Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: NCSG Inreach
Saturday, 10 March 2018 at 17:00 AST
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Farzaneh Badii: Hi everyone. We are going to start our session on Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Inreach. My name is Farzaneh Badii. I am the chair of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and please take your seat. For sure, (Olivia), you do not belong here. That's fine. So, this is the idea, the idea of this session is that I - in the campaign when I was campaigning to be elected as the NCSG Chair, one of my campaign promises was that I'm going to do Inreach and so this session is to make me - help me achieve that objective, and so on our agenda… Yes, do we have the agenda? (Unintelligible) So one of the issues that we have faced recently is that we don't have enough volunteers, although we have a great pool of civil society organizations and individuals that are our members and I would like to identify these members who have various skills as they're active in privacy protection or their active in due process and freedom of the speech so that when it comes to important policy issues that we have to issue a statement or we have to have our opinion as ICANN so that they come and help us. It looks like that we are - we have not been able to get these organizations and individuals constantly active with the process so I thought, and this is not only my idea, that others

have been saying it as well, that maybe we can come up with like an network of experts in various -- so for example, if some organizations are working on privacy issues, we have that network of experts and then when we go, when there's privacy need that we need to address at ICANN, we go to that network and we ask them to weigh in. And that is my idea of creating networks of subject matter experts which is (unintelligible) the number four, but I want to know if this is something practical, if you think this would engage our members more and what we should do - and if not, then why - because if not, then I'm not going to pursue that - less work for me. Any comments? Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Farzaneh, for bringing those issue. As you said, that's something that we talked about for many years. I think identifying the subject matter expert, I think it's possible, and I think in the last years we are getting the platform to do so that we can get - like understanding the interest of people and then having knowledge what they want - I mean in which area they can help so we can work on that first step. Maybe what we need to explore is that in how we want to get them involved because what we face is that either like to write a public comment or we want them to participate in working group, there are two different level of commitment.

So for example, like if we take the interim - the model for GDPR, I could reach some of our members and they could deliver something quickly because it was like one - I would say it was quite simple just to cover one thing. If we tried that - to do like asking them to join a working group, it would be more challenging in term of commitment so maybe we can start with this - we get them to maybe respond to public comment. It's more realistic and for us, first step. And particularly for organizations, they can do that. For working groups, this is my assumption, not fact, but I think what it's -- in term of commitment, it's more individual who can do that so if we can't identify maybe some individual who wants, really, to get involved in some working groups that we have - maybe for now it won't be effective because many of these working group are in the middle. It will challenging for anyone to change but

we can start working for the next phases or the next working group and maybe next year or the year after, but we should start working for now. So it's good that we initiate or kick off this discussion now.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, great. Thanks, Rafik. Is there any other comment? Okay, so I - what I'm going to do that's going to be my action item - I'm going to look into how we can start the process of inreach and what sort of steps we should take to do that and have these networks of experts on various issues. So let's go to Agenda Item 1 - NCSG Structure: Values and Goals. This agenda item is there because the Board of ICANN wants to ask us two questions during our board meeting this week. One is that what are your key goals in 2018? The Board is interested in this question to make sure that its own priorities are aligned with the community's priority. And then the second question, what are your most relevant long-term goals? The word is interesting in this question because discussions about long-term goals and strategy planning will commence soon between the community, the Board and ICANN.org.

Responding to these questions does not mean that the Board necessarily take them into consideration but what we need to do, we need to specify what sorts of goals we have in the short term. So I just want to start the conversation here with our members. Tell me what are NCSG goals in the short term? Go ahead (unintelligible). Fine, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. I don't want everybody to laugh when I describe this as a short-term goal. I'd like to see much better GDPR and global data protection compliance. That's probably a long-term goal. But the other long-term goal that I'd like to sort of kick out on the table, if anybody's interested, is I really would like to see ICANN as a multi-stakeholder organization reach a higher level of maturation in a COSO-style maturation model. We are at a very primitive level. We're all thrilled that we even just get to participate but to actually have civil society working effectively and contributing to a really good model, we have a lot of work to do. So that - I see that as a long-term goal, and I wonder if there's any interest in that. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Farzaneh. I mean, first comment, I mean, these questions from the Board are quite funny. It's like really vague, what are your goals and so on but because one thing we need to have in mind at several levels - like the activities we are doing - it's because the Board or the organization started them, so we are only doing kind of catching here. First, I think, in terms - because we have to (unintelligible) sometime, the discussions, how we do the planning for our activities and this usually should be around the policy.

