ICANN
Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 16, 2017
3:59 am CT

Farzaneh Badii: I think we are going to start (unintelligible) who else is there? (Unintelligible).

Tatiana Tropina: So first on our side we have Ines, David and me. I hope others will join a bit later. We are still missing Anna and Renata I believe right?

David Cake: Right.

Woman: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: We are just going to then start the meeting. I will send to David – okay so I think Maryam has started the recording so that is fine.

    David good morning.

David Cake: Good morning.

Farzaneh Badii: How are you?

David Cake: Wishing I had gone to bed a lot earlier last night.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes I wish that too (unintelligible). So if you could just start with briefing us on how it is going with the mentor/mentee (unintelligible). That would be great thanks.

Tatiana Tropina: Sorry (unintelligible) we just have – we just got Anna and Renata joining.

Farzaneh Badii: I ask that we prefer that we go ahead with David and Ines first.

Tatiana Tropina: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: So I would say Ines, David, Renata and I put Anna before Matt and Ayden because we want to also to discuss the (unintelligible) the part about how we are going to (unintelligible).

So I think it makes more sense that Anna start kind of before Matt and Ayden.

Woman: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: All right so David go ahead.

David Cake: I mean I don't really have all that much to say about the mentor program other than it is ongoing. All of the people who are received travel funding have been mentored. It seems to be going okay.

They have turned up to some working group meetings. They seem to be engaged. I don't know if we have any sort of other metrics that we are looking towards to see how well it is going. Other than will they stick around in the long term?

Meanwhile I am mentoring has been (unintelligible). That I wasn't able to make it to the IDS meeting this week so I haven't heard from her. That is about all I have to say (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Okay so my question – I have two questions about it. First of all, I want to know it is kind of important to have – it is very difficult to find people that their background fits these working groups.

So I am wondering if kind of (unintelligible) and travel support incentivized. How do you see that (unintelligible)? Are they actually (unintelligible) or are they kind of (unintelligible)?

David Cake: It is hard to say. Like (unintelligible) has not been asking questions recently but he asked for, you know, suggestions and things to read. I am mentoring meaning I don't know – I haven't personally heard from (Grace).

Farzaneh Badii: All right. So you finished my other point is so I tried to give them kind of like small I mean kind of small tasks, a specific task. (Unintelligible) or contributing to public comment.

I know that it is – it might be a little bit too early for them but there is a public comment coming up on (unintelligible) and I thought we could help them and show them the process of how they can issue public comment and start the process.

Do you think that would be something that if we tell them that we can help them with this? And of course substantively we have to help a lot. But they could start the process. Would that be something that makes them more active and probably make them research more about the issues?

David Cake: I think the idea of getting them to do a public comment is a really good one. The IGO one is a very complicated issue though. And – I don't think it has anything to do with the interest they have so far.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes that is the problem. We can't always kind of tailor it to their interest. I will see what I can do if everyone else agrees that we (unintelligible) IGO is a very complicated topic. I am going to see (unintelligible) public comment is open out there and whether I can get them to kind of shepherd the process (unintelligible).

                     All right that is that. And so the last question David. Considering the (unintelligible) do you think this was a good idea? The mentor and mentee thing and did it work and should we do it next time?

David Cake: It seems to be working. They seem to be at least, you know, we know they will be engaged with at least one working group and we will attain sessions (unintelligible) Copenhagen.

                     I think we should see how well it works out to Copenhagen really. If we see them then it worked.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Okay thank you. Ines over to you about what (unintelligible) what you have done and what do you think could be done (unintelligible)?

Ines Hfaiedh   Okay good morning (unintelligible). Before the worksite migration can I add something, a small thing about the mentor/mentee not specifically but can I add something?

Farzaneh Badii: Of course.

Ines Hfaiedh   I was thinking if you could find some sort of strategy or mechanism so that we could have the mentor/mentee not necessarily from and by (unintelligible) members but some kind of more experienced NCUC members who could mentor newcomers? So this is number one.

And number two, I wanted to ask about the next round of selection and selection of new members in NCUC because I have to fellows that I am coaching right now for the next ICANN.

Both of them they want to join NCUC. And also I have my friend, (Dustin Phillips) from ICANNWiki who would like to join NCUC as well. What can we do and when is the next round?

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry Ines I didn't quite understand the question. I just understood that there are three people that want to join NCUC which is great. But I didn't understand.

Ines Hfaiedh   Okay I was asking – so there are three people that I know that would like to join NCUC. Two that I am coaching for next ICANN and one who is (Dustin Phillips) from ICANNWiki.

So these three people they would like to join NCUC. When is the next round to accept new members? And how can they proceed? Is it the usual just an application. When can they apply? So this is my first question.

Farzaneh Badii: They can apply anytime. We are open but yes – so what they need to know is that the current ICANN staff of course I cannot join constituencies.

Ines Hfaiedh   But they are not ICANN staff. ICANNWiki.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: I don't know. We have to look into that. Rafik maybe you can help us here.

Rafik Dammak: As far as I know it is independent. This is what (Dustin) has told me.

Farzaneh Badii: Completely…

Rafik Dammak: Completely independent from ICANN.

Farzaneh Badii: There is an ICANNWiki but that is not the ICANNWiki.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: So the ones that are drawing cartoons want to join NCUC.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: I think that is a great idea. How do we do that?

Ines Hfaiedh: Also there is the (unintelligible) from Egypt who is very, very active, you know, especially on the Middle East working group. And also (unintelligible) from Yemen. So those three they – last week they told me they would like to join NCUC.

Farzaneh Badii: That is wonderful. They should join and they can just apply. You just show them on the Web site where to go and explain to them about NCSG and

NCUC. They should come first like the application goes through the NCSG (unintelligible).

Ines Hfaiedh   Okay perfect. So I will move then to the Web site migration. So as you know we have a new Web site, a new baby which looks really, really cute right now. I like the colors and also our new logo.

And so basically I worked with David who showed me kind of how to work on the platform and to migrate all the logs. At first it was just the 2016 but I thought maybe we should migrate all of it. So this is what I did. So I migrated all the blog posts and all that we had on the old Web site NCUC Web site.

