, blah." If so, they might be able to fund you, okay?

And Pranesh is the point person for this, and (Ellen)'s raising her hand.

(Ellen):   I just have a question about the program, this financial year. So the events that you would apply for would have to be in what window of time?

Bill Graham: Well, just in the current fiscal year. So this is up until the end of -

(Ellen):   End of -

Bill Graham: ...June to do that.

(Ellen):   ...June okay.

Bill Graham: Okay. Finances and fundraising, just to let you know where we are, we have about after this meeting probably we'll have about $74,000 in the bank. We will be applying for funding support from PIR, which usually gives us 15, and CGI.BR and a couple of others, so we should be able to replenish ourselves back up into the 80s somewhere. So we'll have some funding to be able to do some things in the way of supporting hopefully more people coming to key meetings where they really need to be.

And we will have to try - we have tried before to specify and publicize the criteria for providing travel support, we will have to get this done because I feel like it's an important thing. We should try to make a lot of resources we have available to more people, while at the same time ensuring that we preserve a reserve, so to speak.

By the way, if there are people who were availing themselves of the offer, we have a list and the executive committee approved funding for the people who asked for it. The people who were asking one extra night at a hotel to attend

the conference who were here on Thursday night need to supply to (Milton) -- who's not here right now -- a bill, an invoice, with a confirmation of his hotel room - of the hotel room.

We will be working in the next quarter on the Web site, trying to spiff it up. It's got lots of holes. There's a lot of this is content stuff that's just missing. We need more people to volunteer to write things. We've got the basic structure in place. We've been saying this now for a year, stuff is just waiting to be done there.

We need to work together more effectively on NCSG, GNSO policy work. There's been a lot of concern expressed by people on the NCSG policy committee about the effectiveness of that activity and moreover our ability to funnel people into the working groups and other activities of the GNSO. I don't know if Rafik, would you like to speak to this at all?

Rafik :   Thanks, Bill. About the policy committee, I think (unintelligible) - more louder. I think about the policy committee there is some progress, but still a lot of work to be done. And about working group, I think in the last six weeks, we have more people involved with it, but we need to support them because it's not easy. Most of them are new, really newcomers. So that's basic idea I guess, is to have the old timer of NCUC and NCSG to support them, to explain how it works on working groups.

So I guess that that's maybe for next month and to fix some open public comment, I guess we can make for it. And so (unintelligible) on that, we can make more progress, so we (unintelligible) to have free comments in the same time I think it's what's challenging. So we can try mouth by mouth to do that and to improve our (unintelligible) to all public comment.

Bill Graham: If anybody had the juice just to raise - you don't have to raise your hand here, but just to read one of these things and provide a public comment on behalf of NCUC or NCSG as the case may be, or even as an individual, just to start

to make us more visible in the space would be really, really good. And I think in particular responding to the strategy panels would be one thing, but there's a lot else going on.

Rafik Dammak: Just I mean if you want to be involved, I mean contact me and also Maria Farrell, which is - who is the Chair of (unintelligible), so we each have new formats and we'll help you to join the working group or also any - you want to read the report (unintelligible), so just feel free to contact (unintelligible).

Bill Graham: So in the second -

Woman: Hold on, hold on.

Bill Graham: Yes.

Woman: You guys, since I wrote two of the last three comments, it's really hard. This is stuff - this is a lot of work. These are very complicated proceedings in many cases. It helps to have 15 years of history on it. I don't know how someone can just pick up one of these reports and write comments, and then it still takes two weeks to get it through, the number of e-mails, procedure list. So there's a lot of time, effort, sweat, that goes into these so I don't want to make it sound easy, because it's not.

Bill Graham: Well it depends on the topic though. Somebody can respond to a policy -

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Graham: ...a strategy panel report without having been 15 years in the trenches and who is -

Woman: Okay.

Bill Graham: Right? It depends on the issue.

Woman: One of the things I wanted to see if is we wanted to create a group of senior people who have been here that can help. So if something goes through on the intellectual property, there are a few of us that have worked - were working on that issue for many years. So if somebody wants to do a draft and we can say, "Well -", you know, and respond to it, it's one - because not everybody can follow all the list of all the points.

               So if something goes through on intellectual property, it should probably run by me and (Robin) and (Wendy) and others who've been kind of working on these issues for a long time. And we can say, "Well, you know, we agree with that, but we understand that there's kind of a dark side over here," and help (unintelligible) and some of the privacy issues. We have expertise in here, but not everybody - but not - the oldtimers can't write all the comments, as he said. So can we work with kind of a core of experts, checks and review.

