ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
GNSO – NCUC Constituency Day Meeting Part 1
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 12:15 JST
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Woman: March 12, 2019, GNSO NCUC Constituency Day meeting, one of two, 12:15 to 1:15, room 403.

Bruna Santos: Just to let you guys know that we're supposed to start at 12:15 but we're starting at 12:30 now. And then we will have the break in between some parts. So help yourself to lunch outside, we have lunch boxes, we have soda and if you guys want to go get it, get it while we have it.

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: NCUC, good afternoon. I'll ask everybody to get to your seats. We have seats available at the table so if you want to join us at the table you're very welcome to. We have two seats here and more there. To the ones who did not get lunch outside, we still might have some lunch boxes so please go ahead and serve yourself.

I guess we can start the recording. Yes. Thank you very much. So welcome, everyone, to NCUC the Non Commercial Users Constituency for the sake of explaining the acronyms, Constituency Day. This is our Constituency Day here in Kobe. We're starting now at 12:30 and we'll be running until around 3:00 in the afternoon.

So on our - my name is Bruna Santos for the record. I am the Chair of NCUC. And right before I jump into the agenda I would like to do maybe a round of introductions for everybody to know who else is in the room. For those of you who are sitting in the back your welcome to join this microphone, just state your name and for everybody to know and to help the transcript as well. So maybe start with Arsene.

Arsene Tungali: Sure. Arsene Tungali, NCUC member on the GNSO Council for the NCSG. Thank you.

Mili Semlani: Hi, everyone. I'm Mili from India, newbie to NCUC and a Fellow this time so thank you for having me and hoping - looking forward to get more involved. Thank you.

Elsa Saade: Hi, everyone. Elsa Saade, I'm originally from Lebanon based in New York. I'm with NCUC and NCSG and currently in the GNSO Council.

Rafik Dammak: Rafik Dammak, I'm NCUC member and I am also representative for NCSG on the Council - GNSO Council.

Louise Marie Hurel: Hi, everyone. Louise Marie Hurel, I am the NCUC Vice Chair and representative for the European region at the NCUC Executive Committee. Nice to be here.

(Amber Craig):   (Unintelligible). I'm (Amber Craig) and I'm a newcomer to ICANN but I'm from Internet New Zealand.

Joy Liddicoat: Joy Liddicoat, NCUC member, former NCSG GNSO councilor. Also from New Zealand.

Ayden Férdeline: Hi, everyone. My name is Ayden Férdeline and I represent the NCSG on the GNSO Council and I'm also an NCUC member. Thanks.

Tatiana Tropina: Hello, everyone. Tatiana Tropina, NCUC member and representative of NCSG on the GNSO Council.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, everybody. I'm Kathy Kleiman. I'm a public interest attorney from the United States and years ago when I was very, very young I helped cofound the Non Commercial Users Constituency.

Ines Hfaiedh: Hi, everyone. I'm Ines Hfaiedh. I'm from Tunisia; I'm a teacher in Africa representative in NCUC Executive Committee.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi, I'm Stephanie Perrin. I'm the - I'm an NCUC member and I'm the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group Chair this year incoming.

Thato Mfikwe: Hi, everyone. My name is Thato Mfikwe I'm the NCUC rep on the Finance Committee. But this is my last year. Thanks.

Michael Karanicolas: Hi. My name is Michael Karanicolas, I'm the NCUC rep for North America.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Anriette Esterhuysen from South Africa, Association for Progressive Communications, NCUC member, currently NCUC appointed member of the NomCom and also a commissioner on the Global Commission on the Stability of Cyberspace.

(Peter Ricksel): Hello, everyone. My name is (Peter Ricksel) from Europol. I'm fighting for the rights of the sexual abuse children.

Olaf Kolkman: And I'm Olaf Kolkman primarily a (netizen) but also Internet Society's Chief Internet Technology Officer and a member of the Global Commission on Stability of Cyberspace.

Julie Hedlund: I'm Julie Hedlund with ICANN staff.

((Crosstalk))

(Ashwin):   Hi. I'm (Ashwin), I'm from India and I'm a newcomer to ICANN. Looking forward to learn about ICANN.

Ken Herman: Hi. Ken Herman from New York also relatively newcomer to ICANN processes.

Man 1:   (Unintelligible) from academia, I'm involved the (unintelligible) in IDN technical group. Thank you.

Ariel Liang: Ariel Liang, ICANN staff supporting the GNSO.

(Lise Meha):   (Lise Meha), ALAC North America, NomCom delegate.

Abdul-Hakeem Ajijola: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Abdul Hakim Ajijola, I'm from Nigeria. I'm on the founding members of the Organization of Islamic Countries Computer Emergency Response Team, and a member of the Global Commission for the Stability of Cyberspace.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, everyone. My name is Maryam Bakoshi, ICANN staff supporting NCSG, NCUC and NPOC.

Diana Middleton: Diana Middleton, ICANN staff.

(Berry Schweikoff):   (Berry Schweikoff), (unintelligible) Vienna and EURALO and NomCom delegate.

Woman: Hi, I'm (unintelligible), I'm from Taiwan. This is my fourth ICANN meeting but my first time in NCUC meeting so I'm really excited.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, everyone, for the introductions. And welcome to this meeting. Moving onto our agenda, as we are showing we're - we're having Stephanie Perrin at the very beginning of our meeting, she'll address NCUC. Stephanie, just like me, we were both elected at the end of last year so the Barcelona meeting was our first one at the NCUC and NCSG leadership at the time.

                   And then we'll move on to EC regional briefings, a small briefing from - a small presentation from Mili, so Mili is our mentee and CROP receiver this time, and then move onto briefings from our representatives at the different NCSG committees, and then policy updates and last but not least we'll receive Commissioners from the Global Commission on the Stability of Cyberspace at this meeting. So without - I'm going to give the floor to Stephanie and, yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Please make sure that I don't talk too long, Bruna. I just wanted to invite you all, I think that sometimes there's some confusion about the agenda at these meetings. We had a Policy Committee meeting yesterday and I think people think they have to be a member of Policy Committee to come to the meeting. No.

                   Policy Committee is where you find out about everything that's going on, it's where we do our discussion about the issues that we're dealing with, so everyone is welcome on the monthly calls, which are usually just before the GNSO meeting, and in person. So please, you missed it yesterday but next time. Rafik always sends out a notice on the NCSG discuss list so that you know when it's coming but it's coincident with the GNSO Council meetings.

Similarly, Non Commercial Stakeholder Group, we are the umbrella over the two constituencies and the non-affiliated members. And you're all welcome at the NCSG meeting as well, which will follow this meeting after I think we get a coffee break and then we - hopefully it's the same room and we don't have to trek back. Wonderful. Thank you. It's quite a little excursion out to this building.

And I just wanted to update, it's been a hectic week already for those of us who were on the EPDP which had a meeting on Saturday. And the leadership team, so that would be me, and Bruna and Joan Kerr, met with the ALAC leadership team yesterday morning, 6:30, you know, I want a medal for that. Thank you. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: We're trying to explore greater cooperation between our two groups. And we thought, you know, what topics can we work together on so one of them is metrics and key performance indicators. As everybody knows there's a big five-year plan. I can smell cuts coming so we should be measuring our own productivity before somebody measures it for us in my view.

And so I didn't even realize that ALAC had had an effort to do the same kind of metrics. It's not easy to measure volunteers, it's also not easy to push volunteers to do more work, you know, they're not employees, right. They can tell you to go away. But we have to be mindful that our resources are scrutinized and if we're not getting product out of them, then we're not using scarce resources effectively.

So this will be an exercise that we'll work on together. They have a metrics expert by the name of Jonathan Zuck who's going to help join that team and I'm really looking forward to it. I'm going to get all nerdy about KPIs and metrics.

The other project that we're looking at - we often get blamed at NCUC/NCSG for being pro-privacy and pro-free speech and anti-cybercrime fighting. And this is not the case. Not only do we have cybercrime experts here among us, but you don't get privacy if you don't have security. So we are not anti-security.

And in fact, we have varying skills among our membership. Some of us, you know, have particular narrow specialties, mine's privacy. So we're trying to bring people up to speed on cybercrime, how it's fought, what the latest trends are. We had Patrik Fältström, Rod Rasmussen come last meeting, yes, and that was really well received. SSAC has committed to coming and helping us. And I think, you know, if we're going to have a reasonable discussion on some of these issues we need to bring our awareness level up.

So we put in an ADR request for funding. We don't know whether we we're going to get it or not. But we've already reached out to see if we can do something in Marrakesh with SSAC and talk about, you know, further that discussion from what we had last time.

So if anybody - that's the second thing that we will do with ALAC because they have, for a long time, had a focus on cyber security and we can do some productive work with them in terms of outreach and education on cyber security. So that's the plan.

So that's probably enough out of me. If you have any further questions about NCSG, don't hesitate to button-hole me or you could pester Maryam, our excellent support, she'll be happy to hook you up with, you know, what you might be looking for. Thank you.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Stephanie. Do we have any questions? I don't think so. If so, just raise your hands. Or not, then we can move with the agenda. Moving on, we're going - we're going to go now with the Executive Committee region briefings. This is an initiative we've been doing for the past year,

something like that, but the idea is for the broader membership to learn what the EC representatives are doing in all the different regions. So I don't know who's up first, yes, yes. Okay, so Michael will go first.

Michael Karanicolas: Thank you for that. Michael Karanicolas. I'm the North American rep. Not a huge amount to report but there's probably two main events that I would point to that took place in the North American region recently. One of those was the Canadian IGF which just took place a few weeks back and where there was a strong NCUC and CSG contingent. Farzi was one of the presenters as was (Sarah), whose last name is escaping me at the moment, but, yes - (Ingle), thank you.

So yes, so there was a number of NCUC folks there and a lot of discussion about noncommercial issues. And it looks like the Canadian IGF is looking to become a feature of the landscape in Canada going forward so for anybody who's Canadian, stay on the lookout for those and there should be more to come in the coming years.

The other event that I would like to draw people's attention to was a panel that took place at the American University set up by Christine Farley who - is Christine an NCUC member? She is not. But she is closely linked to NCUC members and of course Kathy was also instrumental in setting it up.

And that featured Kathy as well as myself as well as Mitch Stoltz, another NCUC-er, and folks from the IPC and the Board and it was a very interesting discussion about trademarks in the domain name space. It is still available online if anybody wants to duck back and watch it on the American University's Web site or on - a bunch of folks are tweeting it out, so it can be found pretty easily.

Anyway those are the main updates from the North American side. Kathy has something to add.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes just that were two panels and Mitch and I were actually on the second panel as well which had to do with content regulation in new gTLDs. So and it is up on YouTube, I think under Washington College of Law. Thanks.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, both of - yes, go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Pardon me, this is something that I mentioned on the panel yesterday, the University of Toronto has been funded by the Office of the Privacy Commissioner in Canada to work on standards in terms of the disclosure process for the Whois. It's not Whois anymore but, you know, for shorthand let's call it that. So we have been working on that all year. And we held a workshop in Barcelona. The materials from that are still up on the Web site.

And I'm wrapping up the report this week. The conclusion that we reached, along with Canadian civil liberties folks who came to that workshop is there's really not a whole lot of interest in standards development to further this even though the privacy commissioners are keen on standards associated with disclosure, the folks at ICANN are - feel they've already got the standards they need.

However, the civil liberties people feel that a digital trust is what we need for the RDAP engine that we are building at ICANN. So we've put in more research applications to do further research on that if anybody is interested in this happy to talk to you.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Stephanie. Do we have any questions or comments? Do we? Okay, good. Moving on I guess David or Louise or Ines? Okay. Ines first then…

Ines Hfaiedh: Hi, everyone. This is Ines Hfaiedh, Africa representative. So from the African side we had been active through the mailing list and also the Africa members' webinars. So the good thing is that our Africa mailing list has become very

active. It's not only the EC which posts on it, it's now the membership actually uses it.

For example recently we had Thato who were - who was asking the membership recommendations with a meeting with the GSE of Africa, what we wanted to ask them for outreach and for events asking for like also funding for some events in Africa. So this is concerning the mailing list.

For the African webinars, so we have each time we open a call for topics and currently we were asked to have a webinar for the African members on the EPDP so we are preparing the agenda and then we will be contacting the speakers for on the EPDP.

Also in terms of events, we had the (CIFA) Africa, where we had a lot of NCUC members where we met and we had some discussions with members. Also we had the Africa IGF with many also NCUC members and also there was (Ariat), also we met there so it was very interesting.

For this year we are having RightsCon, very important event in Tunisia and ICANN is going to have a booth so I was contacted for the booth at RightsCon and we'll if we can find also some other volunteers for the RightsCon.

Also we're having - luckily we're having also the Middle East School on Internet Governance run by ICANN, it's going to be in Africa this year in Morocco and I was - I am in the secretary also of the organization. And apart from that so the - we like created an atmosphere of consultation with the African membership so that they reach out to us like for example they feel really comfortable to reach out to me or Thato or Arsene to ask about policies and how to get more engaged and having a road map.