So that we have enough data and archives and then we will work on having – we will start I guess first with our reports from this intercessional to add from the Web site.

And then we will work also maybe – I don't know if the mentees that are going to attend ICANN are they supposed to write a report David on their experience?

David Cake: Yes.

Ines Hfaiedh   Okay good thanks. So I think that is all I have. So I completed my (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. So for the Web site, for the new Web site I don't know if everyone has the link to it. We haven't migrated yet because not all the content is there. But I am just going to put this in the chat.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. So what I would like to ask if the members if you don't do it voluntarily. I am going to assign it to you. What I would like to ask you is to go on this Web site and see what sort of content we need.

       And it doesn't have to be like, you know, very elaborate just, you know, if you see that you need (unintelligible) sentence that explains how to join NCUC, for example.

       Then just come up with it and write it down and then we create a page. But what I would like to ask you all is to think about what sort of content we need (unintelligible). And come up with the content.

       So ideas are great but also write them down as a draft and then we work on them. But this is not a priority thing. But I think about how to populate and maintain the Web site content.

       And also Maryam if you are – all of us know Maryam I suppose. Maryam is NCSG support she has been great help for the past years for NCUC and she is also helping with migrating the Web site link.

       And also Maryam so after the intercessional we can – we have a couple of other names that we need to just (unintelligible) and then we will be done. Is that right?

Maryam Bakoshi: Could you repeat that?

Farzaneh Badii: I don't if Maryam can actually speak but I was asking Maryam if we can just finalize the Web site after the intercession of next week?

Maryam Bakoshi: Oh okay.

Farzaneh Badii: I will follow up with them but think about content. Think about what you want to be there. Don't go very ambitious because you will never get (unintelligible).

Think about what you want there and write it down and then we will look at it and publish it on the Web site.

Okay that is that. And now we can go to – if there are any questions, comments on the new Web site. What do you think should be there? Just let me know.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry if you have questions and comments just go ahead and ask because you know here I don't see (unintelligible). But if you have questions or comments just go ahead and ask and just discuss.

Tatiana Tropina: I think we can actually go with the raising our hands in Adobe Connect not to jump in. But now that I think I interrupted Maryam. I would like to say something about the Web site content.

I think that we have to think – I mean what is the target audience? I understand that we want it to be both informative for anyone who is going to join or get acquainted with NCUC.

But how much are they going to make it the portal for our members? This is another question. So definitely it is (unintelligible) because we are going to

put online reports from the meetings, impressions from newcomers and so on and so forth.

So the question is like once you open the first page how does it speak to you? And I believe that in this sense it should be speaking to newcomers or to anyone who has no idea bout NCUC. Because this is our face for our potential target audience.

But also kind of make clear for the existing members where they can find (unintelligible). So somehow combining these two but clearly kind of clearly also separating these two types because they are two different target audiences.

And I believe that we have to target rather those who have no idea because others have mail in lists, they can read all the discussions and so on.

So this is just my thought but I also believe that we have a task force Web site, task force meeting in Copenhagen so we can discuss hopefully with you present on site (unintelligible). So that is all from me.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. Yes that is a very good idea. So at the moment I think the design of the Web site is in a way that it (unintelligible) and those who want to join. But what we need to do – let me just briefly also tell you about this onboarding program that (unintelligible) and Ayden are a part of.

They coming up with these materials about how the new members can join NCUC and can be (unintelligible). It is after joining. So we have to come up with materials about those that want to join.

But onboarding program what they are coming up with is the (unintelligible) information about how to get engaged with their (unintelligible).

And they are going to produce that I don't know when. I have looked at what they have so far but we will give them some time. I mean I don't know the timeline of the program. It is an ICANN program.

I don't know when they are supposed to submit a final but of course they are going to (unintelligible). And then hopefully and then we comment on it and then approve it and probably use it for (unintelligible).

Let's go to – and if you see that there are things that you want to publish and (unintelligible) let the (unintelligible) know and (unintelligible).

So let's go to Renata about outreach. And also I think (Tatiana) wants to make some comments about that as well (unintelligible). Renata go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: First of all, apologies for arriving a little late. But what I wanted to say is that it is really interesting that they are having a new Web site because this will be completely related to outreach. Can you listen to me okay? Yes? Are you listening?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. I am I am trying yes.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Okay so our outreach effort it was directed as a form. So folks could send out their outreach ideas via the form. And all EC would have a column on the spreadsheet that they could input their vote regarding that outreach idea.

We made it clear that NCUC has a limited budget for outreach. And that the opportunities for 2017 were travels slot and event in Johannesburg. So for the travel slot we had the right (unintelligible). But for the event in Johannesburg we had only up to now one plan sent. It was over budget.

As for the other outreach activities many of them related to blog posts and reference to social media posts. NCUC is moving to a new Web site. This is probably not the time to think about how we are going to go about this in the future.

But what (unintelligible) suggested is that folks send their own text so it can be published. Up to now we had no text sent and the intervals for outreach responses is going out monthly. So folks can send, can register on the form their outreach idea and monthly they receive a feedback by the end of the month.

We had also some self-organized activities. So we now have an activity (unintelligible) first of all with NCSG and (unintelligible) members as well who are going to be there.

Farzaneh Badii: Renata can I ask you something? I know that (unintelligible) growth are both going to (unintelligible). Is it possible to ask them to do outreach in the – I don't know tell people about (unintelligible). You are going to be there as well right?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Yes we arranged the session, a self-organized session. It is called Internet Policymaking Meetup. I just got it confirmed today. So we already have a space that we will be there for like two hours to tell people about internet policymaking and NCUC.

Farzaneh Badii: Oh that is wonderful thank you for self-initiating.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: I have only one observation. I think we need to discuss for the Web site for it to be ready. It needs to have manual configuration right? At one point I remember there wasn't going to be an automatic export of the old content.

Has this changed or being slowly built and when can we – when do we expect to have it ready?

Farzaneh Badii: I think Maryam can answer that because Maryam is quite busy. So yes Maryam is quite busy so she will do the last part of the migration with this links that I sent her.