Bill Graham: Can I call on Avri Doria because she's been waiting and then Rafik and Pranesh.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, yes, I wanted to first of all recommend to people a method that has been used and I think works. And this goes to the timing. It's true. There is limited timing to get our thing written and then go through the two weeks of review to get the policy committee to approve it. But - and it's probably going to change again because part of the ATRT recommendations was that this current method of commenting doesn't work.

               But until it does change, if a person writes a comment that they feel comfortable with because it's their comment, they should just submit it. And they should also, at the same time, submit to the policy committee saying, "I just submitted a comment; I would like you to endorse it." And what that does is it actually doubles the amount of time we've got. We've got time for someone to write a comment that they put - that they believe in, which is in and of itself is adequate.

In other words, that any of us have a comment to make about something, we read it, we comment, that's good enough. But then the PC can then add to it by either just saying, "We endorse it," or "We endorse it and we go further," or what have you. Now that's not to say we shouldn't try to have, you know, group things, and I think some of the ideas that Pranesh had and some of the ideas that (Brendan) had about working methods may, if we learn to use them, help us develop a statement within 30 days.

But - and we should try to do that, but please, if you've got a comment to make, read the things, make your comment. Don't be shy and ask people, you know, there's nothing that happens to you. I mean having put in stupid comments, you know, nothing that happens. You might get nominated for something, but other than that, you know, there's no penalty for doing it. So be brave, write a comment, and then, you know, we can look at (unintelligible).

Man:	Yes, (unintelligible).

Man:	As an expert in stupid comments -

Man:	Oh, sorry -

Man:	...(unintelligible). So just a clarification question, it's a small one. So it's just there are the four strategic planners -- identifier technology innovation, ICANN multi-stakeholder innovation, public responsibility framework, and the ICANN role in the Internet governance system. You need to read them, then send an e-mail to these lists and that is the process that's going on for there, because it sounded a bit complicated but that's it.

Bill Graham:	Okay. Rafik -

Woman:	Quick question.

Bill Graham: Sorry, (Stephie), Rafik, and then the person behind me.

(Stephie):   Just a clarification because I'm new in this business. So make a comment
                with the NCUC label, it has to be approved by the policy committee? Or, I
                mean this individual committee you're talking about, is it like -

Woman: Okay, yes. To be approved by the NCSG, it has to be approved by the NCSG
                policy committee. I assume the same true is - the same thing is true of
                NCUC, that the group in some way -- and I think it's the policy committee --
                has to approve the statement as that. And that's why I say to submit it on
                your own and then get that later.

(Stephie):   Yes, okay.

Bill Graham: This goes back to the long-riding issue, NCUC does not have a formal
                process for adopting anything anymore. Because we used to do things in a
                very informal way between internal groups of people and we don't have a
                current policy committee. In the bylaws rewrite, I am hoping that we will do
                that, so but right now, any kind of policy statement that's made, either if it's
                going to be formally adopted, it's going to go through the NCSG PC where it
                is joint with NPOC and where we have only two people really there as well,
                (unintelligible).

                And conversely, if there are things that NCUC wants to put out under its own
                label as kind of reflecting its own values and so on, then we have to devise
                an alternative mechanism for doing that. Now, I want to go stick with the
                order, so monsieur, then monsieur, then monsieur.

Man: Okay, just to respond. Yes, I understand the comment of Kathy that it's not
                easy, but we try really to improve the process at least within the NCSG to
                have more people involved to share the knowledge and that's why we count
                and maybe you say the senior people who were involved in the - in ICANN for

a long time. So this idea of having different group (unintelligible) about privacy group, or people involved in similar working groups, so we can replicate that by - for the different topic that we need to handle.

So I don't want really to not encourage people. Let's people try. I mean myself, I joined working group and then how I learn it, that's how you will learn about policy. That's the only way I guess. So about of the public comment, it's quite easy, as it's just I mean you (unintelligible) to others, but if you want to have the endorsement just to send whether in the NCSG policy committee, there will be some discussions that (unintelligible) consensus and we endorse.

So that's why - we try to improve. It's not easy and we are really under a huge overload with many things going on, so we try to do maybe some privatization to send more people to working group. I understand that's not easy. Like I am living in Asia Pac and now most of the working group is in the middle of the night so I cannot end more of them. So let's try to (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, my name is (unintelligible) from Ghana -

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Come again?

Man: Is the mic on?

Man: Yes, it's on, the mic is on.

Man: From Ghana?

Man: From Ghana, (unintelligible) from Ghana. I'm a new fellow. I work with the (unintelligible) Ghana, advice (unintelligible) of (unintelligible) Ghana Chapter,

executive member of (unintelligible) of Ghana. Then vice president of (unintelligible) User Group in Ghana. And then I'm kind of strange to come out with an (unintelligible) foundation Ghana, but I want to get all these people involved.