Also the onboarding material it was very crucial that some African members translated it into French which is far more easier for African membership. So that's from the African side. And if you have any questions - thank you.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Ines. We have questions or comments? Okay. If not, okay.

Anriette Esterhuysen: …to what Ines said, I think yes RightsCon definitely is going to be I think a good opportunity. And I've heard informally that the Tunisian government is wanting to release a statement, a little bit like the Paris call that was released around, a smaller scale, around the IGF.

So it might be worth trying to get onto the radar of this or will be by governments, they'll put a call out to governments who are participating in RightsCon, but it's something that one might want to get involved in lobbying around the content for that.

And then this year I think the African IGF is going to be in a French-speaking country. The African (Union) Commission has put out the call, it hasn't been finalized but they really are focusing on central Africa so we're looking at Congo or DRC possibly Cameroon but that's the wish.

Also just a West African IGF will take place in - from 22-24 July and it will be coincide with the West African Internet Governance School, so for those of you that have networks in West Africa the applications are open now. African School on Internet Governance, which we convene, my organization, APC, along with the African (Union) Commission, probably in early August and again in Zanzibar which we think is now going to become (Mycen), except Zanzibar is a little bit nicer than (Mycen) in some respects.

And I think that's really, I mean, yes, I think that's - oh yes, I had one more question, it's not just for Africa and maybe we can come to it later, but if there's anyone here in NCUC or NCSG who's participating in the Domains

Working Group of the Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network, in fact I think Michael might be involved in that, it would be useful to talk about that because that is this - it's the Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network, I think some of you are aware of that.

And it would just be good to know what people in NCUC and NCSG think about that process and what they're experiences is and if they're participating. So that's a question for later.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Anriette and Ines. So I guess we can move on to David, yes. Thank you very much, David.

David Cake: Sure, I don't have a lot to report about specific regional stuff in particular in my home country Internet governance is currently in a kind of disastrous period in - where our national IGF disappeared a while ago and has not yet to be rebuilt. So we are having - I have been trying to put together a strategy to see if we can get a few extra people to the AP - the Asia Pacific RIGF. It's - that is again a bit awkward this year is a long - I mean, realistically it's expected to be reasonably smaller than usual because it's a long way from sort of a - it's Vladivostok which is a long way from a lot of Asia.

And we - I'm also - been trying to set up connections with the sort of - the open tech fund network and the IFF. I believe it will be - they haven't yet decided on sort of whether or not they'll be holding a major event in Asia in the near future so the planning on that is a little bit or at least if they have they have not told me. So but trying to make sure that when that does happen we are sort of ready to connect with - is a focus and look at the networks around there.

I did go to their planning meeting shortly after the Barcelona meeting so - and there's a lot of very, very useful about presented there about Internet related activities in Australia - sorry in Asia - particularly about the things like the Chinese surveillance of the (Wigo) people and so on.

I do think I should probably do whatever Ines has done and organize a webinar so I will get onto that straight away. But I'm - and we probably - yes, that's pretty much. I don't have a lot to report, I've been chasing a couple of sort of connections to funding and other groups but have not yet had any luck so I'll let you know.

Bruna Santos: Okay thank you very much, David. This is Bruna again for the record. The reason for these briefings and feedback from our EC representatives is for you - for all our members as well to know who are the focal points and if you have any idea or any suggestions to give to us we can act with membership in developing ideas and events and participating in whatever talks or like you want us to join. So and also to raise awareness that NCUC has a few resources that we can use with for events and things like this.

So we will be having - we'll be announcing two more CROP calls, CROP is a resource that ICANN Org gives us to, we have three slots for traveling regionally so we will announce soon a call for CROP for the next ICANN meeting which will be Marrakesh, and the third one we can maybe use with RightsCon or any other like meeting that you see that it's interesting for NCUC to attend and do some outreach at, so if you have any ideas just let us know, you can just ask us questions and doesn't have to be in Africa, it can elsewhere, so the only rule is that if you were from - if the event is at like let's say my region, Latin America, you would have to live in Latin America to attend and use the resource, so that's just a heads up for you guys.

Maryam. I guess we have a question from remote. Yes. Can you read this for me because I'm not with Adobe here?

Maryam Bakoshi: This is a question from (Shahu Hamid). And it's a question to Dave. Is there anything planned for bringing more people in our region to involve in NCUC/ICANN?

David Cake: I mean, I don't think there are specific - I don't think there are specific things for the region but there are definitely many mechanisms. Yes, did you want to say something, Elsa? Sorry, you just looked excited.

Elsa Saade: I am excited.

David Cake: Yes.

Bruna Santos: Elsa is over excited…

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: Yes well of course. But, yes, I mean, I don't know about any specific efforts in the Asia Pacific region.

Bruna Santos: I had you the queue, Elsa and Mili. Yes, okay go ahead.

Elsa Saade: great. Thanks, Bruna. And thanks Dave and (Shahul), thank you so much for the question. I have to note that (Shahul) was great with the Ask NCUC and in the room if you just go on Twitter and check out the hashtag AskNCUC you'll find out that there's so many people, focal points, in our membership who were interviewed through that hashtag and they went into several PDP - policy development process issues.

And I also wanted to talk about Asia Pacific just a bit because Asia Pacific is such a huge region, it includes a variety of diverse members and it's Australia, it's the Pacific region and it's also Asia which includes China, India, as well as Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, so you can imagine how big of a region it is and how hard it is to have that overreach. So for instance Dave has been focusing mostly on Australia, (Shahul) has been working in India, there are other people who are working in the Middle East.

So I think a suggestion for this region would be if you are - who is from Asia Pacific in this room? Can you raise your hand? Okay, we have such a big turnout. So if you're interested in helping out NCUC with outreach, please get in touch with Dave, get in touch with the whole EC so that you can also be proactive and find your own context in this civil society part of our work at ICANN because it's of added value.

(Shahul), on his own, did AskNCUC with the help of Bruna and Renata, our pat chair, so if you initiate certain things for the region, you are more knowledgeable about your own context and this will help NCUC and NCUC in its own role will be able to help you more. So yes, I just thought I'd say that out loud.

David Cake: Yes, Asia is a huge region. I didn't even realize that you know, it included Vladivostok. But until - that's where they're putting the regional IGF. But the - I mean, I haven't been concentrating just on Australia or - but even - I mean, Southeast Asia is a huge area and is only a small part of the Asia Pacific which is giant.

And the - I think we are going to have to come up with a strategy that includes some ongoing sort of, you know, sub regional sort of hubs. We're going to have one for Southeast Asia, I mean, as an Australian I do regularly talk to the New Zealanders who - Internet and (Zed) are a wonderfully active organization who, you know, helped drive a lot of useful things in the region.

The, you know, the - yes, India is a, you know, could be a region on its own there's enough going on there. So yes, it's huge. I have one thing I'm just going to suggest as sort of outside NCUC at the moment is there's an APRALO function as well this evening where there will be a lot of Asia Pacific organizations there so that's going to be a good opportunity for some networking and trying to get some, you know, find out what other organizations are doing actively.

And as I said, there was a very - there is a lot of activities there I think we're unaware of sort of what we do there and that we need to connect with which - well Elsa said, the Open Tech Fund sort of network which is doing a lot more - more sort of operational on the ground activism than we do but there's a lot of organizations in that, that, you know, we should connect to.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, David. We'll have Mili - can I just ask you to be really brief…

((Crosstalk))

Mili Semlani: Yes, I'm going to be quick. I have a question and a suggestion. I've been involved with API IGF for about four years and I do think it is a great platform especially to get to - get closer to civil society for the region as diverse as Asia and the fact that it travels to remote places or far away places like Vladivostok itself is interesting to get to that audience, so definitely I think I can work with Dave and (Shahul) and everybody else to see what we can do more in these places.

My question is, do we have a separate Asia mailing list like Ines mentioned one for Africa, if there is one (unintelligible). Thank you.

Bruna Santos: Yes, we do. We have one separate list for each of the regional representations of the EC so we have one for LAC, ERU and every other one. So but then I guess we can help talk to the representatives for the EC for each region just so we can (unintelligible). Thanks very much for the intervention, Mili.

Moving on it's Louise up next. Thank you very much, Lou.

Louise Marie Hurel: Hi, everyone. Louise Marie Hurel for the record here. I would just like to follow up on what Mili said for a moment. And I do think that it's perhaps one action point for us from the EC maybe to send out an email from time to time

just reminding members from the different regions that we do have these mailing lists because as we see, like clearly there's a way that we can improve in communication and that is definitely a way forward.

But now going to the - well to Europe, so there were a couple of - there are some updates that I'd like to give. First of all the year started already like with a couple of developments on the broader Internet governance landscape, but most importantly in the beginning of the year there was the planning meeting for the EuroDIG which will take place in the Hague from 19th to 20th June.

But the planning meeting, why I'm mentioning it, I was at the planning meeting, there were a couple of people over here, (Tonya) was over there as well, she's deeply involved in EuroDIG. And it's always been a very important place for us to get engaged. And I know Ayden already has been in EuroDIG previously talking on behalf of NCUC.

And there I just wanted to bring about the attention of all of you that now in the program there is a session, obviously we had the discussions and setting up the program, and there's a flash session that is specifically focused on ICANN, what will come out of Work Stream 2. So maybe stay tuned to that and people from the European region who might be interested in joining over at EuroDIG I will be there, (Tonya) will be there and anyone else who would like to join. I do think it's something for us to keep an eye on.

There was also the Computer State of Privacy CPDP conference over in Brussels. And the day before the GSC organized kind of like a side event focusing on trying to understand what the civil society engagement in ICANN, how do you understand civil society at ICANN, and it was very - it was a whole day of events and Ayden spoke over there, (Tonya) spoke, Olivier and it was very much open.

Everyone kind of like chimed in so it was a really good outreach in the sense of in terms of trying to - make more vocal and trying to connect with European

organizations. I do think that's the challenge for us and always trying to keep them informed of what's happening in the policy discussions at ICANN.

And there was also a panel organized by ICANN that was called Ensuring that Data is Safe, the Whois experience of balancing security and privacy needs in the GDPR and major evolution of privacy legislation so it was a very fiery discussion, but, yes, so I was there.

I followed the discussions but I do think it's also a place to keep an eye on for the next year and trying to articulate better whether how we could engage our members or connect with them that are going to be there since many of the central organizations such as the European Digital Rights Organization was there as well in this panel specifically talking about more of the non-commercial approach to the discussion.

And just in the way forward so we plan accordingly, there's CDIG coming up on May 7-8 and obviously for the third year in a row there's the IGF in Europe in Berlin more specifically in November. So we always have a very intense presence over at the IGF so we'll probably have a booth, I'm just guessing, there's the whole process, let know, I don't know, but I do think that's something that we always kept going back to the IGF so if we do do this just to articulate with our members and try to work better in our mailing list because I do think there is a challenge.

I know that in - as Ines was saying on her side, there's a lot of action from the members themselves but I do think, as I've been saying for the past, I don't know how long, there is another dynamic to the European region which I think is more of us trying to inform them. But I do think these are the moment that we can engage with them more concretely. So yes, I just wanted to mention that. And I think that's all for the European region. Yes, thanks.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Louise. This is Bruna again for the record. Just a reminder that we have an open call for sessions for the IGF so if maybe

members want to work together in the session in any other teams like things or values reach out to us.

I have Stephanie in the queue.

Louise Marie Hurel: Sorry, just to mention, it's until the - I think the 15th of April just to…

Bruna Santos: Yes, 15th of April, yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And just a reminder that we are trying to work on key performance indicators. In order to do that you need to decide what your output is from these meetings. And obviously very early days yet, I'm going to write this up and hopefully have a formulary form that'll help explain what we're looking for.

But as you're planning so for the IGF, that's a big one. What are our goals there? What can we count? I don't mean how many brochures we gave out, I mean, how many interested people who had something to contribute joined us and helped do the work of ICANN? That's my key measured item, not to say that education isn't important and all the rest, but in terms of ICANN's evaluation of what we're doing, I think it's really important that we're providing something to the organization. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Stephanie. This is Bruna again. I do agree that we should be looking forward to setting our participations in those events. In the past IGF I remember we had the booth but we didn't necessarily have the proper outreach and we were like actually profiting from the meeting as we should be doing. So thanks very much to all. Go ahead, Arsene.

Arsene Tungali: Yes, Arsene here. Just probably to make it, I mean, to say some on the IGF, so if there is anything I can help with in terms of, you know, support through

the proposal - workshop proposal submission, which actually the deadline is the 12th of April so approaching very soon. So I would encourage NCUC members if there is anything that you want to do. But also if there is any ideas in terms of booth we can work on input for that as well.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Louise. And I'll wrap this up.