If you see her links from the old Web site that need to be on the new Web site please (unintelligible) then you are welcome to (unintelligible). We are very close to launching it going to be – and Tapani. Is there Tapani there (unintelligible)?

So Tapani is in charge of the GNSO thing for the domain. So he is – if Tapani is available by the end of next week we can launch it. And of course if anyone else wants to help with migrating things that would be great.

And if you want to (unintelligible).

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Sorry I didn't quite catch the last part.

Farzaneh Badii: So if you want the outreach form to be on the Web site (unintelligible). I think it should be (unintelligible) very careful with the instructions. Can I just

say something about - (unintelligible) received and we all have (unintelligible).

For the ones about blog posts and social media and stuff like that the only thing you have to do really is to (unintelligible) or what they want to put and we just approve it (unintelligible). We say either yes or no this is not related to our mission and stuff like that.

For those that want materials to go to events and talk about NCUC of course there are like flyers and there is another brochure that we have. We also have name cards just let me know I will send it to them. That is like easy we can help them with.

For those that want people to speak at their event that is really easy as well. We just ask people to speak at their event. So the only thing is to kind of (unintelligible) Renata I know you have been doing this.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Ines wants to talk. Ines please go ahead.

Ines Hfaiedh So (unintelligible) I was (unintelligible) talk to me today about an outreach event between NCUC and (unintelligible) and he was thinking about Tunisia and he was thinking beginning September.

So I really wanted to discuss with all of you but I don't know if this is – we have time for this or not on the agenda. Or if you would like me to send you an email to the list for the (unintelligible)

Farzaneh Badii: I actually want to talk about this. I want to talk about outreach more so I think we can give ourselves another five, six minutes for outreach and then we can go to Anna. So go ahead.

Anna Loup: Real quick. I mean I sent out an update yesterday that actually says everything that I am going to say right now. So I mean I can sort of reread my email or I can just sort of say…

David Cake: Read it.

Anna Loup: Read my email and then we can spend as much time as we need on the outreach because I think outreach is a really critical issue that I would much rather spend a lot of time with especially because mine is very (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Let's do – we do 10, 15 minutes on outreach but then Ayden and Matt will hopefully join us. And then of course it is good for them to hear what you have about policy procedure and stuff like that. So go ahead Ines.

Tapani Tarvainen: May I interrupt just to (unintelligible) as far as we know that Tapani if you don't know my voice and Ayden who just walked in.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes welcome. Welcome guys.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Tapani do you have any holiday planning next week? I want to know.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I do.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay so what I want – okay so we want to know when we can launch the new Web site. So we can actually do it not next week but the week after right? If we are ready.

Tapani Tarvainen: I will be getting home on Wednesday night. After that I am available.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay that is great. I don't think we are going to be ready anyway. But yes thank you. So go ahead Ines. You wanted to talk about outreach.

Ines Hfaiedh So I said (unintelligible) just talk to me about an outreach like event. We were thinking about at first he told me about Morocco and then because since the internet governance like organizations are very, very active in Tunisia. We said maybe it should be in Tunisia especially that there is a high probability that the next IGS after this one is going to be in Tunisia.

So we said we could have an event with NCUC and (unintelligible) level. So I just wanted to share this with you and see what you think. And we are thinking in September.

Farzaneh Badii: If you are willing to (unintelligible) I come up with a plan I think that is okay (unintelligible).

Ines Hfaiedh Yes (unintelligible) so I don't know.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: When you make a common proposal how does the funding thing go?

Farzaneh Badii: So we could – if there is a proposal that is kind of, you know, we can only fund minimally. So you need to find funding in some other places. But you

can always come up with a proposal and say this is (unintelligible) $800 for this and that and I think (unintelligible) reach out to this project (unintelligible). So come up with a proposal and (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay we will do that.

Renata Aquino: Renata here. I have one more info about outreach. Can I go on?

Farzaneh Badii: Sure. Don't ask me for permission. I allow you (unintelligible) allows you to go on.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: (Unintelligible) internet governance. It is confirmed. I will be there on the first day. It is a panel after lunchtime. And the university in Rio will be on the (unintelligible) and Olga and (Luca) were going to be there too. (Luca Belli).

And next week (unintelligible) university Sao Paolo and Olga can be there if we get the funding from GAC and also for (Luca). But the panel I will be in is a panel with IGF folks but I will present myself as NCUC and also be there the whole week of the (unintelligible) internet governance doing outreach for NCUC.

(Unintelligible) university are universities are really big. So for Rio it is like I don't know 40 to 60 people. Sao Paolo may be 30 or so each one of them. So I am thinking something like big lectures meaning lectures like one hour Olga, one hour (Luca), one hour me.

In Sao Paolo would be the whole afternoon. Rio would be just one hour. And then I am also trying and this would be something very new for ICANN that I

think would be very interesting. I am trying to get community NGO because you have the big NGOs in Sao Paolo and Rio that do sort of tech project.

So I am trying to get that too but as I said it (unintelligible) I haven't really run over by the (unintelligible) people. But I thinking if they are not up for going up there, not many people are. I will go on my own. So yes just wanted to run over by you.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay great. That is nice. Anything – you know as much you can talk anywhere about NCUC as long as they are our target of course we don't want to go and talk about NCUC to those that have conflicting interest.

I mean we could but we can't tell them to join us. But yes talking about NCUC is good. I see Anna your hand is up. Go ahead.

Anna Loup: Yes thanks a lot. I wonder how many all the EC members are aware about our joint (unintelligible) in Copenhagen. I believe that just because we already quite well developed this. I can just update you guys because I think it will be interesting and worthwhile event.

So what was behind the concept of the outreach is that we decided to go for joint outreach with the (Ural) because we had experience in Geneva (unintelligible) where some (Ural) members were speaking together with us.

There was people (unintelligible) confused in Europe like where do I join? Where do I belong? Am I (unintelligible) society in (Ural) terms at (unintelligible)?

So we decided to organize a joint outreach event which would be very much in interrupted I believe like almost in the same format that we had – at least in Geneva last year. Which would be called, What Can You Change at ICANN?