We know we have some policy, so we need to work around that. So we need maybe to have a kind of - from the beginning, what we what to achieve. It's not just to be in reactive mode but how we can more proactive - I have no answer for this, to be honest, but it's something we need to find a better way to do so. It's not just to respond like we have public comment here or it's like now with GDPR, we are kind of trying to cover that. So it's still around policy but yes, there are other models we get to cover. Those like (unintelligible) earlier you wanted to discuss this because if we want to do and learn long term strategy to do better policy, we need more resources, human resources and people to get involved. Maybe to respond to (Stephanie). So your question is what do you mean by a level of maturation here is because - okay, we're so much lower, we are maybe still trying to hear, to respond to the basic needs, eating sleeping and so on, but what are you thinking, exactly, because it's still vague for me. You are talking about the organization itself? Like the staff? Or…

Stephanie Perrin: I'm actually talking -- Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think I'm really talking and I haven't taken the time to develop what exact metrics you would require to get to a higher level as a multi-stakeholder organization but there's certainly academic work on that particular theme. I think from our perspective, I would dare say that including civil society in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model is tokenism at the moment. I mean, not that we don't actually exert an influence - I'm not saying that - but the degree to which we are considered a

respected player is not where it could be and not where it should be, in my view.

So part of having a mature organization is compliance with law, which we don't always have, as we know. I won't get going on GDPR. Fairness, global outreach, I mean we've - ICANN has made some great strides in terms of global outreach but these are the kinds of metrics that I think would bring it up a level. Financial, let's not talk about the budget again - that was a painful exercise. These are the metrics we would be looking for and I think it behooves us - if we want to be taken seriously - to do some work among people who have actually worked on this kind of thing. I mean, I'm an ex-government wonk - we do this kind of stuff. Economists do this kind of stuff. Accountants do this kind of stuff.

If we have those people around the table and they would want to spend the time doing the work, then we can situate our contribution and our work within in framework that makes sense because I feel sometimes that we spend an awful lot of time complaining about ICANN, its procedures, its processes, its unfairness - its yadda, yadda, yadda without kind of - this would give us a more professional approach to how we criticize certain things, including finance. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, Stephanie. So just to get us more focused, I think our longer term goal is to prevent ICANN to become a content regulator. We could talk about that. We could also say that we want ICANN to remain a transnational, non-state, not inter-government organization. We could also say that we have certain values, we care for freedom of the speech and other values that we want to infuse in the policy processes. So these could be - I don't know if they can qualify as goals, but they could be some issues that we mention. And before I go to Tatiana - every time I look at Tatiana, it reminds me of DNS abuse.

Tatiana Tropina   I look very abused, Tatiana Tropina, for the record.

Farzaneh Badii: So also for, we want to keep the DNS abuse definition technical and limited, so that could be one. Go ahead, Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Well, I think it's reason that the prevention of content regulation but you know, I feel sometimes that I'm not very much comfortable with the word goal, you know? I'm sorry for making this example from my professional experience - it's like you can't say that your goal is cybersecurity because cybersecurity is a state, a process, and you always have to think about this. And I feel the same, for example, with ICANN not becoming a content regulator because there are so many ways to circumvent these so we always have to - to keep up and just to cut - cut here, cut here - it's like a bloody Hydra, you know? You cut one head and then 12 heads spring up. And calling it a goal? I like more, you know, the issues we are working on. It provides the continuity in a way so a goal is to work on this issue, to constantly keep up, to cut the ways to circumvent the processes and then you have set of issues which you are working on. Maybe like these, I don't know, because there is no end goal in keeping ICANN not being a content regulator. It's a process.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Farzaneh. I think what you're mentioning is not goals, because always can come up but maybe kind of guiding principle, something like that, that we know this is what our - we don't accept this, this, this, this - and that give us some guidance, so.

Woman 1:   Values.

Rafik Dammak: Values, yes. Because we know the healthiest discussion many times is kind of - so yes. It's like TV drama. It's like see the number 10, so maybe yes, we see like this, and I mean at goals - I guess maybe when they say in long term, they are talking about five years or three years? Something like that? Because I think we would have really hard time to do this if - let's take five years ago, nobody we were thinking that we were going to handle the (unintelligible) transition, just come and we had to shift all our attention and

resources to cover it. Because we are - the whole organization, the whole structure is still not in an - that way to really plan to really plan for three or five years. We have high level plan, but we never speak to them at the end, so.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh Badii speaking. Thank you, Rafik and Tatiana, so you're making my job harder. If these are not - so if what I mentioned are not goals as such, and I agree, then I don't really understand and I don't know what Board really wants from us. Are we talking about - are we going to talk about the values of NCSG and what we are going to do to exert those values in the policy processes and at ICANN? We could do that, but -- go ahead, Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: I believe that the goal would be to promote and sustain the set of values and principles we adhere to. And then we leave them, and that's it. And our goal? To work on these and to support these and to ensure that these values are constantly taken into account and protected. (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, I think our Board is not very strict on what goals are. Okay.