Louise Marie Hurel: Yes, Louise here. Just a quick comment on what Arsene was saying and what Stephanie was saying, I do think we have to tackle very seriously why we are in these places and what is our purpose especially because I do think we have to have a more - on our side we might have to communicate better with our members to say we're going to be there and who's going to be there and how can you engage with us and how can - can we create a collaborative effort because I do think in the last IGF as Bruna was saying, it was pretty much us trying to get together and cover up the booth. So I do think we have to rethink our strategies on how to better use these resources. So yes, thank you.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Louise. So I guess we're wrapping up the EC regional briefings. Moving on we have Mili up next doing her presentation. Mili is our NCUC mentee and as part as capacity building efforts NCUC has bringing mentors to the past ICANN meetings. So Mili, I guess you have the floor. Do you - do we have your presentation uploaded? I guess we do. If - I don't know if I have it here, let me see. No I don't, so…

((Crosstalk))

Maryam, do we…

Mili Semlani: Hello. I'm Mili, the NCUC Fellow. Thank you for such a warm welcome. I guess I can probably do it without the slides. The idea was to do (unintelligible) and because he's in the room I'll make a little note, Olaf was at

(NSIG) last year and that's where I picked it off from and I thought we're in Japan, let me do something local.

It's the idea of just doing short slides and speak for like - the timeline there denotes the amount of time I will speak so I won't take too much time per slide, but let me just go by a little with - maybe (unintelligible) the slides and just go on to what I really want to say.

A little bit about me first, I'm a journalist by profession but I've been involved in the IG space, thanks to the Net Mission program by dotAsia. I was studying in Hong Kong, got into the, you know, university program. It was very interesting to learn about things I never heard of, never thought I would actually get acquainted to. That's what brought me to my first ICANN and APR IGF and thereon to IGF and few other forums locally.

Thanks to the Net Mission I've been engaged a lot with the Asian Youth Fellows and almost helped facilitate and coordinate this big group of Asian Youth Fellows from all different forums and different local community initiatives together and we do stuff at the community level at different schools of governance in different countries, some of them also go back to their own national IGF so a lot of which has started happening. Nepal had their first one last year. Those kind of things, in smaller Southeast Asian places.

A few challenges of course, because we are dealing with a big diverse continent we face challenges like language. English is not everybody's first language with the speed at which I speak to most of my Japanese or Chinese, you know, fellow youth would be a bit difficult for them to understand so we still deal with that barrier. There is a little more challenge when have to get information to them about IG or these processes in general.

And secondly, it's about getting them to speak up or just getting them to be at these forums. And I guess one of the reasons why even at NCUC I still don't see so much of the Asian participation, I mean, when I asked about the

mailing list Elsa also told me that's it's not as active as we expected or want it to be and I can totally see why. So that's one of the steps and areas I really want to help into because I'm already plugged into with the Asian youth I really want them to come to this platform and be more engaged with NCUC. It's something most of them can easily fit in with before they decide to move on to some particular professional capacity, we're all civil society at the end of the day.

Secondly I think Spain or Barcelona, one of the reasons why there are flags in my presentation, so Barcelona was my big exposure to ICANN in general. I was a fellow last time. And I learned a lot about just the atmosphere, the constituencies, the kind of work that happens, the PDP process, you know, just got on from the point where I thought acronyms are annoying to the point where I think acronyms are necessary and really time saving.

So yes I think finally feel I'm acquainted to the culture and I kind of get it without trying to Google right in the middle of the session, what this really - what does this really mean or who this person really is. So feels great. And I feel NCUC is the direct fit into what I want to do more about especially with the Asian community, I'm really passionate about bringing their interests to the floor, A, because it's underrepresented, B, because it's the largest (unintelligible) we're talking about and the most growing number of users, I mean, just India China itself even if I really for the - I mean, for once not look at the other places, but yes.

And thirdly because the diversity, because it will still take a lot, a lot, longer to break into the different people and their needs and just how they operate for them to come to this floor. So I think that's what really keeps me motivated to be here. And the third big point I really want to make about is something that in first from this morning's discussion with the Board about, you know, just as NCUC or NCSG, how do we take this platform to more and more common users? How do we bring them here?

And that's where I think a little bit of the journalist in me comes in and says yes, I want more common people to know about this in a manner that doesn't annoy them, I mean, you know, when you first refer the ICANN Web site to somebody they're like what is this? Maybe that's an internal corporate - I don't want to know anything about it. I mean, my friends probably would give me that reaction.

But at the end of day it is stuff, I mean, stuff that's spoken here and a few other forums is actually stuff that really matters to us. I didn't think about privacy and security and an individual similarly before a lot before all this happened to me and I was like thank God I'm part of this, I think about privacy a lot differently now just digital privacy in my own personal space. And I think more people should know that.

So that's where I'm trying to, you know, do something about bringing my journalism skills and trying to take this platform and the issues discussed here to more people and also bring in their views back to this place, which is what we need more of, the public participation we need more people to comment on things and they will only comment if A, they understand it and, B, it takes a lot less of their time to understand it because yes, the PDP process is interesting, it's amazing and people put in a lot of work but the documents are lengthy and a bit incomprehensible for people who are not, you know, not really equally educated.

So I guess that is where I want to step in, to simplify that process and bridge this gap between public or common users or the masses, as we call them, and just IG in general. So that's a little about me, and I think I speak a bit too fast but if you have anything to add ask, suggestion, please do so, I am still a newbie and I would love to learn from everybody and if there's any way I can help in any other spirit I'm happy to do that so open to all of your suggestions and questions. Thank you.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much. So I'm taking that, NCUC from now on has its official translator. Do we have any questions for Mili, anyone? Ayden.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks. It's not really a question. Hi, I'm Ayden. Thanks so much for your presentation. That was great. And your energy and passion really comes across there, so I hope that you do stay involved.

And if there is one particular issue that you really want to focus on, because within the space it's very easy to be pulled this way, that way or the other, but if you do decide to focus on one issue in particular and that might have been privacy, as you mentioned it, then we do have several different focal points for different issues who I'm sure would be happy to shepherd you to a working group where you can have even more of an impact because we need more people like you. So thanks again and I think you've really shown the value of NCUC launching a distinct fellowship program. Thanks.

Mili Semlani: Thank you. Thank you, Ayden.

Bruna Santos: Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And basically I'm echoing what Ayden is saying. And your perspective as a newbie but as a journalist is invaluable to help us figure out how to do the education piece. So we will be sending back further comments from the Board discussion and we did commit to providing some of our materials, nobody ever wants my privacy presentations, I'm crushed, but they're going to get them anyway. And send them to Sally Costerton.

You know, if we could build a portfolio of basic pieces that would get across our, you know, our basic subject areas I think it'd be useful because what we tend to do is criticize the stuff that ICANN puts out and that isn't always, you know, well viewed. If we could say here, here, we've got some materials that

we're using, what do you think? That would be so positive and you can help us do that. Thank you.

Elsa Saade: Thanks, Bruna. And thanks, Mili, for this. I completely agree with Ayden and Stephanie that I felt it too. And I think the fact that you're a newcomer is extremely valuable because you're at the point where you can definitely highlight the perspective of a newcomer who also knows a bit about the space now. And that's exactly where it - the value of outreach through people like you come in.

And I also think going forward, as you gain more and more experience in the space, then we'd be able to work together on in-reach within NCUC, within NCSG. But this - like this is the most valuable points for outreach for people like Mili here who are coming in to NCUC as fellows. So, yes, this was brilliant. Thank you.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Mili, Elsa, and everybody who did an intervention right now. This is Bruna again for the record. Just to let you guys know that we have coffee outside so if you guys want coffee we deserve coffee so go get your coffees. Right now, everybody. But then we can move on with our agenda.

Our next point is also kind of a feeling that both me and the EC we got in this past year that we need some more information from our representatives at the different NCSG committees. We know that they are an independent forces from NCUC but at the same time we felt the need for more feedback and also setting a line in the focus of information between us and them.

So we are inviting Robin, who is EC - NCUC appointee to the Executive Committee of the NCSG and then we will have Rafik here because our representative of the Policy Committee is not - unfortunately not at the meeting right now. And then we'll have Thato Mfikwe who is our - who was

our appointee to the Finance Committee. So I guess I can give the floor to Robin. Thank you very much.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Bruna. Yes my name is Robin Gross. And I am one of NCUC's two appointees to the NCSG Executive Committee, so I'm just going to give you a very brief update on what we've been up to lately. So we spend a lot of time going through the membership applications and approving the membership applications, and that's one of the most important things that we do because managing the membership per se and ensuring that it remains noncommercial and non-market, non-state actors, is extremely important so that's something that we spend a lot of our time on.

We are all caught up in approving our existing membership applications that are in the queue. We try to do that about once a month or so so that's been a very significant chunk of time that we've been working on.

Also I think another thing that we're talking about now and needs to happen over the next few weeks as I think Stephanie has already mentioned is operating procedures and making sure that the different committees have their appropriate operating procedures so they know how to operate properly and getting this all documented and put up on the Web site, so things like there's a travel policy.

It's extremely important that we get that all documented and people have an understanding about how things are going to work, finance Committee, travel support, Policy Committee, they all need operating procedures that people can read and understand what's going to happen, how things work.

Another thing that we've been talking about, and I think Stephanie has already mentioned is the metrics for participation. We need to be more rigorous in terms of trying to understand what the different participants are working at these meetings and in between meetings and so trying to get an understanding for who's attending what meetings and who's working on what

issues. That's something that's also coming to the top of our agenda list. And if anyone wants to help with that that'd be great.

And I think the other thing that we've been talking about and we'll be continuing to work on over the next while is reforming our database, our membership database itself tends to be broken a lot. And we haven't been particularly happy with the companies that have built it and that maintain it, so we've got to do some work in terms of making sure that membership database doesn't become too much more cumbersome than it already is and actually really trying to get it up to speed so it helps us instead of hinders us in our work.

So those are really the only four big things that we're kind of talking about and working on now and have been. So that's really it. I don't know if you guys have any questions. Yes.

Colin Kurre: Hi, this is Colin Kurre. I just have a question about the metrics and things. Are you predominantly looking at people who are funded by ICANN or are you trying to get this kind of information from all NCUC members?

Robin Gross: Well I think it's best to get it from all NCUC members. But I think it's particularly important to know where, you know, when we get funding and when we send people to meeting, how is that funding actually being used. So I think there will be certainly a particular examination of that but I think really, you know, in terms of trying to help us understand who should get funding having metrics for everyone would be very helpful as well.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Robin. Did the metrics also like falls very close to like some concerns we've had while developing the ABR in our course on policy writing, when we were doing this year's ABR we submitted a new one requesting a new face to face interaction on the policy writing course. At the EC we encountered like problems in finding out how many of our members were actually doing policy as well, like we knew like from the names but they

were like rather few. So, I mean, this need is - falls within everybody in the NCUC (unintelligible) so yes. Thank you very much, Robin, for your presentation.

I guess we can move on to Rafik or Tatiana, I don't know who wants to go first? Rafik, you want to go? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So I'm not the representative of NCUC at the Policy Committee, I think as I'm here as the Chair of the Policy Committee. So in term of update, I think as those who are throwing in the list we are focusing on trying to cover all the kind of - most of the public consultation or public comment open by ICANN or by PDP working groups so in order for us to, speaking for NCSG, to give input on those public consultation.

And since everyone know it seems like that trendy talk is about metrics, I have some numbers. For last year I think we thought that maybe we can cover 49 public comment. We could submit comment for 41. So we can improve that I guess, but I can say that is much higher than previous years.

And already for this year we had opportunity to possibly cover seven public comments but we covered only two, so always the issue is that we have so many public consultation in parallel and can be tricky to cover them. The approach that we are following is now is not just in counting on one person to do the drafting or to be the pen holder but trying to have drafting team so to share the workload and also to get newcomer to participate.

And I think from my experience this is working to some extent. It can be improved in term of following up but the thing is it's worked because it encourage more people to participate. For just maybe for those who are not aware in how we are doing things, we have our monthly NCSG policy call which happen usually before the GNSO Council meeting.

And the (unintelligible) it's important is it's that give an opportunity to explain to our members what's going on in the Council by briefing them about the agenda and also to get some input. We try to use more the mailing list by sharing the updates and so on or write some policy discussion but we use more the policy call because I think they are more kind of more convenient.

So in term of the policy issues, I think the focus for the last time out was the EPDP. And you I think we could get update from our representatives to the EPDP team. I think you will get more maybe details later on but this is the kind of - having appointed representative I think creates more, how to say, it help us really to participate on those policy development process and to get the guarantee to get an update.

What else? Also in term mostly kind of an administrative part for the Policy Committee, we had to do some appointment. This is maybe not that known, but one of the role or task for the Policy Committee is to appoint working group for any committee that the - on behalf of NCSG. So we did lately for the - we did replacement for the - our representative to the Standing Selection Committee for GNSO and also to suggest a name for subject matter expert to the standing committee for ICANN budget and operation.

So this is kind of basically what's going on. I mean, the focus of NCSG policy is really try to focus on the activities for the Council, to cover the public comments. We don't shape the comment themselves, but we kind of manage the process that we get our members to work on draft that to be reviewed by the members and then need to be approved. And that last step is the Policy Committee.