And so we decided we will start with very short pitch talks without all these, you know, all these shocking diagrams about ICANN structures and without diving really deep into policy issues and structures.
So we will just (unintelligible) what is the difference between us? What is different about ICANN this year and why should we care? Why should they care and join?

And then we will have resource people and I believe that like either (Matthew) – (Matthew) just entered the room. Those who are dealing with different policy issues, different policy topics can join. It is not like we are really inviting like speakers we are going to give lectures.

Anyone who is into the (unintelligible) have one or two meetings to speak and then the floor will be open for participants to ask questions.

And the concept is that whatever question we have the jurisdiction accountability transparency, data protection. We have someone who is dealing with this issue and someone who can actually say what is being done.

So we do hope for some turnout. We asked for the room for up to 50 people. We will have drinks after. It is very hard to reach people in Denmark. I believe that (Ural) has no at large structure there.

We do have some members who are residing in Denmark so we are trying to distribute these among our networks. But the invitations will go to the list soon.

And I would like to ask everyone who knows anyone or non-commercial mailing list networks that should they email there, invite people. And I believe it is going to be an instant event and we have for drinks and snacks after.

So and I think that I mean of course we would love EC members to be there but I also hope that people like either like (Matthew) who are deeply into policy issues. Like I mean David you are from the EC. I believe that you can update guys on data protection and all these.

Anyway so please join this event. I mean I don't think we will make it an obligation except those people who really want to be there. The hard core. So I do hope it is going to be an interesting and nice event but we are still fine tuning the concept and contacting people and so on.

It was a bit of joint work but (unintelligible). So this is my update. Thank you.

Woman: I raised my hand.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay do you have a date for it?

Woman: Yes, yes. If you have your calendars open please mark 11th of March, Saturday. We asked for the room from 3 pm, 1500 local time but I believe we were given the room from 1515. So basically from 3pm to 6 something. Then we have some drinks and snacks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes (unintelligible).

Man: If there is anything you want from me.

Woman: Yes I actually wanted – we wanted to talk about policy. And we wanted to talk about kind of that is why I also asked Ayden and Matt to join us and Tapani. But I don't think five minutes would be enough.

What I wanted to ask. I am sorry when we didn't finalize what you said at (unintelligible). But just wondering as for the NCSG policy committee meeting which I have (unintelligible) like three hours at Copenhagen Tapani.

How can NCUC help with (unintelligible)? What sort of agenda are we in the making of the agenda or can we make this more kind of interactive regarding the discussion?

So that it wouldn't be just the policy committee discussion. It will be like (unintelligible) NCSG as a whole talk about how they are involved with policy at ICANN.

Tapani Tarvainen: (Unintelligible) associations the council sessions. So you really should talk to Rafik about because (unintelligible). Otherwise of course we would be most welcome for all the members who have interest in any policy position (unintelligible). If that helps you any.

Man: (Unintelligible) Tapani how much of those three hours do you think would (unintelligible) by council?

Tapani Tarvainen: I am trying to remember but it is – if you do that in half the time at least that much. Well how much do you want to squeeze in (unintelligible)?

Man: Well I am just thinking that one of the things that is always incredibly valuable and we don't get enough face to face or even discussion time even on the (unintelligible) just to have a quick run through where we are.

And where there is a need for additional resources or additional focus or where the immediate kind of (unintelligible). It is always good to have that kind of a discussion. I don't know if that will be something you can fit into that (unintelligible) or if there is an opportunity to do that.

Man: Yes. That is often (unintelligible) better to do those things face to face.

Man: Well at face to face as much as possible.

Man: (Unintelligible) how high the agenda is and actually hopefully it will be better this time because we have Rafik (unintelligible). I don't know former vice chair (unintelligible).

But am leaving in about two minutes I think.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay thank you very much Tapani. So we will go back now to the outreach. Sorry (Tatiana). So I think for our – I wanted to talk to you for a couple of minutes on Johannesburg outreach.

So if anyone in the room has contact in Johannesburg and can help us with the outreach. I have (unintelligible) would be good to have like when we have the outreach in Johannesburg because we have (unintelligible) to send and we might be able to have a two day outreach which one of the days can be regarding (unintelligible).

And I think it would be a good idea actually (unintelligible) that I just mentioned because we have our NCUC policy (unintelligible). So we could use one day or half a day in Johannesburg to go over policy issues at NCUC may be created and interesting for the new attendees that want to join.

But I don't think – I am not very sure about whether we should make that event a policy focus in the way that (unintelligible) and discuss their policy positions because that would not be appealing for the newcomers.

But whatever comments you have just feel free to comment on it now. To have a half a day or a policy day (unintelligible) numbers.

Woman: Well whatever comments you have just feel free to comment on it now. You have half the policy day (unintelligible) before John (unintelligible).

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: I think - may I comment on this?

Woman: Yeah. As I said, just go ahead. I don't (unintelligible).

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Okay. Have you spoken to (Henriette) about this?

Woman: So because it's in June. I thought it's not a pressing issue, but I did get Henriette on Skype and I told her that I will talk to her because (Patel) talked to Henriette already and it's seems like (Patel) was a bit confused about what

we can do for - it would be nice to get (Patel) to collaborate with us, of course, outside of whatever proposal he has because we can help with that (unintelligible), but what we can do is we just coordinate with (Patel) and (Angrid) and with (Angrid) I can talk to (Angrid) and probably could (unintelligible) and organizational can be done by APC, but I have to check with Henriette because they might not just do this for us pro bono.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Yeah. I realize. Yeah Poncelet also offered to (unintelligible) Linda, but I had told her that you were talking to Henriette already, but my point on this is that each one of these organizations in Africa carries a flag right? I think (unintelligible) reminds of things and they are doing the (unintelligible) School of Internet Governance which is where sort of he wanted to fit us in and then Henriette will probably be involved in the African Declaration for Human Rights.

I think (unintelligible) way and we should be prepared for this - is that presenting as you said an event about making policy and then bringing in those topics (unintelligible) in alignment with what NCC does so we can bring in these people, but they will want to come with their specific plan. Just sort of - I'm just anticipating that. As I said, it is very likely I won't be in Johannesburg, but that will likely come up at any point of this negotiation so just bringing it up.