Tatiana Tropina: Yes, you know, it's just wordsmithing in a way, you know? Because it's - well, okay. I will stop here. It doesn't matter if these are goals or values or processes, we just - as you said, you know, we know what we're working on. You express these - call them goals, call them values, call them issues, but these are what we are doing.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, yes and we could also say so we can split it to two things. One is policy and one is the general ICANN governance and the decisions that they make and so, when they ask us to comment on the meeting locations and petty stuff like that as well. Okay. Thank you. I think I have an answer for our Board. And then we have time to talk about the letter if you want.

Ayden Férdeline: Hi everyone. Ayden Férdeline for the record. Not too much to say but more sort of in an FYI that we, well, really Stephanie has been drafting a letter analyzing the most recent compliance model that ICANN put forward on

March 8 and so that has been circulating amongst the policy committee and we will - I imagine we will take it to our main mailing list today and we would really appreciate your input. I don't know if Stephanie wants to comment, perhaps, on the content of the letter itself or do we even want to get it up on the screen and go through it together? Happy to hear ideas.

Stephanie Perrin: I don't mind going through it although I think if people have not read the latest model, this will be painful and long and you're probably already sick of hearing about GDPR. How many hear have read the latest model, all 60 pages of it?

Farzaneh Badii: Except the model is not 60 pages, Stephanie. You keep saying this.

Stephanie Perrin: The analysis is.

Farzaneh Badii: Analysis, in quotes, the comments but the model has not really changed. What are the change - major changes from the last?

Stephanie Perrin: The problem is, Farzaneh, that what we are looking at here is a flawed analysis and the reasoning that has been behind the previous models. One of the problems of the previous models is they just kind of said okay, as I described it in my comments, here's the Goldilocks. You can do this one, this one - door number one, two or three - but they did not go through the legal analysis. Now we have the legal analysis, how they have interpreted everybody's comments, whether they have accorded it the same legal weight as even their advice from their lawyers. So I think it's extremely important that we respond to that because at the end of the day, that is exactly the analysis that the protection authorities are going to do. But I may be alone in that, happy to discuss.

The model, the letter is about four pages, at the moment. Everybody seems to be glued to their devices, so I think there's very limited interest in it, you know?

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: My name is Caleb for the record, and I think I, for me, I made a comment early on the proposal for the second model and part of the things I said was that I have an issue with that model because of the jurisdiction in which it covers. For me, I was giving the example that - take for example, in Africa, we have all the -- the EU GDPR is strictly for EU citizens. In Africa, we have a number of data protection and privacy laws coming up and some are still in the oven, still thinking of being finally baked.

For example, in my country right now, it's still a bill which as passed the lower house. It's currently at the upper house and probably waiting for the final presidential assent. Now with that in place, the privacy laws that are coming from the EU GDPR might, at the end of the day, not affect some of the African countries. So we also need to also make this (unintelligible) how these things affect registries as well as the citizens that are concerned within the African space. So that's basically my own concern for the second model, which I raised an issue on - during the mailing list here.

Stephanie Perrin: Well, I hope you'll be pleased. One of the comments that is in the letter at the moment, and it's going to be circulated, obviously, is that we are disappointed that ICANN is only responding to the GDPR. There are 120 data protection laws out there. Yes, the GDPR is the only one with 4% (unintelligible) so far, although other laws are having to be revised to ensure greater compliance because the standards are being lifted, you know, by the actions of the European Economic Area.

Now, it's not actually true that only European citizens are protected under the GDPR. Anybody whose data is in the GDPR in a European Economic Area, whether it's being processed there, whether the individuals are there, whether the companies are - have an operation selling into the Economic Area, all of that data is covered and that was ever thus. The Directive 95/46 also had a pretty significant extra-territorial reach in the determinations of adequacy that the Article 29 Committee was empowered to adjudicate. And for instance, in

Canada, which is where I come from, our national law was not considered adequate - our national public sector law - because we did not provide data protection rights for non-residents and so this is something that is backstopped by the European Charter of Rights.