There is something that we - I personally try to do few years ago, is to track the participation in working group. We had a page to list the participation but it's kind of not update for a long time and I think also Maryam helped me in that time so it is something I guess we will resume in term of to check who

are participating in the different working group or any committees and so on just to in term of information and transparency.

Yes, I think that's it for my side. I'm happy to answer any questions. Yes, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Not to keep on going on metrics, but I think it's really important that we measure quality not you know, like numbers of comments. I mean, if we don't feel passionate about a particular issue, if it's not really something we care about, sometimes we have put in kind of nondescript comments just to get a comment in. And I feel that's a waste of our time.

But we, I mean, I'm open to other people's views on that. But there's many roles in writing comments. Like I often am the last kick at it because I'm a native English speaker, and we have many pen holders who aren't. That's a job that people can do without knowing the subject matter. People are timid to jump in and do something. Similarly, Farrell set up the framework for a comment recently, even though he didn't have the deep background.

That's really helpful because then the pen holder has a document to just fill in. It's little things like that that we could, you know, and then we could basically measure how many new people we've got participating in the process. It's an engagement thing. That's important. Thanks.

Bruna Santos: Apologies, but we have just to stop for five seconds because of the recording. The session was supposed to stop now and then we're stopping and restarting the recording.

Thank you very much. I guess we're back. Are we recording already?

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Bruna Santos: Rafik, you have the…

Rafik Dammak: Please. We are back. We are back. We are back. Okay so - no, I'm not hungry. I'm into self control.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: No. So okay so just to respond first comment, if we have even if we, let's say, identify a person - one topic that we should cover and we how to say, it would happen that we don't - we don't get a draft or people work on it, we can assume that we didn't have interest really on covering it. So I don't believe that we are trying just to cover things for the sake of covering them to submit comments because, how to say, Stephanie, I can suggest to you to go through the wiki page, which is listing all the comments that we try to cover, those we submitted and also the names of who were participating in the draft.

You can see that all those kind of comments are quite critical. Quite critical. We have too many, that's another problem, that is out of control. But I do believe we try to cover things that we thought that we need to submit a comment and to - because some of them, in particular those initiated by ICANN, that's the only opportunity to participate. You can say whatever in public forum or anything, but the public comment is the really only vehicle here to influence that process.

Regarding the quality, I think this is just subjective judgment. I mean, we can always do things better. And here I don't want to call people but the Policy Committee is formed by many participants and then all of them they need to participate in that process to improve the quality, here really just speaking as the chair. I do my work to ask folks to review comments, and so on. So we can improve if everyone participate in the process. They do their job. That's my take here.

I take your point about we can improve the quality, how to judge it, that's something I'm not sure what are - can be the criteria - can I finish, Stephanie?

Yes? So I'm not sure what are the criteria and how we can do that but moving a little bit backward, I'm just - we're here, I will call really all the Policy Committee members to participate in that process. When we are doing the review and to try to shape we can improve the comments or the draft.

And regarding another metric, so since we are also track who is - who are participating in the comment, we can also get some numbers there to see who - like who are the most people who are participating or contributing and if it can be of any help.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Rafik. Stephanie, you have a follow up, and Kathy in the queue as well, and Elsa and I'll close the queue.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Yes, I'm not quite sure what I said that sounded critical. I didn't mean it to be critical, I'm just trying to think of metrics for our process. I know very well that it's - there is a core team who writes the comments and we need to expand. And I think that measuring new people who participate is - that's a really good indicator that our process is working. So I didn't mean that as a criticism, Rafik, I don't think - if you take it as a criticism, I'll retract everything I said. Okay?

Rafik Dammak: I'm taking things as criticism, just here trying to clarify it because I thought I responded before. In term of to know who are participating and drafting, we are listing that. And I can say that we don't have, I mean, we expanded already the number - the pool of contributors, so maybe it's not clear but that can be done just to maybe to highlight who are the kind of new contributors.

I can give you names if you - I mean, to be more specific, that they really joined lately and they are participating already in the drafting comments. Yes, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, Rafik, this is Kathy Kleiman for the record. Rafik, congratulations, and thank you for seeing so many comments through to fruition. In the past I don't

think we've submitted anywhere near that number of comments or many proceedings. We did not have the bandwidth to submit it.

So I think it was Stephanie who mentioned that there are ways for kind of old-timers and new-timers to work together and that setting up a framework which is kind of setting up - there's kind of a framework of who we are and what the issue is and then most comments have their own structure when there's a call for comments, kind of A, B and C that we're responding to. And just so you know you don't have to respond to everything, we respond to the things that are of interest to the constituency or the stakeholder group, to noncommercial users.

Farrell and I did something really interesting too, in addition to his setting up the - we worked on several comments last year which he set up the framework, and he did the first draft. I came in as an old-timer and filled in the history and that my concerns were based on 20 years of our history in that area.

And then he handled the edits because invariably I was going back to some deadline in another working group. And he then, when Rafik sent it out to the whole constituency or the whole stakeholder group for comments, Farrell then handled the edits so that I didn't have to do that and submitted the final draft.

And so there are lots of ways for us to work together that kind of optimizes everybody's time and brings new people up to speed. And that's what we really need is we really need the knowledge to pass to the next generation so that you guys can continue writing the comments for the next 20 years.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks, Kathy. I think that we are not here in this agreement because when the call of - for volunteers that issued on time when just the public comment is published it's clearly just to kind of the same structure, people probably observed that. So like we explain quickly the context and we create

like Google Document, Google Docs to start, but many times I really request that those either like participating in the working group or like they worked on those issue is to participate.

So probably we can do better in term of to reach them directly but there is - that, I mean, it's shared and requested. So we can always do better. I mean, I have no problem with the continuous improvement, just try to say that it's also to - I would like also other to jump in to so I mean, if it's possible like you did in term for - I think you are talk about the Consumer Competition, something else, Review Team, so I think that's it.

So I would be happy if others do the same and to jump in, but to some extent I don't want also to kind of put people on the spot. So the call of volunteers just to be open so everyone can participate. And my feeling that many do now because they feel it's much easier to do when there is a group of people but we can add that element of identify and reaching the veterans if we can say so.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Rafik. Thank you very much. Elsa, you're also in the queue and, yes.

Elsa Saade: Thank you, Bruna. Thank you, Rafik. I have to say it might be irrelevant but Rafik was my mentor when I first came into ICANN. He taught me what Internet governance was when I first came into this space. And honestly the best thing that Rafik has told me from my very first day at ICANN was, go out and read everything that's out there. And I have to really say that it really makes much more sense to me today than it did when I first came into this space.

So one, I would - who has written a public comment in this room or has helped in writing a public comment? So look at - the people who haven't written public comments, please go ahead and speak to those people who have just raised their hands because it's - they will tell you how important it is

to work in a team and to read all that information that ICANN Org would have summarized into one little page and then provided all the links that you need to know more about that issue. And then if you go in and look at the NCSG comments you'd know our position.

So it's a very educational way of getting further into this space and working with other people in writing comments. You don't have to be a pen holder when you first come in, you can just be there, go to meetings, talk on the side on Skype or by email or whatever it is, and eventually you will be a pen holder, you will be able to manage going to certain working groups and understanding the situation and knowing exactly who to talk to when you need to ask questions.

And please go to policy calls because they're so important. You'd know so much more. So yes, let's all follow Rafik's advice that he gave me from day one, let's all read and just step up, be encouraged enough to just join a team and write even if you feel it's wrong, it's fine, there's always someone who will be looking back and fixing, so yes.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Elsa. This is Bruna again for the record. Indeed, public comments tend to help us understand way more what NCSG is talking about and doing around all the policy issues. So I'm closing up all the NCSG committee representatives, I'm going to give the floor to Thato. Thato, although our agenda says it's 15 minutes, can you do it in 10 just so we don't -because we have to stop at 2:30 with all NCUC discussions or just so we can give the floor to our invitees to this meeting.

Thato Mfikwe: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Bruna. I'll try and take 15 minutes. Basically I just want to provide a synopsis of the Finance Committee activities in the past 12 months. But number one, worth noting is that the Finance Committee has been having a limited number of participants whereas it's facing a huge load of work at the same time.

So one of the main activities that the Finance Committee has been working on, it's development of the Finance Committee operational procedures. And it has been experiencing some kind of resistance from the leaders and from (unintelligible) but now are also referring to the charter but I (unintelligible) because exhaust most of the time that I have been allocated.

So in regard to the Finance Committee one of its main roles is to fulfill the accounting and auditing function. Now when you're talking about accounting function, we're talking about providing oversight and ensuring the integrity of financial information that is provided. But now (unintelligible) in regard to that is that we don't necessarily receive financial information because currently before NCSG never had its own bank account but we've been engaging with the NCSG Executive Committee it seems like we are moving towards a positive direction now in terms of NCSG being able to have its own bank account.

And now there's also an issue of incorporation of NCSG because NCSG is not going to be incorporated because that was one of the things that the Finance Committee (unintelligible) to push to get NCSG registered to become a legal entity. So it won't be registered in order to avoid obligation that may come with that particular move.

And then secondly, there is this audit function. So the audit function involves scrutiny of financial information but now the audit function actually goes down to a point whereby we need to actually like check each thing every transaction that happens within NCSG. So those are some of the main challenges that we've been having as the Finance Committee.

So I will just take you through some of the areas that we've had some sort of consensus as the Finance Committee towards finalizing the operational procedures. But I won't necessarily cover the entire thing. Number one, the first thing that we agree as the Finance Committee is that the constituency says they're going to officially become the observers within the Finance

Committee, and then the constituencies themselves they can request for advice from the Finance Committee and the Finance Committee (unintelligible) can actually provide recommendations to the NCSG.

But whatever it is (unintelligible) it's non-binding, it is final decision, it needs to be made by either the constituency or NCSG itself. Another issue that we faced as the Finance Committee is that the Finance Committee needed to (unintelligible) being mainstreamed in ICANN and NCSG activities. So that is one of the things that we are fully trying to push but I believe that since we are having a new representative they will be able to (unintelligible) carry on with (unintelligible) finished.

So one of the issues, the main issues that we - has caused some sort of challenge in regards to the Finance Committee is that the way NCSG is structured we are not able to fully engage directly with the Executive Committee of NCSG because according to the charter the chair of NCSG is supposed to the treasurer and according to core objectives, treasurers are usually part of the Executive Committee.

So that was discussed I think two days back in a meeting with NCSG but I'm hoping that we'll be able to move forward in regard to that. So time to give you an overview in terms of the activities that we've been busy within the past 12 months.

We've been involved in the budget comment process in 2018 and 2019. And also on the IANA PTI plan and budget. We participated in the ICANN 62 outreach (unintelligible) NCUC (unintelligible) and then we've had several meetings online as the Finance Committee. We have developed a standardized template for ABR submission but it is not yet utilized.

But we are hoping that moving forward there will be a coordinated and a simple way of making sure that ABRs are submitted because when we look at ABRs themselves, you will note that back in 2018 I think there were four, if

I'm not mistaken, four ABRs that were submitted and they're all approved. But this year I think we had around nine ABRs that were submitted but only two approved. So I think (unintelligible) able to work on this, this will now - we can fully encourage or support the activities of constituencies and the stakeholder group itself.

The Finance Committee as I have mentioned, that it also has a role of the audit function and the audit function requires that the Finance Committee have a set level of autonomy because it's going to be difficult for the Finance Committee to provide those services if they cannot have that level of autonomy. Because failing to have that autonomy it means that the Finance Committee will probably have to agree with any proposal, any suggestion, any comment that is coming either from the constituency or from the stakeholder level.

So currently the Finance Committee (unintelligible) about seven members, we've got three members, each member is (unintelligible) constituency which is NPOC and NCUC and the NCSG is the ex-official member of NCSG. And then we've got the chairs of constituencies also as (unintelligible) and then we had the policy chair also joining in on the Finance Committee. So what we - we actually also developed an action plan and some of the things that we are hoping to do in the past 12 months (unintelligible), just a second.

Number 1, it was working on completion of the operating procedures and so we are (unintelligible) in advance stage of completing that but hopefully this process is not going to take another two years, hopefully it's going to be finalized within a year.

And then ABR checking and analysis, which is something that we've already done so the action plan that I'm actually talking about is also available on the wiki space. So if you are connected online a link will be shared there. I think Maryam has already shared that

And then we actually did an assessment of the ABRs themselves to see what are the nature of requests that are being submitted because mainly the requests that have been made, they are sent out (unintelligible) around capacity building and then but on Thursday, this coming Thursday, we will be having a meeting of the Finance Committee so that we have a clearer understanding of what are the needs once of the community so that we are able to support them better.

So the issue of the (unintelligible) account I think I've also mentioned but we (unintelligible). Yes, besides that, I don't know, Bruna, I hope I would get some questions if there are any because I don't know, I hope I've been (unintelligible) 10 minutes.