Woman: Okay. Thank you for that (unintelligible) Renata. I think Ines's (unintelligible) region as well so I think Ines can coordinate a lot of people. Ines go ahead. Your hand's up.

Ines Hfaiedh: I just want to talk about (unintelligible) in Johannesburg. I think that he can (unintelligible) also the Renata just said about the school. I think he could be a great help in Johannesburg because he's also an ex-fellow and I think that you could have a great visibility thanks to this school so I don't know. I think

his request is over budget trade, Renata. What can we do? Can we like try to edit it?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: We did but that's the thing. I think there's (unintelligible) there and that there is a bigger project of the South School of Internet Governance and the proposal was to fit NCC in somewhere in this project, but then yeah the budget is $7,000 for this event and what he asked for $300,000 so we try to adapt it and we didn't get any response so I do think it's interesting to talk then to (Henriette) see what she can propose and then maybe invite (unintelligible) as a speaker later. Something on that - something like a compromise.

Woman: We will do some kind of formal - we cannot fund what they asked us to fund and what we can do is we have to (unintelligible) submit (unintelligible).

Woman: Me again (unintelligible). Are you there? Hello?

Woman: Okay, sorry. The volume goes sometimes.

Woman: So let's talk about our policy (unintelligible). Let's talk about our policy data that we want to have in Johannesburg and I have one more point to talk about and I want Anna to chip in about it as well - about issuing public comments at NCSG level with the participation of NCC, but let's go ahead and talk about the policy day at Johannesburg. Should we have half a day of policy day and how can we (unintelligible) interesting thing and so on and Matt and (unintelligible) chip in. Thank you.

Matt: Thanks (unintelligible). Just a couple of thoughts on the policy day. I think one of the challenge for newcomers is and I think it's something we really

need to think about is how do we position what ICANN does in the broader kind of internet governance and internet policy space.

I think one of the challenges when people come to ICANN the first time on the policy side is that it's very difficult to try to make linkages between what is a general awareness of internet governance if you're interested in this space and the specifics and the details of the policy government process and so it might be useful if we're gonna have that kind of time, it might be useful to start with that overview of the ecosystem and the policy space and to position ICANN in that space so that the newcomers understand the kind of broader policy context of what ICANN is doing.

Also, at the same time, the narrow space so to speak that it operates in because I think those are the two important concepts for people to understand when they think about ICANN and internet governments more generally. I would just recommend an approach that kind of starts from the bigger picture and then really takes a kind of methodical approach to seeing how ICANN fits in that bigger internet government policy space.

The other thing I would say is it might be nice to actually have somebody to talk a little bit about what the internet government ENS policy space is like in South Africa. What's happening on the policy front in South Africa. Maybe have the ICANN reps for Africa who will be there come in and talk a little bit about that to maybe get some local expertise as well just to give kind of (unintelligible) those coming South Africa can benefit from (unintelligible) local environments as well. Think a little bit about how we deal with these similar (unintelligible) issues of policy that ICANN's dealing with when we're talking to newcomers (unintelligible).

Anna Loup: Could I just add one thing? This is Anna. I think that's a really good idea.
               What might be helpful is to develop a survey that looks at the knowledge base
               that we're working with because I think just sort of saying well we have
               people who know generally and know a lot. It might be interesting to look at
               the spectrum in a way and I'm working on some preliminary surveys that we
               can then adapt for Johannesburg that would help maybe have a very specific -
               sort of tailored focus so that if we do see that there is this grey area where
               there are people who know about high level stuff that's being done, that might
               be helpful as well.

               Why is there is a group of folks who know about these sort of big name issues
               but then what might be more important. We might have to touch on maybe
               issues having to do with bylaws - not very cool issues. I'd be willing to help
               develop a way to just measure that. Then you can sort of best tailor.

Man: If I could jump into - I agree with what both of you just mentioned. I think
               Matt is right. That we need to make it clear what is actually within ICANN
               (unintelligible) because I do sometimes think that people - that some of our
               new members joining caring more about public policy aspects and more about
               sort of the impact of the internet on society rather than the technical
               infrastructure and making that distinction I think is important.

               I think we also need to have maybe a discussion on when we talk about
               policy, what is it that we actually mean? What we actually expecting people
               to do? I think we need to have a discussion on what you get in retirement.
               What are the benefits to you for doing it and just as important (unintelligible).
               I would have found this very useful. What do we actually stand for? What
               are our values? What are the positions that we've historically taken just to
               make sure that all of our members do feel that they are aligned with the values

and just not (unintelligible) other common values that we have (unintelligible) so I think a very interactive session along with (unintelligible).

Woman: This is brilliant.

Anna Loup: Then I'll hope - preemptively measure all of this in a survey and to do a post survey which with that - I'm sorry. I'm all about the numbers which should probably also - so I can also add those things as well. This idea of like returns and expectations - this idea of advocacy or something and then measure the before and after. Do we generate people who feel advocacy - enter this stuff.

Woman: There's also important thing going on right now which is internet shutdowns - like the shutdown in (unintelligible) and it was the first time actually that a global community (unintelligible) on a local internet society to try and position themselves against a government practice because the shutdowns are government practices. The government shuts down the internet in some areas on Sub Sahara and Africa so this would be something that - it can be brought up. Certainly will be brought up and I think we should definitely be ready to address that issue.

Woman: Yeah. I'm not very sure internet shutdowns are within (unintelligible) of ICANN but we should discuss that later. We are going to have half the policy. (Maria), can you take this action to develop a plan for policy day in Johannesburg and so we can go - why I asked you Aidan and Matt to join us - and thank you very much - was because first of all, I wanted to show the Eastern members who are reps are and (unintelligible) policy (unintelligible).

The other thing is that we are coming up with procedure role for NCC various function and what we want to do is that - one of the tasks for us is - if I'm not mistaken - is coming up with public comments and how we can

(unintelligible) public comments either at the NCC level, or how we feed into the discussion for NCSG public comments and I'm glad (unintelligible) as the chair of NCC is here, as well as to help us. I wanted to first ask you if you could kindly volunteer for that (unintelligible) which is about getting involved with policy at NCC level and NCSG level and the other thing that I wanted to know was how can we make more effective participation in the policy and issuing public comments at ICANN?