And but then I want to find out if there is any action plan, if they set a timeline, if they send a guideline or sort of a program that targets something so that we'll all look at it and then we'll work towards the target for the achievement of the whatever (unintelligible) question.

Bill Graham: You're a very rational person and that would be a rational way of proceeding and if only it could be done that way. But the constant problem of getting volunteers to commit to work programs with defined periods, defined deliverables around policy issues or anything else, is an ongoing one that we suffer with. And so it's up to, in a way, members who have a particularly keen interest in an area that they'd like to see move forward to try to take the initiative and do that.

And we have the ability. I mean if we should view NCUC as a platform, right? It's a platform where you can hook up with other people who have similar interests. If you want to form a working group with some friends, we can put up a listserv for you, we can jabber, whatever you want to do, and you can begin to devise something. But in terms of the overall, there are so many things going on that it's hard for people to be able to be much more specific.

I've tried to lay out what - the executive committee has fairly limited role. We don't adopt policy positions. Under our existing bylaws, we don't have any role in doing that. So all we do is try and keep the trains running, keep the platform together. When it comes to putting out policy positions, there the work goes through under the existing system the NCSG stakeholder group level policy committee. But that's not to say that we couldn't improve and adopt statements and pursue work programs and issues of interest to members. For them, that's easy.

But people have to take the initiative and do it. So if you have something you'd like to work with, you should send something to the listserv and say so, and probably there will be others who apply and then we can set up a listserv for you and get you guys connected and then you can go for it, okay? That's the best I can do at this point.

If we - if someday ICANN provides more support for all the technical crap that we have to do, so maybe that would free up some space. But right now I am working, you know, four days a week unpaid doing NCUC. And I really can't do a lot more. I teach. So, you know, it's just, people have to contribute together and we have to have a division of label. Pranesh, you were trying to say something?

Pranesh Prakash: My comments were I guess slightly along similar lines, which is that it would be useful not just to - not going as far as adopting work - tight work plans, et cetera, and trying to commit people to them, but just to have an overview of saying, "Here are the six issues that are going on at the GNSO level --" which are in PTP -- "... this is the due date for comments for each of those. Here is the next date for a call."

So is there - so I'm not saying NCUC should do this, my - or NCSG, et cetera, my question is does -

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bill Graham: (Unintelligible) NCSG PC thing.

Pranesh Prakash: Sure. So does ICANN actually provide this kind of - because many of the ICANN tools, given that I'm new to the EC, I'm new to NCUC, I don't know of what exists out there. Is there this kind of an overview of what all is happening at the GNSO level that ICANN provides?

Bill Graham: Yes, you ask Avri Doria.

Pranesh Prakash: Okay.

Avri Doria: I missed the question. What am I being asked?

Pranesh Prakash: Avri Doria, my question was, does ICANN provide an overview of what all is
                  happening at the GNSO level in a very simplified table form saying, "Here are
                  the six PTPs that are going on that this is the next date - this is the date of
                  submission for each of those and here's the dates of the next call for each of
                  those," in one place so that people within NCUC have one central place to
                  look at when they are, you know, thinking of jumping on board?

Avri Doria: Almost. The GNSO council does keep, you know, action lists, and it does
                    keep lists of what's going on and such. Is it a collated list that also has all the
                    open comment periods and the dates of the next requirements, no. I think for
                    a while when I was, you know, in the past, when I was chairing the PC, I tried
                    to keep such a list there. And I did it for a while but then I fell apart and, you
                    know, or rather the list fell apart. Well maybe it was because I fell apart, but
                    anyway.

                    So it wasn't kept up. But so no, there are several places one can look. So if
                    you look in like, and I can point to the two or three places that you can look
                    that show ongoing work, open comment period, end date, and such. So by
                    looking at two different things, you can probably get your answer, and then of
                    course it would have to be done in a way that was for any constituency
                    member, not just for NCUC.

                    But I always thought that it was a good idea for our policy committee to keep
                    such a list up. But - and that's why I tried to do one, but it takes someone
                    that's going to put, you know, administrative time into it on a weekly basis.
                    And that's where we've had difficulty having someone that can - because it's
                    purely a Wiki editing and moving, you know, cross pointers from place to

place. And it's easy to do, but it takes a couple hours out of your week every week and you have to do it every week and you miss one week and all of a sudden it's no longer trustworthy, you know, and such.

So it really takes an administrator, which comes back sometimes to the other questions that people say, "Hey, can we get an administrator?" "Do we have budget," et cetera, but you're in EC so you know if we have budget for an administrator to do that. So I bring the question back to you, can you get an administrator who could do that for the NCUC?