Bruna Santos: This is Bruna for the record. Again, thank you very much, Thato, for your intervention. We do - we're a bit out of time but then I see Amr's hand right in the back and I see Arsene as well. Can I just ask some questions to you guys? Thato has 30 minutes at the agenda of NCSG meeting, right?

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Yes, half an hour, so can we maybe ask those questions at the NCSG meeting? Thank you very much for understanding that. So I guess we can move on at our agenda just so we - we will have like more time to do the discussion on the Finance Committee on the next meeting.

And I apologize for everyone for not being a good time keeper on this. We were supposed to have 15 minutes for policy updates, now we have 35, so let's try - I'll ask all our speakers to be rather brief on this. And I guess we can move on to Robin up next, yes? Thank you very much, Robin.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me? Okay. Hi, this is Robin Gross for the record. So I've been working in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group for a couple of years now and have been a co-chair of one of the subgroups so on

the leadership team for that. In terms of where we are now, we have published the - the initial report and that went out for public comment. That came back and then we did - we divided the comments up into different subtopics and have been going through them literally comment by comment. And that piece was just completed in the last week or so.

And so now we've got Work Track 5 which also went out for public comment. And we've started to go out - we've started to go through those public comments as well. And of course Work Track 5 deals with the geographical - geographic names at the top level. And so we expect all of the various subgroups and Work Track 5 now to sort of merge together for a final report that is - will hopefully go out in third quarter of 2019, so maybe in just a few months from now.

And there are a couple of issues that have come up in the last few weeks that we are realizing we're going to need some discussion on before we finish everything up. And one is this idea of closure of a round and what does it mean to actually close a round that hasn't been clearly defined and we need a definition around that.

So it was very ambiguous in the last round whether that means for example you know, when the application process no longer accepts applications or when some of the follow up materials have been provided. You know, what actually counts as closing a round? So that's something that we have to work through in the next couple of months.

And the other issue that's come up that we need to talk about is an appeals process, a very specific appeals process that's only dealing with new gTLDs. The thinking is that the ICANN's traditional accountability mechanisms are not really adequate for dealing with the new gTLD process.

One thing we learned in the last round was that, you know, all of - there were tons and tons of reconsideration requests and, you know, it just really ate up

all of ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms and they didn't really address the new gTLD issue specifically so the thinking is we need to have some kind of an appeals process that deals specifically with the new gTLD process.

And so these are a couple issues that have come up in the last little while that we're realizing we need to put some meat on those bones before we have the final report. And yes, so that's pretty much where we are on that. I don't know if anybody has any questions or concerns?

Kathy Kleiman: I'm not going to stop the process. This is Kathy Kleiman. Just to say that we're going to be talking about this in more detail during the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group. We're going to be kind of going through as a member of Subsequent Procedures, you know, kind of some of the issues that I'm seeing that might be useful to have NCSG input on and the NCUC. But I also wanted to thank Robin. She's dedicated, what, three years now to this working group.

Robin Gross: And Avri promised me it'd only be six months.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Thanks, Robin. And just a question, and in fact I'll probably have similar question for the other policy updates because I'm not following the work closely. I always struggle to do that but now NomCom is a good excuse. But just what are the bottom lines? I mean, just generally what do you think from the Noncommercial Constituency, User Constituency perspective, what are the issues? What are the - what are the things that we should be watching out for? What are the warning alarm bells that are ringing that as a Non Commercial Constituency we should be looking at out for not just - sorry, yes.

Robin Gross: I'm really glad you've asked that because one of the issues is that has come back since public comment came out was we got tons and tons of comment from - comments from members of the Intellectual Property Constituency that are very much concerned that the freedom of expression is going to

somehow cut into trademark rights. And so they're really wanting to sort of narrow down the freedom of expression protections and beef up trademark protections.

And that's something that we're going to have - we as a stakeholder group or constituency I think we're going to want to submit some comments on and be pretty vocal on because you know, like I say, we've just been reviewing these comments now and there's a lot of them and they're from the IPC so we know we're going to have to fight back on that issue. I think that's probably one of the most important.

And the other of course deals with Work Track 5 and geographic names and the extent to which people are going to have freedom of expression rights to use words that, you know, governments might want to control.

And that's one's been pretty contentious and I don't think there's actually going to be a ton of changes in the rules on that issue from that we had the last time just because there's not a lot of consensus and the rule is if you can't have consensus to change something the default is it'll be the way it was last time.

So I don't think there's going to be tons of changes on that issue as well, so it could have been a lot worse or could, you know, could have been a lot worse and I think it's going to actually end up being, but it is something that, you know, we need to pay attention to and sort of see what happens in the next couple of months as we deal with those comments that have come back. And like I say, we just started to go through the Work Track 5 comments so, you know, now is a good time to pay attention to that particular issue.

Bruna Santos: Arsene, I know you were in the queue but if you want - yes. Okay. Thank you very much. So I guess we can move onto the RPMs Working Group. I don't know whether it's Michael or Kathy? Michael, okay. You have…

Michael Karanicolas: We have slides.

Bruna Santos: You have five minutes?

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Can you do slides in five minutes?

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Five minutes.

Michael Karanicolas: All right we're going to move fast. Slides please. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Karanicolas: My time hasn't started yet.

Bruna Santos: Well while the…

Michael Karanicolas: While it's going I'll just give my introduction. So the Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group - the RPMs Working Group studies right protection mechanisms here at ICANN. This presentation is going to start with a quick overview of how we got to where we are and then introduce the issues that are currently being looked at.

So trademarks and domain names have been an issue since the very beginnings of ICANN. And a lot of the conflict, a lot of the debates, as you're hearing, focus on trademark - debates around trademark. In terms of understanding the RPMs Working Group, a key stating point is the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, which was created in order to allow a sort of quicker administrative remedy for trademark claims.

There it is. Okay, so could we go down? Yes, that's me on the right. And one more further down please. Great. Great. All right so the UDRP was created to allow intellectual property holders an avenue to take down cases of cyber squatting where somebody else would take a domain name belonging to a famous mark like Panavision or American Airlines.

And the reason why it's problematic, and the reason why it gets complicated very early on is because you have a lot of famous trademarks which correspond to dictionary words, generic words or common names like McDonalds or Delta or Wendy's. So, you know, you have the company which owns that trademark saying nobody else can have a domain name that says Wendy because that's our mark. And of course anybody named Wendy is going to have a major problem with that because they're obviously going to want their own domain name that has Wendy in it.

So that's one of the conflicts between legitimate IP - between IP enforcement and fair use. And part of the reason why it gets so complicated is that trademarks are inherently contextual. When you see them in the real world a trademark is usually applied to a specific product, generally in a specific jurisdiction. Protections are limited, the protections that the trademark offers are limited to a particular context.

But in the domain name space it's just the word without that context. So it's a difficult kind of circle to square between the legitimate interest that's there in having and protecting that trademark, and how to translate that inherently contextual thing into the context of the domain name space.

So the UDRP, so in response to that challenge, slide please, in response to that challenge advocates of fair use and freedom of expression have come up with this concept called the right to words which basically says that dictionary words belong to everyone and that just because you have a trademark in Delta or Fox or Apple or Mini, that doesn't mean you have exclusive right to use that word on the Internet.

Slide please. So…

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: …nonverbal, you know, and noncommercials in ICANN are the (unintelligible).

Anriette Esterhuysen: It's one of the big battles.

Michael Karanicolas: Yes. So individuals, noncommercial organizations, you know, there are ongoing battles over the extent of trademark interests and it's a constant back and forth as Kathy just mentioned, between noncommercial interests that are arguing for fair use and for registrants to be able to use common words themselves and IP rights that are trying to expand the scope of trademark protections.

Slide. So the UDRP itself is for many years was the main mechanism where these battles were taking place, but when the gTLD expansion took place and we went from just seven different top level domains to the hundreds that we have now, the IP industry - there were a number of concessions made to the IP constituency - the Intellectual Property Constituency as a result of that.

I know those included the Trademark Clearinghouse, which is a centralized database to registry trademarks, which facilitates two special trademark enforcement tools, the sunrise period which means when a new top level domain opens up brand owners that have a registered brand in the Trademark Clearinghouse get first dibs on registering a domain name connected to that mark.

And trademark claims, which means that when anybody else tries to register that mark you get a little notice saying hey, I know - I see you're trying to register this mark, did you know that you could lose it at the end because

there are trademark interests in it? So both of which are problematic from a freedom of expression perspective.

Slide. But there were certain safeguards built into that, including that the Trademark Clearinghouse originally - as originally intended was supposed to be open and transparent. And also there were limitations - and that it was meant to only accept word marks and not design marks. So there are trademarks which are protectable by virtue of being part of a fancy or ornate design, not just the word itself.

So the Clearinghouse was only meant to accept word marks, as well as limitations on the sunrise period, limitations on what kind of notifications were offered through the trademark claims notice. Slide please.

I'm on Slide 8 and I have 12. I will go fast now. So we can go to the next slide because this is all just history lessons. Let's focus on…

((Crosstalk))

Michael Karanicolas: Three wonderful people who are involved in this debate are in this room, Kathy Kleiman, Robin Gross and Wendy Seltzer. So they will correct me as I inevitably get aspects of this wrong. But we can move to the next slide. And one more. So to the present day where right now the Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group is re-examining these different things including the sunrise, registration period, the UDRP, the URS, which is a faster tracked version of the UDRP.

The UDRP itself is supposed to be faster and quicker and cheaper than going to court, which is the normal remedy, but it's still not fast and quick and cheap enough so there's an even more fast track version that was made available called the URS. And so as part of the RPMs Working Group we're not re-examining these and suggesting recommendations for how they should be improved.

And some of these main areas that are up to debate, that are up for debate include some of those things I alluded to earlier which are problems with how the Trademark Clearinghouse has drifted since it was created. Remember how I said it was supposed to be open and transparent? Funny story, it's not; it's entirely secret. Every trademark database in the world is open but the Trademark Clearinghouse, which is a database of protected trademarks, is entirely secret because there are arguments that disclosing that would violate commercial confidentiality even though these are all publicly registered trademarks.

You know, there are arguments among IP stakeholders to further expand scope of trademark protections beyond exact matches into close matches. So, you know, you get to the point where Google could stop people from registering domain names for goggles, that kind of stuff. And there is also - in parallel to this but not - I don't think within the ambit of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group, there is something called the Domain Protected - Donuts's Domain Protected Marks List, am I getting the acronym right?

Okay, so the DPML is basically a privately administrated trademark protection mechanisms that's run by Donuts which is the world's largest registry with 240 different top level domains that basically said if you're a brand owner you can pay them and it prevents other folks - it means that you basically have exclusivity over that brand name across all of the different top level domains that they have.

I think this is outside of the ambit of the RPMs because it's not, it is, it isn't?

Kathy Kleiman: There's questions we're looking at.

Michael Karanicolas: Well there's questions. All right, so it's not as close to our wheelhouse as the other areas but it's still very relevant insofar as it is a rights protection

mechanism. So I see Bruna reaching for her microphone so thank you very much for that. And let's have some wonderful Q&A if there's time.

Bruna Santos: Thank you, Michael. I'm going to take one question maybe because we'll have the opportunity of the policy discussion again at the NCSG meeting. The idea here was for a short introduction so - but yes.

(Amber Craig): I'm (Amber) from New Zealand. I had a question around this and around the cultural aspects of right of words because a lot of our culture and a lot of our language is linked into our culture. So I guess how is that kind of taken into this because I know that these examples where (Menuca) is a native tree for us and part of our health for our indigenous people back in New Zealand but we have Australia trying to trademark that. So how do you see that kind of working?

Michael Karanicolas: Hi, this is Michael Karanicolas again for the record. So as far as I know those kinds of traditional cultural intellectual property rights are not respected as part of the system. And part of the reason for that or maybe the entire reason for that is because the advocacy for trademark interests here at ICANN tends to be from a fairly well organized lobby or group of lobbyists that are funded by the brand - by big brands. Very well funded by big brands.

And so there's not - that hasn't been part of the - what you're framing at the moment sounds to me like an argument for protection of a particular area and that's not an argument that gets voted because of the nature of the people that are arguing on the pro IP side. Now that being said, I'm also hearing, I think a fair use argument.

I think there's a very strong fair use argument behind what you say insofar as I assume you wouldn't want to advocate for a situation where only one company or only one person would be allowed to use that word in the domain name space. So that's the way that the current rights protection mechanisms are frame worked push towards that monopolization where there's one

person that gets to use it or decides who gets to use it. So, you know, if - the applicability of it and how it would shake out kind of depends on how the right is expressed. Yes.

(Amber Craig): I guess - and sorry, in our culture it's not necessarily one person but it's one culture. So to have our language used with beer products when it's a special (tonga) for us like a treasure, is quite offensive to us I guess, you know, that kind of takes into account.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much for the question. I guess you, like if there is any other questions to ask Michael and Kathy will be here for the next meeting and you can reach out to both of them on this discussion as well. Thanks, Michael. I guess we can move on and back to our agenda. We have 15 more minute and three policy topics to cover. One of them is the EPDP, which will be - might be the one that will be - that will take the longest, but then I'll give the floor to Ayden, yes.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks for that, Bruna. Hi, everyone. This is Ayden. And I'm going to keep this really brief just to five minutes, and of course we can talk about this in the next session as well. Also in the room is Amr, Dave and Stephanie who are also members or alternates of the EPDP for the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group. So if I do happen to misspeak, please do take the mic and correct me.