For example, should we tell our members to go ahead and look at these open public comments, (unintelligible) and topics that they like and start holding the pen, or should you - do you think as the policy (unintelligible) rep, do you think that would be your responsibility to go ahead and look at the various policy needs that we should be present (unintelligible)?

(Aidan): If you'd like (unintelligible) I'll make a brief comment. This is Aidan. Ideally we would have a combination (unintelligible) where we would have members proactively volunteering to respond to public comments and (unintelligible) void. We, on the policy committee, could accept this, but that's not always happening so I think that we do need to take responsibility in making sure the NCSG statement is being developed and informed in a timely manner. I think that we do need to be more (unintelligible) on between the NCUC and the NCSG.

I think that we do need to be reviewing public comments that are open at the moment or that are coming up and perhaps bringing them to the attention of which members (unintelligible) place to comment, but I'm looking at the open comments on the ICANN website at the moment and there are a few I think we wouldn't know which of our members had the expertise to respond to them. So maybe we do need to also look at creating some kind of map of areas of expertise that our members should have because I could probably

only tell you what maybe 10 to 15 of our members specialize in, but I do take a point - I do think we need to be developing, drafting and responding to more public comments - at least we do better and that we need to.

Matt: Aidan said a number of things I was gonna say. This is a challenge - policy - it's a challenge on so many fronts. We tried to address the issue of timeliness through and (unintelligible) was central to this. Through promoting the use of the (unintelligible) which works if everybody uses it, but most people don't use it. I tried for a while and then as interests seemed to wane after an initial push by (unintelligible) bless him, we need a buy-in into that model. It's not a bad model. It's the kind of thing that allows you to track and to identify resources and do a number of things with - Aidan (unintelligible) was trying to.

If we're going to do this, we almost need a fresh start and I think it's probably a good time to do it and when Anna was talking about earlier on, makes me think that actually probably we have the resources to be able to this now, which comes to Aidan's point which is we know who the poor people are in our group and NCSG more broadly who are leading on, or engaging mostly in some of these PDPs and following some issues and there are a handful right?

There are a number of us who are involved in different working groups, or work stream activities, or PDPs or whatever, but I don't think - it's not clear to me who is doing what and the degree of engagement and maybe a thing we're suggesting. We need to actually go out to people and say, "What are your areas of expertise?" Of the issues that are underway at the moment, the PDPs are underway at the moment and work streams everything, "Which ones are you involved in? Which ones would you be involved in and getting engaged in if you had a little bit of coaching, or a little bit of mentoring, or whatever" and kind of go through that process methodically.

Then we have an issue which is - and we need to get this - step in there because our approach to responding to things is (unintelligible). What we actually need to do is whenever there's public comment that comes up, or some piece of work is started, we need to have a mechanism whereby we assess whether or not we should be responding and have the resources to respond and that's a key step that we sometimes forget because then things kind of get - somebody jumps in at the last minute, or somebody takes on the entire burden of doing this themselves. Then all things are done between a couple of people and then inserted at the last minute.

We've written this up. Can we make this - and introduce the NCSG comment which is not ideal either. I think if we put in a process - a set of steps - whatever those steps may be, one of them has to be should we engage on this issue? Are we going to and who's going to lead on that right? Then we just need a better tracking mechanism and this is where perhaps where (unintelligible) comes in, or something similar that says and (unintelligible) does this sort of - at least at least it was doing for a while that sends you alerts.

Okay you're three weeks out, or you're two weeks out so that kind of thing to submission basis. I think if we can standardize that and get a bit of structure to that, that will help immensely. We have to do that because those of us - I'm speaking for myself. I have a - considering the breadth of issues of ICANN, I know that I can engage in some of them. There are some that I just don't have the awareness of and some that truly should be led by other people.

I think we need to have a much better sense as to how we share that burden across - those who have the expertise and those who want to lead as putting in place some structure. We tried with (unintelligible). We didn't have the other supporting pieces and I think we really need to kind of just go back to basics,

or kind of step zero and work out from there so if we can use some kind of surveying mechanism, or some questionnaire to kind of assess, or if you could append it to your statement of interest, or something like that that actually says, "Here's the issues I want to engage in." I think we just need to think through a more structured approach.

Anna Loup: This is Anna. Just to add onto that, for the processes group, we actually have a development on voting and policy statements and public comments section that's being developed so Tatyana, (unintelligible) and Rafik are on that, but also if either of you would be interested, and even if it's something small as this idea of a tracking mechanism and coming up with a procedure to implement that, or looking at a mechanism that would help us figure - is there public comments that we should respond to. Sort of figuring that out, even if it's a small piece. If you could maybe sign up for that, that would be really helpful.

I think those are great ideas and I'm really just trying to get people to sign up for tiny parts of the process which would be great, but I think those are awesome.

Matt: I don't know that the graphic shows, but Rafik did come up with a proposal.

Anna Loup: He has.

Matt Something along the lines of what we've talking about. I think we need to revisit that. We never get the attention that it warrants.

Woman: Okay. Yes. Great. I heard that Rob is there and we are going over time. I don't want to make Rob bored so.

Man: (Unintelligible) worried about making Rob bored?

Woman: Well.

Matt: He's been totally attentive.

Woman: Rob is here to talk - I invited Rob to our meeting because I wanted to discuss the approval of a new NCUC bylaw and Rob can tell us about the processes and if you have questions on how we can go about it, to get this bylaw finally one day, if I'm not dead, approved and then so that's why I asked him to come join us.

As you know, we drafted a new NCC bylaw (unintelligible) last year and during our elections sent up for what was approved by the (unintelligible) and here I am going to stop and ask Rob if he can tell us - because I have had this conversation before with Rob, but I want you guys to know as well. If Rob can tell us - I have received comments from ICANN staff on the bylaws, but if Rob can explain to us where should we go from here, or what he suggests, that would be great. Rob, over to you.

Rob: Thank you (unintelligible) and please tell me if you can't hear me. I don't know how sensitive the microphone is. Can you hear me okay?