Pranesh Prakash: This is Pranesh and I think perhaps in what we are asking of ICANN in terms of administrative support, perhaps this could be one of the things we ask for.

Man: Okay, I'm sorry (unintelligible).

Woman: And following up on administrative questions, is there a list anywhere of the NCUC members that are participating in working groups right now? Is there a list anywhere of -

Man: No.

Woman: Okay. Because, for those of us, you know, everybody's working full-time here, so but when you have a little bit of time to look up and want to connect with somebody in another working group, that would be really useful.

Man: Right. And again, all -

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: This was not my decision, nor my preference, but all GNSO related work is now through the NCSG.

Woman: I'm sorry, what does (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: That - actually if I can speak to that, the NCSG did keep such a list. And it was the NCUC that proposed the NCSG and the model we've got and the group. So you may not have been - to your personal taste, but it wasn't, "Oh my word, NCUC was downtrodden by the coming of the NCSG," and et cetera. It was a decision we all made together to create the NCSG and now the NCUC wants to resurge and resurrect and be a phoenix and that's cool.

                  But - and in the NCSG we did try to keep a list of everybody that was involved in all the working groups, but again it was me doing it and eventually I fell apart.

Bill Graham: Correct. And I'm not contesting the first point and saying only that NCUC, because it does not have a direct policy rule anymore, it has not been doing that kind of activity.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And I stand corrected, because Rafik says there is a list in NCSG of this type of thing, (unintelligible) on the working groups. So we will try to publicize it more. And by the way, this isn't really a fight, everybody, this is about encouraging more people to become involved because we're missing a lot of comment deadlines. There's a lot of places our voices need to be heard, so this is about leveraging and making it easier for people to do that.

                  And by the way, I'd be happy to mentor anyone who wants to go into a working group.

Man: I -

Bill Graham: You've had your hand up for a while, but the man back here has been waiting too. So I feel bad for both of you, I'm not sure. I think you've been waiting longer.

Man: He's from my country, so no problem.

Bill Graham: Okay.

Man: Well she actually said what I wanted to say. Like I've been following the list and the conversation. What I would want to do to participate, I would like to adopt somebody's view. (Unintelligible) my mentor, I (unintelligible) view for a while. After following this person's view for probably six months, then I can start having my own, independent view, alright? Just to be able to get into the pool and understand what is happening, because now, you know, you get (unintelligible), you just (unintelligible).

                    And that makes it even more difficult for you to make a comment, because (unintelligible) stand and you don't know who to follow or which one is credible, (unintelligible). So with that, getting back into thinking mode, more critical, self-critical. So that's (unintelligible) participating or put in our comments in -

Bill Graham: Really it would be great if we had a mentoring program and that would be great if we had ICANN resources as part of it. We don't, but it's something we can pursue. I'll come to you in a sec, but the young man here has been waiting for a long time.

(Shil):   For the transcript record, my name is (Shil). I'm from Nigeria and just a brief of me, I also am the Chair - Co-Chair of (unintelligible) and I'm the executive of (unintelligible), which is involved in some (unintelligible) in Africa. I applied like I said earlier, I applied to NCUC a few weeks back and I haven't gotten a response yet, so I need to understand what is the process to application submitting or to get it admitted?

                    And where is the communication happening really, because it's all about communicating and when you say post-comment, we are (unintelligible)

comments and the comments, when it's posted, does it get distributed among all the members or it's just posted like someone receives it and decides which one it doesn't pick?

Because I think people's comment is to be queried - or not really queried, just to be critiqued, so when we get someone's comment, we need to critique it to know - to perhaps also bring (unintelligible) from the comments. So I need to understand the all. I've been used to contributing within the agencies just because I'm interested.

Bill Graham: Okay, lots of good questions there. On the process of getting in, we have the Chair of the NCSG Executive Committee sitting here who has been dealing with this process for some time, and he can tell you once again - or lay out once again briefly what that process is.

Man: So the process that people fill the application form online and then executive committee NCSG has (unintelligible) try monthly to review all the application. It takes some time because we need to review and to find more details about applicants. I'm not sure about your particular case, but (unintelligible) tell me, then I can follow up. So we try, we try really to speed up the process, but we receive like more than 20 or many applications means we have I'd say (unintelligible) review of that.

So sometimes, I mean we need to issue but they are non-commercial organization or individual who want to join us, but just, you know, we'll check your status. But I will try to follow up with all (unintelligible) applicants.