So what we have - the comment that we put in the letter is we're disappointed that ICANN has made compliance with other data protection law optional, because quite frankly, we've had 20 years of compliance with data protection law being optional and nobody's ever opted for it. So here's our opportunity to do some global harmonization and protect the rights of everybody, whether their governments have got around to passing a law or not. ICANN policy should be fair and it should therefore, if they're protecting rights in one area, they should protect them in another area and that would also be consistent with our adherence to the Human Rights Principle.

I mean, if you were to apply, for instance, I think everybody has heard about the fact that we managed to get human rights into the Bylaws. If we can't do a human rights impact assessments on this process -- actually, that's a good thing to put into the letter, now that I'm thinking of it -- then we're losing, you know? Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, well, so just to not to lose you - this is - we have to make a very quick decision and submit this comment as soon as possible because it is very time sensitive. This is why I brought it up during this meeting and I think we should just wrap it up soon, but our letter really says that (unintelligible) is unnecessary. It also says that - raises the issue of natural and legal persons and also a couple of other points and I think we are not really saying something really different than what we have been saying throughout the process and we should get the letter out as soon as possible. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, talk about the process. When we talk as soon as possible, what you are thinking exactly? 24 hours? Something like that?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Because maybe just to - we need to understand the context. There is a Cross-Community session on Monday about GDPR so we should - before that. And we know that also the organization is discussing with DBA and so on, so this is because we need to set the scene to understand why we are trying to send as soon as possible. Okay? So I think the letter should be shared at least - in the least so everyone has access to that version and we can make decision quickly. But I mean, because I don't think we are arising new issues. We are rehashing what we said before, and we want to make input, but we still have to keep -- just sending the letter is not enough. We have to keep pushing and using all the venue we have to reiterate what we are saying.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, and we are -- Farzaneh speaking -- and we have a position, we want to advocate for this position and we want to do it during this meeting, and here. And this is one of the things that we have not - we should understand its time sensitivity and that ICANN has to make a decision. If we do not advocate for it now, in this meeting, we have missed the chance. Go ahead, Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yes, this is going to sound a little bit clueless, but you - probably like most members, I haven't been able to day by day follow this, right? So when you talk about the letter, I don't know for sure what you mean. I know that Stephanie emailed a letter to the list that was signed by you, Farzaneh, so there's a new letter? That's not it? Okay, so that's something you might make clear to people.

The other thing is so I saw a letter that (Taio) circulated and was happy to see that the - I think it's coming from the Article 29 Group, and that letter is actually referencing, to my amazement, the fact that the GNSO came up with a definition of the purpose of WHOIS in 2006 so apparently somebody has gotten to those people and explained to them what's been going on. That's a

very good thing that we might build on. And then finally, you're saying on Monday there is a public session so I - yes, I think you're on the right track here, you're trying to coordinate - identify four or five people who can go to the microphone and have a coherent message, synchronize your letter with those processes - whether it's before or after - it depends on what would have the most impact. So yes, let's do some very specific things here.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay, Stephanie Perrin again, can I just enumerate what we've coughed up in the way of GDPR compliance in the last month or so? So we had a couple of responses to the interim - the first model, the three doors. There was an NCSG response that basically said, we like door number three, so did EFS, they put in their own. I gave a much longer response, saying basically I'd rather have option two or the (ECO) model. I commend the (ECO) model to anybody, but I have heard the criticism that if you don't understand data protection talk, you might miss some of the key things in it but it's the best analysis I've seen yet in the time I've been here.

Then we had the response to the - the CEO, Göran Marby was encouraging everybody to contact the Article 29 Working Group, reach out, tell them your views. We sent a response to that letter, I put your point about the original definition in that letter just to make sure that we took that shot across the bows. I believe it made its way into the Berlin Group report as well. That was only just finally released on Friday. I did provide an advance copy to Göran a couple of weeks ago because they were making decisions about compliance and this is actually the first time a group of data protection commissioners have gone on at length with concrete, easy to understand complaints about ICANN's treatment. I mean, the Berlin Group gave us a document back in 2000. This was basically an update.