Woman: Yes. I can hear you. Thank you.

Rob: Okay great. Thank you. For the benefit of those in the room, we very much appreciated the activities of this group to finally move forward to do updates of the bylaws, or charter - whatever they're being called today. The important thing has been that until (unintelligible) sort of grabbed the bull by the horns, there was always talk about doing improvements and updates to the

governance documentation, but there was never that complete momentum to get it going and so it was great that you as a community put that together.

There is a process that the board created for approving governance document changes and that process is essentially four phases. There was the expectation that the community itself would get together and discuss its changes, approve those changes in the community.

A second phase in which the documentation that gets reviewed by the staff. Next phase in which those changes are subject to community review and public comment and then finally, deliberations by the board in terms of thumbs up, thumbs down.

It's been an interesting history when the board created this process about three years ago now. The idea there was and the debate was should the board be in a position to actually approve charters, or just more of an oversight role to acknowledge changes had been made and gives thumbs up and move forward. The decision at the time was made that no, the board panel has a responsibility to oversee these chartering organizations and to what has to be "an approval."

How this practically works since it was created is that it's basically - this is the term used by another member of the community - a rubber stamp for the most part because what was contemplated and hoped for by the board is that there'd be big collaborations between staff and communities. There'd be opportunities for the public comment and so what's actually - reaches the board level - everything would be taken care of and that's certainly the spirit that we bring to the party.

You guys embark on your charter bylaws' review effort and modifications. We, as staff, offered our help early in the process. You all decided to do it on

your own which is great and so we're now sort of at the end of Phase I where you've done all this work and my understanding is that the membership of the NCUC has voted on the changes. We saw the changes for the first time at the end of last year as part of our review - basically said, "Okay. Let's go through the documents" and what I shared with (unintelligible) was we had a host of comments in four major areas.

One, just the organization structure and flow of the documents. Two, the terminology and (unintelligible). Three, some observation could be made about various provisions and how it appears to us that some of them are conflicting and so basically what we did was - and just overall language and meaning which is more a cultural thing. We made some observations.

The point is that (unintelligible) provided you with feedback based upon our experience and knowledge with best practices from other communities in (unintelligible). I prepared (unintelligible) and Rafik for the fact that you get a red line document back that would be fairly thick with comments and that's essentially what is looks like and the offer at this point is to say, "What would you like to do?" We can walk through - not today - but we can have a session and walk through the document and point out particular areas of concern we have.

You can say, "Thanks very much staff. You provided us with comments. As usual, we can accept or reject your comments. We want to proceed" or we're at this point now where we provided some feedback and we'd like to get direction from you - just instructions back to say, "Yeah. We'd like to work with you on some of the recommendations or suggestions that you've made", or that "Thanks very much. We'll move forward and submit this to the board for approval."

You'll have an idea of what some of our comments will be and advice to the board through the feedback that we've given. There are aspects where I think we could - in relatively short order - help you with some of the documentation. I recognize that it's always helpful to help a fresh set of eyes look at and go, "Do you realize Section 5 doesn't match with Section 6"?

It may be a case where we meet with a smaller group to talk about some of the changes, or again, because this is our overall attitude, it's not our job to tell you guys what to do. I mean these are our observations based upon our understanding and perspective in terms of other groups and what they've done. You can accept that, or reject that.

These are truly our recommendations and suggestions. I honestly don't know the process what you use in terms of your internal drafting team. There's a lot of good work here so we're happy to proceed in any way that you want as a community. Obviously the interest is in moving forward. You've got changes, you've got updates that you want to have the board approve so we don't want to be bottle-necked with that. At the same time, I don't know how many shots you're gonna get at this. Are you gonna start a new process in a year's time?

As we look at the new world of the empowered community so is this something of a year, or is this our only shot in the next five years. In that case, wow, it would be really great to have something nailed down. As far as in whatever way that you would like to proceed as a community, we are happy to help, or happy to back off. You'll obviously go through public comment and things like that so it's basically an offer to all of you to continue the bylaw, or stop. Thank you. I'll stop there - clarify - it's a question to however you want to proceed.

Woman: Yes.

Matt: Sorry. I was just jumping in to ask if we've received the red line version?

Woman: We have indeed. Yes.

Matt: That's all. Sorry.

Woman: Okay so what I'm going to do is - I called Rob because I still don't quite understand the process with the board so I'm going to suggest a couple of steps and then Rob can tell us which we are in line with the process that (unintelligible) board actually will (unintelligible). What we can do is we can look at this past recommendations and revision in a group.

                We can see - and those that were involved with drafting, I think it can be open - any NCUC members could look at the document and comment on the comments of the staff. Then we can have a meeting with - Rob, you said we can have a meeting with the staff and discuss the comments?

Rob: Yeah. We'd be delighted to do that. I mean just to give you a sense. We have worked for several years now with an outside advisor that - to help work with all the different communities on the charter documentation. So far we've had successful collaborations with the registries. We're doing all of the registrars right now. You all may have head (Del Bianco)'s comment the other day about the support of the DC's work. The (unintelligible) has approached us. I've had just side conversations with - talked to me about what is a more comprehensive look at the entire suite of governance documents for the non-commercial community look like just so that they're all chewed up and consistent.

We've got I think a good track record and over time established a best practices document that sort of has a similar table of contents and folks are singing off the same song sheet with still the flexibility within each community to do whatever you want to provide more consistency and the board seems to have liked that, but in looking at the documentation, we haven't come across anything where we say, "Oh my goodness. This is a fiscal liability concern for the ICANN organization." It's more noticing things that might be problematic for you in the future where you either don't have certain elements to a process, or where the organization of the document has the duties of the chair in three or four different places, or the terminology is just not consistent in terms of defined terms, or some terms that are not defined at all.

It really comes down to for you as a community and in looking at this as documentation that you're gonna use for the next five or ten years doesn't really do what you want it to accomplish. Are you putting some band aids on now that the scabs are gonna fall off later and there's gonna be a new injury, or are we cleaning the whole body and making sure that things are consistent and strong for the future? Again, (unintelligible), however you want to - cause I know it's a larger group than folks surrounding the table here - in terms of how you want to approach that. We're not coming here and telling you that we have all the answers.