So what you might remember, the EPDP, the Expedited Policy Development Process, is essentially the Whois reform effort that has been underway. And you might remember if you've joined some of our Policy Committee calls, or our meeting in Barcelona, that we said that there had been this persistent cleavage between stakeholder groups representing noncommercial interests and the contracted parties on the one hand, and on the other stakeholder groups representing the Government Advisory Committee and also business interests.

And we had said back in Barcelona that it seemed unlikely that we would come out of this process with any form of consensus. It seemed very unlikely, and yet we have. So over the past seven months the EPDP team has been working very hard. Some weeks as many as 15 hours of calls and Phase 1 final report was recently published and adopted by the GNSO Council on which we did have consensus in over 20 recommendations.

And so that is a really great achievement. And I think there's a lot of things in there that we'll be really happy about in terms of how we've been able to ensure that what ICANN terms nonpublic registration data or what you might - personal information, is no longer simply out in the wild for anyone to harvest or retrieve or to archive for whatever purposes they may desire.

And so this is a really big achievement and I think for the most part while we did have to give up some things and Farzaneh is in the process at the moment of documenting where it is that we did actually negotiate and what it is that we did give up because there is a perception among some stakeholder groups that we got everything we want in this report. And while that's a very favorable - it sounds very favorable to us and we do like a lot of the report, we didn't quite get everything. But it is what it is.

That there is still a few issues that remain and I won't go into Phase 2, we might keep that for the next meeting. But there are a few things that are not yet resolved and one is who is the data controller? We still haven't reached - ICANN has been a bit behind the curve on understanding what its roles and responsibilities are as the data controller.

And there hasn't been a lot of progress made on that front yet. ICANN did publish a legal memo in January that ICANN Legal does not seem to give much weight to either. And it makes some rather convoluted arguments essentially stating that ICANN might possibly be a co-controller or it might not be. You can read it - there's a sort of a picture and adventure type of situation in that legal memo.

There is also the case that the temporary specification will be expiring soon, and so what will be the replacement only perhaps an hour ago I see that the contracted parties have sent a proposal through to the EPDP team mailing list with one potential path forward. And so we don't know what this bridging method is - bridging policy will be between when the temporary specification expires and when the final report recommendations are actually implemented by. We don't know what that is going to look like.

And most disturbingly is there is this parallel process underway to undermine the EPDP. So you may heard that there is a Technical Study Group that ICANN Org unilaterally launched by - the CEO himself launched it last year. We haven't had a liaison to it. We don't know what it's up to. Its transcripts are not very descriptive. They meet in closed environments, they publish blog posts with photographs that have more people in the photos than there are members of the team so you don't really know who they're meeting with.

And so we're very unclear as to what this Technical Study Group is up to. We had our first briefing there two days ago and they seem to have integrated some policy assumptions into the technical model that they've been developing. And so we are very worried about what could be happening on that front.

But I see Stephanie has her hand raised so perhaps Stephanie can add a few comments there.

Stephanie Perrin: I just wanted to interrupt you to say that they are coming to the NCSG meeting to brief us at 5:30, so be there or be square, folks.

Ayden Férdeline: Well that is very useful to know actually because we do have a lot of unanswered questions. And I guess the problem that we always saw is that it seems - it seemed impossible to us to imagine how a Technical Study Group

could make technical-defined decisions in the absence of an agreed policy. I mean, what - how do you build a system that way?

And our concern was that so-called technical decisions could become policy decisions and that is something that we were very uncomfortable with. A lot of issues with this Technical Study Group. It is not the most diverse body that you will see at ICANN but that is a - another issue.

But for now I think I will leave the summary there. The final report is - you're able to read it if you like. It's currently open for public comment for 40 days and then the ICANN Board will be reviewing comments that are received and hopefully they will be adopting the recommendations as-is. If there are any questions I'm more than happy to take them. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. First, thank you. The EPDP that's been living, breathing, this for so many months. If the public comment is open, what would be useful for you to hear as public comment?

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks for the question, Kathy. This is Ayden. And again, other EPDP members feel free to respond. What I would like to see is supporting the recommendations that have been proposed because again, they're not perfect, we did not get everything that we wanted and certainly in the NCSG comment that we submit I hope it was suggested yesterday during the Policy Committee meeting that I hope that we make it clear we did not get everything we want but that we're happy to accept the final outcome and that we will note what we did not get but accepting the final outcome.

We are aware that the Intellectual Property Constituency and the Business Constituency has been speaking to the Board. They did this only in the past hour or so asking that changes be made by the Board to the final recommendations. Hopefully that is just wishful thinking on their part and it won't actually happen. But I think we would be very concerned about that. We would like to preserve the integrity of the GNSO to be able to develop

consensus policy, we would like these recommendations that were negotiated by most people in good faith to be - to be adopted as-is. Thanks.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Ayden, for the intervention. I guess we can move on then with the agenda, or yes, hope so. Last - almost last in the - one of our five policy updates we have now Colin with a little briefing on the Cross Community Working Party in Human Rights. Colin, you have the floor.

Colin Kurre: Hi, there. Yes, my name is Colin Kurre. The Cross Committee Working Party on ICANN and Human Rights is housed within the NCSG but it is a cross community working party so it's open to any interested member of the ICANN community.

So a lot of our work in the past has revolved around the - ICANN's human right core value which was passed in 2016 and it mandates that ICANN will respect internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law. Unfortunately that bylaw has not been affected yet because it is part of the giant package of Work Stream 2 recommendations on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability.

So it looks like that's not going to be approved by the Board until sometime next year, fingers crossed. But in the meantime we in our little working party have been working to develop new mechanisms for implementing this core value if and when it comes to effect, because as part of the framework of interpretation that was developed in Work Stream 2, it says that each SO and AC will create its own mechanisms for living up to this bylaw.

So we started with the GNSO because that's where we operate, you know, that's what we're most familiar with. We began looking at different models for human rights impact assessments and how they might be applied to policy development processes in the GNSO. And I'm not going to go into too much detail because we've actually got a session tomorrow at 10:30 in Lilac so if you're interested in this work then you can come tomorrow and I will do kind

of a little retrospective on the different models that we put forth, how they've evolved and what we're working with now.

But I will say, branching off of Robin's presentation, that the most recent model we got something that we thought was ready to trial, ready to demo, and we applied it to those Subsequent Procedures policy development process over the winter, so from December through February. And we learned a lot through that, we learned a lot about the Subsequent Procedures policy development process. And we learned about our own model.

The big takeaway was that it sucked, our model, so we made a new model while we were doing this demo, and we really like this new model and we think that this one is a good one.

So and I think that we've already had a little bit of proof of concept because during the Subsequent Procedures meeting on Sunday we were able to identify a lot of concerns that we kind of fleshed out in this model and make a few recommendations that seems to resonate really well with the long-time - more long-time members of the working group. So that just goes to show that, you know, there is a role for people, you know, for outsiders.

It was - there was a comment that was made recently on the list by Jamie Baxter from dotGay about there is some, you know, real expertise and things that come, you know, you don't need necessarily to have a lot of years in ICANN for your voice to be useful or for your voice to feed into the process, so these things - these new mechanisms and tools that we're trying to develop in the working party are also ways to allow that to happen more.

And this isn't the only thing we're doing; it's the thing that's occupying a lot of our time right now. But in the past we've worked on - we've had a lot of focus on transparency issues or on diversity issues, so again, this is a - this working party is open to anyone who's interested. And if you have a specific concern or, you know, a project idea, then this is - this little think tank is a platform for

you to come and entertain your thoughts. And if you'd like to have a (unintelligible) on our Web site or anything like that then please get in touch. I'll be around all week. I'm Colin Kurre. Colin@article19@org. Thanks.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much, Colin, for the very brief intervention. We might have time for one question for you so does anyone want to ask a question? Go ahead.

(Amber Craig): I have a question around how the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, is that included within the Human Rights aspect or…

Colin Kurre: Yes.

(Amber Craig): Okay cool. So it's like a subcategory of it that you're…

Colin Kurre: So we don't - so we typically look at the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and then the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. That's been the primary focus in the past. However, we are not exclusive, we've looked at economic, social and cultural rights, we've looked at - we haven't thought about indigenous rights probably as much as we should have in the past because we were kind of starting to build a working party from the ground up.

So that's why we started with corporate social responsibility in the beginning as kind of a foot in the door and then expanded it out to the - sorry the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But as we move into a more mature phase of our work I think that this would be an appropriate time to start looking at things like indigenous rights.

Bruna Santos: Awesome. Thank you, Colin and thanks for the intervention. I guess we can go on then to our last subject before we welcome the Global Commission and Stability of Cyberspace. So Michael, you have the microphone once again. And you have five minutes.

Michael Karanicolas: I have 20 minutes of slides. No. I don't have slides for this because there's actually not a huge amount to present because the ATRT 3 process is only just getting started. ATRT 3 stands for the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. You can tell I'm new to it because I had to look at the acronym.

And so basically we're going to be looking at a package of issues related to accountability and hopefully transparency. Transparency is not something that has been added to our list of issues that we're looking at very clearly so far, which is one of the things that I'm working on right now.

In terms of - so it's a year-long review that's going to be officially getting going at the beginning of April. The - we've had a few kind of remote meetings on the issues thus far mostly just to establish our work plan and how we're going to set the work out.

The noncommercial perspective is represented by myself, as well as Wolfgang. So if you have anything to add it would be very welcome. But fundamentally this is going to be a year-long review that's going to look at ICANN's accountability, decision making processes, and hopefully some aspects of transparency and presenting recommendations - I'm not sure, and we're just getting going.

So if there are any other - if you have anything to add, it would be very welcome, and if there are any questions we can do that briefly, or we can also move on because I know we were a bit behind.

Bruna Santos: Does anyone want to ask a questions or add anything? No? Am I right? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Yes, very good presentation, Michael.

Michael Karanicolas: Flew by.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very, very much. Thanks for all our policy focal points so far who have - did a short iteration and presentation here. Apologies for not, once again, not keeping tine very well. These are like obviously very long discussions that it's almost impossible to sum up in five minutes so, I mean, I do know that this is not really nice for discussions so far.

But then going to the last item in our agenda, NCUC is welcoming the Global Commission on the Stability of Cyberspace. This is an initiative of the Commission of - with regards to outreach to the ICANN community. And I guess I'll give the floor to Anriette, right now. And we have some more commissioners here, right? I guess if you guys want to come to the table or we can also have the mic as well. So…

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Yes, of course.

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Thanks very much, Bruna. So just for the record again, I'm Anriette Esterhuysen. I am an NCUC member for a long time and a member of the Commission. And thank you very much. I know how precious your time is here so thank you very much for giving us this time. And we would like to share our work with you. And we'd like to get your feedback on it. And I think if you want to raise some of your ongoing policy concerns as part of that feedback, so much the better.

So I'd like the other commissioners who are here to introduce themselves starting with Wolfgang who organized this session for us in the first place.

Wolfgang, do you want to - where's Olaf? Oh there you are. Just if the other commissioners at the table can briefly introduce themselves?

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Wolfgang Kleinwächter. I'm with this community for many, many years. And I think we have, after being now in the Global Commission I have identified that there are overlapping interests even if ICANN has a very limited technical mandate, it operates in a broader political environment and as in the human rights field, so ICANN would be better advised if they ignored development in the broader environment and insofar to be not the leader as Fadi Chehadé was the leader in global Internet governance development but to be a participant in this global discussion.

This is important for ICANN and insofar I think I'm very happy that we can build now bridges between the Global Commission and various constituencies of ICANN.

Abdul-Hakeem Ajijola: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Abdul-Hakeem Ajijola. I'm one of the commissioners of the Global Commission but I'm also one of the founders of the Organization of Islamic Countries Computer Emergency Response Team, and I'm also a member of the Stop Online Child Abuse Material. So that's my history. Thank you.

Olaf Kolkman: Olaf Kolkman, I'm the Chief Internet Technology Officer at the Internet Society. I am - I have a background actually in DNS protocol development and software development so I'm somewhat familiar with the ICANN world from the technical perspective.

I'm one of the people with technical background. Abdul is also one of the people with more technical background on the Commission. Commission has commissioners from east, west, south, and north and also from various backgrounds, technical background, academic background like Wolfgang, civil society, but also certified spooks and diplomats and ex foreign ministers.

While - so it has a multistakeholder - yes, how would I say it? It's multistakeholder composition, although we do not necessarily - we represent specific stakeholder groups. And that is I think the reason why we're here. We meet at several places to actually get input from groups that might have interest in the work of the Commission. And over to Anriette.