So all of that's done and now we are trying, kind of frantically, to respond to the new model with the analysis and it's my position that having done all these other things, we should make sure that we got something new. I agree that we need some very clear talking points and strategy that everybody

understands, here's our position, but I'd like at least to touch on some of the foibles in that new analysis, and I think we're nearly there. But maybe should - throw it up on the screen if people want to go through the painful process.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Stephanie. I wanted to respond to Milton because that's - Stephanie, can you please send to the mailing list, the latest version, so everyone will have access? And as we said, we can make decision within 24 hours, can do that kind of fast track. I was also thinking that tomorrow we have the Policy Committee session. Knowing the agenda of the Council, we don't have any vote or something really substantive, so we can just reschedule the whole thing about GDPR. So, the Cross-Community session, we have Stephanie speaking, but maybe take into account what the (unintelligible) that we also have to use the mic or the audience to push more and to coordinate our action.

So first thing, let's get the latest version shared in the pool within 24 hours, we can do that. Having tomorrow's session for maybe more kind of the strategy for the whole week, maybe there are other -because I think there are other meeting, maybe not for the whole community but maybe we can use that and the Cross-Community session on Monday. I'm not sure if I am missing - I don't know, but - and maybe today we can elaborate more what we should do for the coming week.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much, Rafik I totally support your approach but I want to ask a question. I hate being clueless because I am a GNSO Council or and a member of the Policy Committee, but maybe it's my jet lag. Is it the same letter we in general approved on the - it's another one? Okay. So then I would support the 24 hours call for consensus and discussing it tomorrow, yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin again, just to point out that I just cleared all the edits. Thank you, Ayden, for commenting and I can send it out to the list now if you're ready. I think we should put that thing that I've already forgotten, I'm looking at Ayden, I hope he remembers what came up a second ago.

Ayden Férdeline: Yes, the human rights impact.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Yes, we need to get that in there, because then that ties it to human rights and we need to start practicing what we preach on that to - on that Bylaw. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, thank you. We can wrap this up and this actually takes us to the issue that I really wanted to raise during this session - how to strategize and how to advocate, how to enable members to advocate in support of our work and so not to be late into the game and be ready beforehand. So for that, I think we have to come up with a plan. We are getting much better this year. The public comments that we have submitted have kind of tripled from last year, right? I think.

Man 1: Do you want those statistics?

Farzaneh Badii: Rafik actually has the numbers.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: So I think we are doing - I think we are on the right track but we need to be a little bit more forceful and more organized on how we reach out to members, how we issue our letters and get them support our values and advocate for us. Nadira you wanted to say something?

Nadira Alaraj: Yes, maybe I didn't miss, especially for the goals and values, what Tatiana mentioned. I don't know if you have something of the (unintelligible). Usually I could see that you would kind of respond to the policies given, but are there you can initiate discussion of policy? Is that - I think it's important to be in to your values and to the goals you have. This is my - one of the point of strategic future.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, I think that's a good point, so as well as working on the issues that already are being discussed at ICANN, we also raise new issues and try to advocate for them and (unintelligible). Yes, I will note that down. I think that's a good point to raise. Okay, so now that we've talked about GDPR and engagement and advocacy, I want to go to Adam Peake who can talk about academic engagement. So one of the network of expertise that we have that is strong at NCSG is our academics. There are many members in academia and they write about domain name system sometimes but to get them active in policy and advocacy has been a challenge. So Adam, do you want to tell us your plans about academic engagement?

Adam Peake: Yes, it's difficult to talk - hi, Adam. Are we on the record and transcriptions? Anyway, Adam Peake for the record, ICANN Staff. So one of the things that we're getting from global stakeholder engagement is we - the requests that come in for information and support and so on - increasingly are coming from academic sector, for want of a better word. Academia has always been included as part of civil society. It historically has been within NCUC and historically and also within the civil society strategy so we don't want to change anything there. It's not about creating new stakeholder groups or anything like that. It's about really trying to satisfy demand that we are seeing.

So we get a lot of requests from universities to give one-off lectures, come and give a presentation on any related subject, very often it's about ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model because ICANN is the most developed and active multi-stakeholder model and people are interested in that generally. So what can we learn from ICANN to apply generally to just sort of learning generally about information technologies and so on. But also they'll ask about - it could be anything - how does the internet work? Of course they ask about how does the DNS works, but so a lot of requests like that. We're also seeing - a very recent trend is for people to - instead of asking for ad hoc courses, it's been - sorry, ad hoc lectures - it's more for structured courses. So instead of the single lecture, it would be can you give us four or five that actually develops into a program or it can be from a professor or somebody running a

school of some kind within a university to try and help them with curriculum development. So that's the sort of request we're hearing and as that develops, certainly I would want to reach out to the NCSG because you have a lot of academics and could probably help us and guide in that sort of direction.