We're just pointing out gaps that we think need to be filled, or places that need clarification and other comments are more about recommendations about language which you (unintelligible) remove. When it comes to the board process, the very next step is, depending upon what feedback you give us, we will submit it to the organization effectiveness committee board - that's (unintelligible) committee and Markus and George were also part of that and were at this meeting and then they'll review it.

We'll give them and share some of the comments that we share with all of you and they'll probably then authorize us to put out a public comment period for that. That's a minimum of 40 days and then after comment period's finished, the media staff summarize the comments. The board then has two meetings - a period of two meetings - in which they need to bring up - it's usually been in the past a consensus item where they say thumbs up, thumbs down. They've never done a thumbs down.

What they have done with the registries is said, "Gee you really didn't go far enough with your changes. We'd like you to go through another round that might be helpful" so they gave instructions about what they'd like to see the registries do. In that case, the registries acknowledged that that was an issue and (unintelligible) so there's interest in a dialogue - an (unintelligible) conversations about things. Really it depended upon how quickly you want to try to get this stuff through because the board process itself is still gonna take five months at least.

Now there's one other piece to this that you should all keep in mind and that is this concept of approval. I mean you already, as I understand it, as a community voted on these changes and approved them. The approval from the board is not official until this process is finished. Now what other communities have done and primarily because they work with (unintelligible) staff and we feel very comfortable with making changes. We're gonna go ahead and implement them and we'll take the risk that the board down the road could say no, or give some feedback that something doesn't work.

That's a judgment that you all have to make in terms of "Are we implementing them where we now - we're going through these processes or not." I would just tell you that other communities have said we're now

operating under these new documents that we've approved. If the board tells us something later, we'll take the risk that we have to fix it, or undo anything we've done. That hasn't happened yet and I'll stop there as far as (unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you. Also, you're saying that we can be anarchist and just go and we have approved them with the members and just apply these bylaws without board approval. This is fantastic. This is what I wanted.

Rob: That's not a discussed (unintelligible) direction. It's simply sharing with you (unintelligible) and I did not use the term anarchist. That was you.

Woman: I don't think anarchist (unintelligible) bylaws but yes that's fantastic. I don't think it's advisable to go that way so. What we could do and I agree on this with the Eastern members - I will share the comments that I received with the (unintelligible) and we can try and categorize these comments okay so spelling mistakes and (unintelligible) we can accept them and like grammatical stuff.

The next step is going to the (unintelligible) comments which I think we should consult with your members as well so we can open the document for comments to our members for a period of like 10, 20 days and then we close that and then we could start. The only problem that I foresee here is that we make any substantive changes to the bylaws based on the comments received by staff, then probably it has to go through (unintelligible) voting which will happen this year at the end of the year which I think it's okay. It's kind of like the time length and the (unintelligible) board take is like five months to approve this. I think we could - so do you agree with this? Was I clear?

What we do is that we list out the comments at the Eastern level and then open it to the members for 20 days and then decide on whether we implement (unintelligible) changes, and how do you think with the members and then send off the change document to the board, if I'm not wrong - to some kind of group they have and then the board can look at this and I think then the board comes back to us with other changes or suggestions, Rob, but correct?

Rob: Well I mean the board is not gonna edit this document. In the case of the registry, they came back and said, "Look we've seen public comments from the brand community and you guys haven't made allowances for these new types of community. You really should be looking at that in your bylaws" and the leadership of the registries were aware of this internal controversy. They saw the comments that were filed and so they had already begun the process recognizing that that was the next phase of their evolution.

You're not presenting - in your changes here a tremendously evolved structure, or changes in how you are governed. (unintelligible) we were taking a document that was drafted itself 10 or 15 years ago, trying to bring it more into the modern day and what we identified is "Gee. You guys are using similar terminology in some sections and then completely different terms in another and so it's much more - and this is how (Ted) and I are consulting on work - it's almost a very engineering-type fashion. It's "Well. This just doesn't (unintelligible)." You'll see a lot of the comments of "Well. This term doesn't match that term. You're using a term - what is it National Chapter that's not really clear to us in what that means in the present day" and sometimes that term is capitalized - sometimes it's lower case.

Those types of comments. It seems back - that says, "Well. Gee the NCSG Charter contemplates membership coming from two different constituencies" but now you guys are also using that term membership and so now we have

membership use twice. Is that clear? It doesn't appear clear to us. Should you be considering using the term affiliate, or associate, or something that qualifies what it is to be a member of the NCUC versus what it is to be a member of the NCSG so it's those types of comments - to just say, "Gee. That doesn't seem to match or (unintelligible)."

Sometimes in a document it references bylaws, sometimes it calls it a charter. "Well. What's the difference" and so it's those types of comments that some of your members may consider to be substantive changes. I don't think we do. I mean our changes aren't suggesting how you change how you operate. It's just how you explain how you operate.

Matt: I got to say I really welcome that level of someone and (unintelligible) stop doing that who are very good at it - doing a detailed (unintelligible) copy that's on the document basically. I particularly noticed it because I discovered about a week or two ago editing the (unintelligible) issues but we do not even to seem to be consistent about the name of the constituency. I mean it's non-commercial - one word and hyphenated in some places.

It's hyphenated in the bylaws but non-hyphenated in our charter and even if people (unintelligible) the name of constituency is not expressed consistently which is kind of ridiculous. I mean it indicates that there a lot of incomplete, little problems of inconsistency and terminology and I think about that absolutely. I don't think there are substantial changes, but I think that standard clarity in (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay so sorry. We have to wrap this up. (Marion) just told me. Thank you very much, Rob. Thank you for attending this meeting. It was very early in the morning for you - well is quarter to 5 a.m. here so a pat on the shoulder for me and okay so what we are going to do is we are going to - you have the

changes that the staff have such as stated and we are going to see which ones we are going to implement and we are gonna send the bylaws off to the board and then see later on what we should do with the - like whether we have any further changes, or whether we can just adopt it, or whether we have to go through another round of elections which I'm going to discuss with you under (unintelligible). Thank you all for attending. Have a great day.

END