Anriette Esterhuysen: And thanks. And I am from the Association for Progressive Communications and I would be one of the two commissioners who come to the Commission with a human rights background. And I think I'm probably the only - well me and Wolfgang both come from the Internet governance background. So to briefly tell you about the Commission, that's our mandate or our mission statement is to engage the full range of stakeholders, to develop proposals for norms and policies to enhance international security and stability and guide responsible state and non-state behaviors.

That's why we're here. You are among those stakeholders that we want to consult and get feedback on - in our work. And ICANN being ICANN we have to have this consultation with different parts of ICANN. This week we've met with SSAC, we've met with the Board, we've met with At Large, and there's been several bilaterals as well.

So basically - can we move onto the next slide? The Commission was launched - it has a limited term, it was launched in 2017 very much in the context of the group of governmental experts, which is an intergovernmental process within the United Nations General Assembly First Committee to look at cyber security. And I don't know how many of you follow that, but basically what happened was that governments couldn't agree, so this is an ongoing process and previous meetings they actually agreed on some norms.

But 2016 and 2017 they really failed to agree. And we felt that that actually puts the security of the Internet and of cyberspace and of the world actually at risk if governments can't agree on how to avoid massive cyber war, breakdown. And so we felt if we wanted to come into this space, work in a

multistakeholder way, different from what the UN was doing, to come up with norms that would guide responsible behavior.

And what we've done so far is we've looked at a definition of cyber stability and I think you'll see it on a later slide, we've developed some principles - overarching principles, the multistakeholder approach would be one of those important principles, we are looking at the sort of overall security architecture and we have developed norms.

Now we haven't completed our work in all of these areas, we'll finish our work at the end of this year, so we've really thus far focused on the definition, the principles, and the norms. And there's one norm which we feel is particularly relevant to the ICANN community. Can we have the next slide?

This is the norms that we've - or this is how we've developed norms. Actually let's move on. Try and run a bit more quickly. Next slide please. So we've got I think six norms - or no, a few more, how many norms have we developed so far? Eight norms.

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: So the first norm that we worked on, and that's the one we really would like your feedback on, is the call to protect the public core of the Internet. And I'll read it. So the core is that without prejudice to their rights and obligations, state and non state actors should not conduct or knowingly allow activity that intentionally and substantially damages the general availability or integrity of the public core of the Internet and therefore the stability of cyberspace.

And maybe to make this list abstract, you know, we - in the context at the moment where several governments are developing cyber-offense strategies and capacities. They're doing it whether we like it or not, whether we believe the Internet should be for peace or not. This is actually happening. Some of them are doing it more transparently than others.

So the idea behind this norm is just that we want to send the message and get buy-in and that this becomes a norm that if people violate this there can be informally and formally be held accountable, that they don't attack that core. And if you look at our documents or our Web site you'll find that we actually include the DNS, the DNS system, the basic routing system. That is part of what we see is the public core of the Internet.

Also the undersea cable, fiber optic infrastructure that enables the sort of global connected interoperable network is also part of that core. And the core protocols as well, the Internet protocol, the protocols that allow the interoperability of the Internet is - are also part of - we see it as part of that core.

And this is the norm we feel actually really asserts the public-ness of the work that ICANN does as well and that's why we think there is a relevance here for ICANN to look at this norm and consider whether you either as your constituencies or recommend, I'm not suggesting you start a PDP, absolutely not. But this is something that might resonate as a norm to endorse for ICANN.

Let's move on to the next slide. These are the other norms. I won't go in detail. You can ask us more about them. There's the norm to avoid tampering. This - a lot of the, I mean, some of this you'll know that recent data breaches and security breaches has happened in the last five years are what we're trying to address with these norms.

Tampering is - state and non state actors should not tamper with products and services and development and production or allow them to be tampered with if doing so may substantially impair the stability of cyberspace. One of my fellow commissioners, you want to mention an example of that, just to illustrate what that norm is?

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, so one of the - one of the ideas behind this is building backdoors in products core home type of features. But for instance also the tampering in standardization process, it's well know that there is a NIST standard for elliptic curves where the mathematical parameters were tweaked in such a way which people found after the fact, that decryption of encrypted material would become a little bit more easier. And it's that type of tampering in the production chain that is addressed by this norm.

Once the devices and materials are out in the field, then the next norm becomes important. And the next norm is really inspired essentially by IoT, by IoT devices that can be compromised en masse. But it's written down in a much more broader sense. It's a norm against commandeering of ICT devices into botnets. So there is a scale and proportionality here implied by the norm and that is also a bit of a result of the negotiation that we have with state actors in the room.

For instance, compromising ICT devices for very particular operations for instance by law enforcement, is something that is allowed by this norm, so that type of negotiation already happened in our room. And the reason for that is that we believe that the set of norms needs to be adopted by a board set of stakeholders. Just to go into a little bit of an example here. Anriette.

Anriette Esterhuysen: I think let's move on. So that's the internet of things norm. This one we don't have to discuss it in detail. But it's about the disclosure of vulnerabilities and assessing whether there are vulnerabilities in software products. Often, governments know about those vulnerabilities and they use them. Often companies don't disclose that - don't disclose those vulnerabilities I mean, you can kind of understand often why they often only discover those vulnerabilities after the fact.

But the norm here is that there should be processes around assessing and disclosure of those vulnerabilities in software products. The classical example

here is Adobe. I don't know how many of you were aware of all the vulnerabilities that were in Adobe and that we all lived with for many years.

Let's move on to the next slide.

Olaf Kolkman: And the default presumption is here, incredibly important because that…

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yes.

Olaf Kolkman: …because that keeps us safe.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yes.

Olaf Kolkman: The presumption that states should disclose in a coordinated fashion…

((Crosstalk))

Olaf Kolkman: …find vulnerabilities, that they find so that we get a more secure infrastructure - public space.

Anriette Esterhuysen: And the next one, the next slide please. Yes, I mean, that's a related norm on vulnerabilities. Then there's the norm on basic cyber hygiene, I mean, that's often the language we would often use in this community is digital security, safe and secure use of the Internet.

And then a norm against offensive cyber operations by non-state actors, and this is - I'll read it because it's - there's a subtlety here, "Non state actors should not engage in offensive cyber operations and state actors should prevent and respond to such activities if they occur." In reality what often happens is that state actors dissociate themselves from so-called non state actors that operate from within their jurisdiction. So we're trying to get at that with that norm.

And then…

Olaf Kolkman: This is basically a norm against hack-back.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yes. And the next slide. Just - and I think we can actually close on this slide. I'll tell you a little bit about our future work. This is our definition of stability in cyberspace. It's the condition where state and non state actors are confident in their ability to use cyberspace safely and securely and where the availability and integrity of service in cyberspace is generally assured. It's quite a broad definition.

And then I'll just finish with where we are now. So our work will end at the end of this year. Cyber security of course is a huge area and there's a lot happening within the intergovernmental space, there are two processes that are starting this year, the Russian government whose long game really is the cyber security treaty have started a process called the Open Ended Working Group in the UN.

They also have a resolution on cybercrime and both those processes will be playing themselves out in the UN General Assembly over the next few years. And it might or might not result, we don't know what it will result in, but their end game is they would like a treaty. There's another process in the UN, the Group of Governmental Experts are starting again. And they will be working really looking at how, to put it in my own words, how the law of war applies to cyberspace.

And international - they are sets of laws here which they look at, there's international humanitarian law, which is basically the law of war; how do you behave if - well when there's war and conflict. And then there's also international human rights law. And one of our contributions to this is increasingly to say to them you have to look not just at international humanitarian law but also international human rights law.

We hope that our work will inform those processes. Our report will be out early next year. We've already had some impact. The European Parliament has adopted the public core norm, the protection of the public core of the Internet. The Paris core, which some of you might know of if you were at the IGF last year which I think around 80 plus governments have signed onto.

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Sixty governments and several non-state actors, include six of our norms, I think I addressed in the Paris core. So and then we are working with groups like ICANN, encouraging ICANN and ICANN constituencies to consider adoption or endorsement of those norms. We'll be at RightsCon to address the digital rights community. We'll do an outreach in Africa with African governments in October at the Africa Union Commission.

We're collaborating with the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise, and the Global Conference on Cyber Security which is sometimes known as the London Process, which is a cyber security collaborative process. And that's really it. We're not planning to build an institution. We don't want to build a new empire. We just wanted to bring a multistakeholder critical thinking process to this area of cyber security and cyber stability and then leave some kind of legacy with others who are working in this area to use our work, to be influenced by it and to build on it.

And I will leave it at that and unless the other commissioners want to add something, or should we go to questions first? Okay, Olaf.

Olaf Kolkman: Let's just be explicit. I think that the ask for the constituency here is to have a look at the norms. One of the things about this package is that we present several - there is severability in these norms. It's not like take them all. Actually in many you pick and choose. It's a buffet, yes, indeed. Yes, yes. And you can have your own tasting strategy.

But more seriously, yes, have your own tasting and if you think this is a - this is something by which if the ICANN community endorses this, makes the Internet a little bit more safe because the ICANN community says actually we are ready to live by these norms, and we're really to promote these norms, then that will be a good thing. So that is essentially the underlying question why we are here walking around trying to get constituencies saying thumbs up. Wolfgang, is that…

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Yes. I would prefer to get questions from the floor and then we can reply.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much for the intervention. I am taking the names and like forming up a queue and I have Colin, Michael, Elsa, Louise, Stephanie, maybe Stephanie and Louise because Stephanie was here, who else? David. Okay. Colin, you're up.

Colin Kurre: So this is a super quick question, so it could just be a yes or no answer. But I know that the Internet Society was doing quite a lot of work on the Internet invariance and trying to prevent legislation or regulation that would be harmful to core functions of the Internet. So I wanted to know if there was any articulation between this work and that ongoing work?

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: I'm thinking very hard how to answer this. Yes, it - well I think it's important, yes. The - I usually call these things a central dogma of the Internet Society so to speak, the invariance. And obviously that has informed our position and specifically on the public core norm. It is - that is right. And yes, we're actually reviewing the Internet invariance at this very moment.

Bruna Santos: Yes, maybe it's interesting for us to take two questions at a time and then, yes, then Michael and then up next is Elsa.

Michael Karanicolas: So thanks so much for that presentation. That was fascinating. And this is - I find this to be a really interesting initiative. I would love to dig more deeply

into a lot of the terms that were used in the last - in some of these principles like whether infrastructure essential to elections includes the mass media. And how you define basic cyber hygiene, because as someone whose background is working a lot on freedom of expression laws, what one country would consider to be basic cyber hygiene, others would consider to be horrendously repressive.

And to add an area that might not be on your radar screen, although this is very tricky to address, arms control and the idea of exporting these technologies from democratic countries like Italy and Germany and Canada where these technologies are developed to repressive countries. Maybe that's beyond your mandate but that's a huge issue that could potentially be looked into and I think that there's a strong need for international collaboration.

But there is one more thing that I wanted to add in terms of the challenges I see in implementing this. I'm not sure if you guys have been patched into the Digital Geneva Convention Initiative that was also taking place, so I spoke to them at RightsCon earlier this year and the thing that I had said to them, which I'll repeat now, when I was in law school I had a professor who was a former prosecutor at the International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia.

And he used to say that the laws of war operate at the rear guard of military efficacy. By which he would mean, it's very easy to get countries to sign a treaty that says they're not going to use serrated spears because the military efficacy of these technologies drops very low by the time you start to get strong consensus in the international community against their use.

The idea of getting a country to sign onto something that creates a real military disadvantage, or to be more precise, requires them to give up a military advantage that they have is very, very, very challenging and conventions that have tried to do that like around cluster munitions, have a mixed record. So I think this is an incredible initiative, it clearly - everything is

very well thought through and I'm really interested to see what comes next, but I just wanted to air that as a potential challenge which I'm sure is on your radar screen.

Elsa Saade: Thank you, Bruna, for the chance. And thank you for the presentation. This is the third time I see this presentation and I made some comments during the GNSO Council which I will not echo again today. But I have more technical questions though I really appreciate what Michael just mentioned. And just to add to what Michael just said before I go into the technicalities, I want to flag (Edmond Monseur) from UAE who's also known as the million dollar dissident, and who is targeted by European exported surveillance tools.

I can send you a report about him. He's currently in jail. And he's one of the most vocal human rights defenders in UAE. And he is being silenced. So these cases are extremely important cases to be highlighted and to be put on the radar when it comes to this work. And as much - as far as I understood from Wolfgang during the GNSO Council that human rights is a big aspect in this and I appreciate that.

So to go into the technicalities, I just - I'm just - I just want to say that you guys are very approachable and I had a long conversation with Abdul-Hakeem like an hour ago, which is very beneficial. So my question is, what is the timeline of this Commission in terms of when the norms are going to be finalized, what's - when do you envision the work to be done in terms of concrete outcomes?

And the second thing is, maybe in the presentation going forward it would be nice to know how this Commission got created maybe also know what sources of funding you guys have because this also affects the outcome of this Commission too. So these are my technical questions - practical questions I'd say. Thanks.