Yes, I'm not quite sure exactly, Farzaneh, you might want me to say on that, so I'll stop for the moment and say something else, which is so we have this civil society engagement and I'm around to try and support what you're doing and I'd like to hear more about what you need, not necessarily now, but if you want to give - the sort of support that you would like from Global Stakeholder Engagement, that would be useful for us to hear.

I mentioned earlier that there are things these regional spaces and I've heard that there's quite a few of these meetings going on this week. People from NCSG are participating but not in a formal sort of way, so perhaps the people you have elected and selected from the regions might like to be formally involved in those because the sorts of things that happen because of these regional space engagements are staff in the regions working together on webinars. Of course you do webinars for yourselves and you have your own expertise but there might be topics where you want staff to come in and talk about topics that are more technically specific. You might want someone to come in and talk about the KSK rollover or universal acceptance or many of the topics that you'd hear about at an ICANN meeting and might like some follow-up on. And these regional engagement spaces are very useful for that. The other thing that happens in the regions, of course, is they develop regional engagement strategies and while many people from NCSG are participating in those, perhaps we could formalize it so that you're bringing in a more structured sort of engagement into those strategies and that would be very helpful. I know many people who are here are already on those advisory councils and committees, but to structure it from the NCSG level so that it's a more coordinated approach, it may be something to think about and helpful

and at the same time also, it would mean a better way of telling you about the events that ICANN staff have been invited to attend.

I know you would like to see some of the budget requests. They've been asking about GSE, where do we go, what do we do, what's the outcomes of these things? And you'd like to see some metrics about the what we do and how we do it and that kind of relationship maybe able to structure that a little bit better so that the information flow is less ad hoc and is more consistent and you can actually see what values - or not - are occurring. And if the values aren't occurring, then how do we make them occur? That's the idea. GSE is meant to be serving the community in many ways so that is something I'd be very interested in. But let me know something more on academic stuff, I can…

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Thank you, Adam. Farzaneh Badii speaking. So that is a - the reason I asked you to say a couple of words on this is that we are staffed with you at (unintelligible) Engagement. You go off and do things and we would like more collaboration and come and ask us what we need and go and do more focused, targeted outreach and don't do outreach as for to - for the propaganda thing of it. Do outreach to actually see if people are interested to attend and get involved and that is one of the problems or challenges that we face.

For example, there's a really good scholar that wrote a paper on contents regulation and I think something that we are really interested in and it is within - we even have our - it's one of our values to prevent ICANN to be a contents regulator, but we have not been able to reach out to them and get them involved with the process. So I think if we could use Global Stakeholder Engagement's activities to get academics more involved with our processes by also being more organized, then that would be better for us and you, I think.

Adam Peake: Adam Peake again. Yes, I think we'd be - I'd personally be very welcoming, I'd like that very much, to have some - if you want to have formal calls or a mailing list or whatever you want it to be, I'm happy to do that. And I do think it's important that we also try and reach out and formalize this engagement with the regional VPs because although there's only five regions, there are about eight or nine of these in the sub-regions, so that can be helpful. At the moment, again, it's a lot of individual members participating, but if we can structure it a bit better, then we can make sure that the information flows are monitored and if we ask if you're - you ask for something, then it becomes my task to make sure that it happens and so on and so forth. So that's what the idea would be, and I would be happy to do that. And it could extend to anything that you need, there are all kinds of resources that you might be able to use that we're not utilizing as much as we should do.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. Yes, Nadira, go ahead.

Nadira Alaraj: Yes, Nadira. Being - coming from the academic field for a long time and being and advisor for graduation projects and theseses (sic), I have - usually students suffer to find right topics and it would be also the opposite way of like - as NCSG to propose some topics, just list this as areas of research. And this is kind of attract people to adopt these concept into their PSG proposal writing.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, so the aim is they help us with our advocacy, we're not helping them with their research. So okay. So thank you, this is good information. I - what NCSG is going to do with the Policy Committee and the Executive Committee is to come up with an inreach plan considering your comments today and try to create these network of experts and also with the help of Adam, we are going to be more engaged with the academics and advocate for our positions. And now we have our goals and we will have the Board meeting this week, which we have five questions that we are going to talk about and I think that would be interesting if you could attend, and also we have the Constituency Day of NCSG Open Meeting on Tuesday at 5:00 to 6:30. I can

adjourn the meeting, it seems like we are done. (Unintelligible) No? All right. Yes. Thank you.

END