Bill Graham: Just to amplify briefly because we're coming - we're past our close time, the process is again you go to the NCSG Web site, you say you want to join NCSG, you indicate a constituency if you want to that you'd like to join. NPOC only accepts organizational members. NCUC accepts organizations and individuals, okay? Rafik and the group that are in the EC will review

these like once a month and they have to go through that with the representatives of NPOC, the other constituency that is in the NCSG.

Often in the past, it has been the case with NPOC has wanted to bring in new member organizations that were not non-commercial organizations, and so they spent a lot of time having fights over getting clarification about the accreditation and what kind of organization and so on and because we're holding up there's, then they hold up ours. And so it goes like that and it's - so sometimes it takes a couple of months for people to get cleared, but normally with an individual application, it should be faster.

The EC will be meeting. You can come and press your case directly. The EC will be meeting this week here in Singapore, where? When?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Graham: Tomorrow?

Man: Yes, (unintelligible).

Bill Graham: Tomorrow morning and it's open, right?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Graham: They're observers, right?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Graham: Observers, who can't speak. But you can come and watch the process.

Woman: Where and when?

((Crosstalk))

Bill Graham: To EC.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: At 8:30, but I mean we'll start by reviewing application, but I'm not sure that's, you know, discussing about cases of application that should be there.

Bill Graham: Okay, so maybe you don't want to sit through that, but they will be presumably tackling your case fairly soon.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Graham: You give him your details and he'll look into it. Okay, Kathy?

Kathy Kleinman: Back to comments for a second because you can see I live in the comment world. An idea to make it a little easier for those - because I see interest in comments and I'm very excited about this, an idea to make it easier, before you draft the whole, full-blown comment, draft bullet points. And circulate them and we can read them and see if there are additional bullet points we'd recommend adding based on history or past or issues.

                  And if someone can start a set of bullet points, we can increase it, we can continue it. So someone looking at a comment period that you're interested in, you know, just circulate, you know, an outline or bullet points and we'll add before you circulate the full-blown comments. And it may be easier and faster to draft the final comments from there.

Bill Graham: Okay. So we should close this meeting because we're 10 minutes over and the technical staff undoubtedly want to go. I only want to point out in closing, one last item -- we can return to these other items later on -- just because we

won't see each other before then, to let you know that the next meeting of ICANN is in London in June.

During that meeting, the large community will be having a conference all week long called Atlas 2. It will be - they will be running parallel tracks alongside all the working sessions, they will be holding seminars and workshops and so on in the same sort of way that we did on a wide variety of different topics.

Many of us have feet in both the At-Large world and this one and I would encourage people to get engaged in that process to ensure there is a working group to map out the At-Large agenda, the Atlas agenda later this week. It's on the program and you might want to look into that and get involved. So one thing to bear in mind, that will be an important meeting. It will be a big, lively meeting, be a lot of stuff going on.

And certainly one that we in the quarter coming up to it, aside from all the other things we have to do, including the bylaws, should try to go into it a little bit prepared. Now, Rafik, we have 20 minutes to eat lunch and the NCSG will be meeting at 1:00 and what can you - do you want to just briefly overview the agenda so people know what they're going to be doing?

Rafik Dammak: I checked his application, he just applied three days ago. I mean since (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Bill Graham: We want to get you on board as quickly as possible, but you do have to wait until the next time the group can meet and review the application.

Rafik Dammak: That's okay. So yes, basically just to set up quickly to get reports from other - I mean from NCSG, NCUC (unintelligible) committee, and then we will have a meeting with the expert working group on the new directory service

(unintelligible), so for 30 minutes to 35 minutes. So maybe we can hear from the NCSG policy committee in particular just to prepare for the GNSO council Wednesday and then we need to focus really on the meeting with the ICANN Board. We have some proposal but we need to work on them and to know who will take the lead on each.

Bill Graham: This is worth emphasizing if it's your fist meeting and you don't know this, at every meeting NCSG, that is both us and NPOC, meets with the ICANN Board of Directors for about an hour and a half in a big room and basically we grill - we have some agreed questions that we worked out in advance that we've proposed and then they have questions they proposed and we kind of grill each other back and forth. And that's a good show to watch so you should definitely want to make that and that's on the Web site.

Rafik Dammak: And just to remind people, it's in Indiana at 1:00pm, Indiana.

Woman: Not the (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible), oh sorry, (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, just to note, it's really hard to -

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: ...(unintelligible) all the way in the back all the way to the right. You have to look for it, so allow a minute or two to find it. Again, on this side, as far back as you can get all the way in the right.

Bill Graham: Okay, everybody wants to go so thank you very much for staying over. Appreciate your help and we'll see you at the NCUC meeting - NCSG meeting.

END