Bruna Santos: I had up next Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. This is very interesting. We certainly will discuss the report and the norms. My question is about enforceability and I come from Canada where amazingly we seem to have signed a trade agreement with China without a national security clause, it's going to cost us $1 billion to remove Hauwei Equipment and I imagine we're going to be under pressure from (unintelligible) to do that. That's just a fact that's in the newspapers, folks.

But if we don't move these norms into the trade arena, we're probably not the only ones who are signing trade agreements without proper national security protections. And so that's one issue, how do we enforce this?

Second question is any of this already in the cybercrime treaty? And is that a vehicle that might incorporate some of these things? And then the third - the third question that I think is has long been a concern for us looking after human rights groups, is the duty to protect, you know, what is the responsibility of any organization, and I look at my own university, in exposing by the use of a particular software, or the use of a product or even my dear government is letting people sign on using Facebook.

You know, cheaper than doing your own front gateway for a secure sign on. That's - to me that's endangerment and it is putting people at risk. I think your norms address this in part. How do we enforce it? Thanks.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay so let me start and then we can all add. So…

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: Yes it's just a follow up.

((Crosstalk))

Louise Marie Hurel: Yes, thank you. Louise here for the record. I think it's just a follow up on what Elsa started to unpack. And I think I've been following the work of the Commission since its inception, more academically but - and here my (unintelligible) ICANN I think my question is - I have two questions actually.

The first would be you talked about buy-in and obviously while the Commission was very much informed about from this debate on the norms development, on cyber norms development and how the GGE failed, and it came out of this - very much informed by this context, right, it was an opportunity to voice this and to have a multistakeholder kind of initiative, it's very good to see that on the cyber security side.

But I was just wondering how do you frame buy-in? Because buy-in is very different according to different stakeholder groups, right? It is easy for us to talk about the Paris call, as a potential buy-in because you're re-vocalizing these norms. But how do you understand civil society really taking on these norms and the buy-in from their side? I think that is more or less my question, how do you unpack this notion of buy-in?

And the second question is going back, well, to this, so you started out from the context of the GGE and you're pretty - as I see it, and please correct me if I'm wrong, the idea is to kind of inform in a certain way this process. So you're going back to where you started in a certain way, right?

So I was just wondering how do you think this convening with ICANN and this convening with the different constituencies can actually better inform how you go back to the - to this very tense moment of the Open Ended Working Group and the GGE? So how do you see specifically ICANN and the constituencies as you've been so far consulting with coming into this process at all? Yes. Thank you.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Thanks, Louise. Okay…

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Fellow commissioners will jump in. I just want to start with the question about funding because that is sort of an origins. The Commission and also the relationship with Microsoft and the Digital Tech Accord, so the Commission is supported by the Dutch government, by Microsoft is contributing, Afilias is contributing and several other governments have made contributions or hosted meetings, for example, Japan, the government of Japan is supporting our participation here at the moment. It's not coming out of ICANN resources.

So it's -but I would say that the initiator, the primary - and the primary supporter has been the Dutch government. And that's in the context of their support of - for the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise and the Global Conference on Cyber Security. So they've been investing and facilitating multistakeholder approaches to cyber security for quite a long time. And their support of the Commission's work, which is a time limited piece of work, also in that context.

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yes, yes.

Olaf Kolkman: Don't know if this works.

((Crosstalk))

Olaf Kolkman: Oh look at that. Perfect. So Internet Society also sponsors for clarity. Other names, Singapore, the French government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, the Globe (Sec) Conference, and then Black Hat, Packet Clearing House, Tel Aviv University, those are all names that are associated with the initiative and that's also on the Web site, all the sponsors and supporters are visible there.

And, yes, Estonia and the Netherlands were both members at the GGE when it failed so that is also one of the inspiring pieces.

Anriette Esterhuysen: And our secretariat institutions, at least one of them, is here in the room, I think, I don't know if (Luc) is here. So we also get enormous support from the East West Institute and the Hague Center which support our work.

So, Michael, the question about election infrastructure, no, it does include mass media. We very deliberately - our norm on elections doesn't cover - it covers the information systems that are used for elections particularly as more and more countries use electronically - or digital facilitated elections. We very consciously did not want to go into the whole so-called fake news, manipulation of information. So there are limitations to that norm.

And the question about basic cyber hygiene, I think that's one of our more controversial norms. We don't always agree on - that's something else to say about how we work as a Commission, individuals often drive and do the development of a particular norm. But the idea about the cyber hygiene, remember it's, you know, look at something like the National Health System bridge in the United Kingdom, for example, which affected, you know, hundreds of thousands of people.

We've tried to get the message, you know, that public sector infrastructure and public - governments, this norm addresses state actors in particular, they need to take digital security seriously. They deal with the data of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of citizens and they therefore need to be careful about how they manage those data and how they protect the systems that run that data. So that's really the idea there.

It's not intended to make individual users responsible for breaches that affect them but it is saying there need to be processes in place to ensure that

systems are up to date, that virus checkers are there, you know, it's quite simple.

Then the arms control issue is a really - it's a big issue and I think maybe Wolfgang can say more about that or Abdul-Hakeem. I think the dual use and export of technology is something that is beyond our mandate. One of our commissioners, Marietje Schaake, has been working on that within the European context for a very long time. So no, we haven't addressed that particularly. And maybe the others can comment on that.

I think the relationship with the Digital Geneva Convention, which no longer exists as a Digital Geneva Convention, what might - what emerged from that is the Digital Tech Accord which is an initiative of Microsoft to get companies to sign on and express a commitment that they only invest in cyber defense, that they're not putting money or creating products for cyber offense. So that's actually going quite well.

They have lots of companies that have signed onto that. And they have their own processes of review. Microsoft's also launching something which we will hear more - which you'll all hear about soon which is the Cyber Peace Institute which will do advocacy on stability and security in cyberspace as well as provide support for victims of cyber attacks, so - our time is up so let me just go very quickly.

So Elsa and Louise asked about the timeline and the GGE context. That's quite a long conversation. Our timeline is that we'll release our report - our norms are more less finalized, we might produce more norms but it's very unlikely. We are now looking at principles and Tatiana has her hand up. And we'll come up with a final report early next year.

And we'll be able to - also come to the IGF, come to RightsCon if you are there and we'll be able to tell you more. And Louise, just one tiny point on you saying we kind of started out of the GGE fairly and now we're feeding in.

There's one big difference between our norms and the GGE and that is that we are addressing state and non state actors. And we've tried to get the message and we're hoping that the GGE and the Open Ended Working Group will get this message that you cannot talk about stability and security in cyberspace just among governments, that that's just not how this space works.

So we are - I think I'll probably have to stop on that because your time is out and our time is up. And maybe those that have not had their questions responded to we can come back to later. Abdul-Hakeem has time with NCSG later on as well so maybe more time can be picked up there. But Bruna, with permission, can the other commissioners add anything if there's something they really feel that's important to say?

Bruna Santos: I guess so but we stopped the recording of this meeting because we have to start the NCSG one in six minutes so just so staff could be excused. But I guess, I mean, we still have two more people in queue, we had David and Tatiana…

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: So just to be clear that this is not going to be recorded because it stopped, right?

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Bruna Santos: So we're going to have the commissioners and then follow up to your questions. Okay?

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, on the point of adoption of the norms and the implementation of the norms, this is one of the things that we're sort of, you know, banging our heads together in the Commission, what is the next step? What are the recommendations that will lead to implementation of these - the norms? How do you track the implementation? How do you assess whether norms have been violated? How do you make people who do that make that transparent and accountable and all those type of things?

The problem of acceptance by the haves instead of the have-nots that is a well-known problem. Vulnerability equity processes, easy to say if you already have a stack of vulnerabilities in the backdoor, in the - in the back pocket. So no, this is a tricky thing. So I think that to some extent what you will see is that there is a tier of nations that will sign up and perhaps some of the haves might be the laggards. But if the pressure becomes high enough by, you know, just sheer volume that might need to change. So that's sort of the hope in the Commission. Or at least of me, I can't speak for the whole Commission.

Bruna Santos: David and Tatiana I guess, David was in queue.

David Cake: Yes so my question - I mean, specific, well first question is just specifically what would be ideal sort of response from us? What would you - is there a specific, you know, do you have sort of specific processes to collect feedback or would you just like us to, you know, promote them as they come and that sort of thing? And also it's sort of leaning into that, what do you expect this will lead to? I mean, what it mean if say ICANN you know, or ICANN accepted these norms and what would - what sort of processes would you expect to respond, you know, yes, where do we go from here?

Anriette Esterhuysen: Should I respond to that now? Is your question different or related, Tatiana?

Tatiana Tropina: Well I have a comment, I don't that a question.

Anriette Esterhuysen: Okay.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh maybe it will sound like a question, I don't know. Shall I? Okay so well thank you very much for being here. And I'm really glad to see that this well-known expert are participating in this initiative, and try to take norm-making on the next level. Some of you know how long I have been in this space and how long I have been dealing with cyber security from legal perspective. And just a comment, I do struggle to take serious some of the norm language.

I think it will relax legislative technique and I would like to make this comment especially in the context of ICANN since day zero, day minus one, we are talking about technology developing so quickly here at this meeting. And then I open the norm package and I read the norm. Commandeering of ICT devices into botnets. Botnet is a technology. Any norm should be technology-neutral. There is technology-neutral definition for botnets, automated attacking systems or something like this. It can be botnets, topnets, whatever tomorrow, you never know.

I'm just wondering, are you going to give this packager to someone who knows the legislative technique who can - a lawyer who can fine tune the language in a precise legislative manner that will make these norms more seriously? Because I do struggle to take some of the language seriously because it is so technology non-neutral or the terms are sometimes confusing.

And when I hear that it might be the final package I really I feel like there might be a bit more work needed to really make it a great product. It can be a great product of a great group of people, it just requires some fine tuning. Thank you.

Anriette Esterhuysen: So, Tatiana, I'll respond to that question and then I'll respond to (unintelligible). Bruna, that's it, that's the final questions. And the answer is

the - the norms - the text of the norms can still change but I said that we're unlikely to produce new norms. There's a research advisory group that has provided input and there was a call for public input. So I'm not sure that - did you respond to the call for public input?

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: Because we invite you still, you can still respond.

Tatiana Tropina: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Anriette Esterhuysen: We received close on 200 public comments on the Singapore norm package, which is the package that we presented here. So in the coming months what we will do is to look at those comments and integrate them into the existing text. And, Tatiana, it's not too late. So please send those comments.

At the same time, we did try to use popular language in our norms. The structure of the norms is that there's a norm and then there's an explanatory document. But your point is really valuable so I think we're going to take that on board, so thanks a lot for that.

Dave, in response to you, very simply, it's about the public core norm. We would like ICANN in whatever way makes sense inside ICANN, whether it's from the constituencies up or through some other process to adopt and endorse the norm on the protection of the public core. Why? I think for three things, three reasons. It's very clearly stating that there's a public-ness that the Doman Name System is part of the core of the Internet and that it's public and that it should be protected as such.

And this is not just a norm that applies to cyber attacks, I think it's a principle that applies to encroachments from the trademark industry for example. And so I think it's sending that message, which is part of ICANN's core identity and core mission is that the DNS should be managed in the public interest.

Secondly, it sends the message to governments that the core of the Internet, which includes the DNS, is managed and should be run and approached in a multistakeholder fashion. So I think that is - that's also important. And then the third thing and linked to that, it's sending the message that we don't need to have separate norms for governments and for non-state actors. Why should there always be these completely different architectures of rules and regulations?

You know, one set for governments made by governments, and another, you know, industry type regulation. And I think that again is very much part of the ICANN ethos. It's saying that we can come together as different stakeholders, agree on common ways of working and that will read to a more sustainable, better public interested result in the longer run.

So we would like you to consider that norm in particular. We don't expect you to look at all the other norms, they're of interest, some of you might find they're more relevant but we feel that the public core norm was actually drafted with the work of ICANN in mind and we'd like you to seriously consider working with it or endorsing it.

Bruna Santos: Thank you very much. Do we have anything else or can we - okay. Yes. Okay.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Good afternoon. Just I think very quickly to the last two speakers, my, you know, my view is slightly different, I think it's beyond the public core norm. So what is the response we expect from you? I think this is to David. First, I think - the first response we expect is for you to read them. The

second response is for you to understand them. The third response is for you to internalize them.

The fourth response is for you to practice them. The fifth response is for you to improve them. And then the sixth and final response is we look forward to you championing them and that's long after we are gone because we are for a limited time. And that's across all the norms.

To the second person, Tatiana, (swaseba), thank you. Really part of the reason we are here is to take your input and feedback in order to improve. We do not claim to know it all and I think this is a very valuable input as Anriette said. So thank you very much.

Bruna Santos: Well thanks all for joining. I guess we're finishing the meeting thankfully only three minutes after the beginning of the NCSG open meeting, so thanks all for attending and this meeting is over.

END