

**Transcription ICANN Helsinki
Non For-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (NPOC)
Wednesday, 29 June 2016**

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 audio is also available at:

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

Rudi Vansnick: Good morning, everybody. This is the NPOC meeting at ICANN 56 Helsinki. Welcome to this meeting. We will have one hour and 15 minutes for this meeting. And the agenda is on the screen. For those who are on remote if you have any questions just raise them in the chat room so that Maryam can handle your requests.

As regularly we will do first the roll call, go around the table and present yourself so that we know who is in the room and who is eventually connected remotely.

I'm Rudi Vansnick, the Chair of today.

Joan Kerr: Joan Kerr, Membership Chair.

Carlos Gutierrez: Carlos Gutierrez.

Tapani Tarvainen: Tapani Tarvainen, NCSG Chair.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus Stoll.

Agustina Callegri: Agustina Callegri

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco.

Maryam Bakoshi: Maryam Bakoshi, Secretariat.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay, thank you very much. We have a remote participant, Maryam? No?
Okay so let's move on. We regularly welcome new members. And if I'm not wrong we have only one member that joined and was approved this month.
Do you have the identity of the person?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, it's One World Platform, (Valentina).

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, is official representative.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay so with that I would like to move on as we don't have that much time in our agenda today. Report from the NPOC Chair. I will give a quick overview of what we did in the last three, four months from the last meeting we had in Dublin until now.

Most of the activities were focused on working in the working groups and I think everybody knows that there has been a lot of energy spent in the IANA transition in the cross community working groups. There are new working groups that have been started up and there will be quite a lot of new PDPs that will be kicked off.

We had a final phase of the GNSO review working party where we finalized all the recommendations that are now on the table of the board to decide on which will be implemented and which one will not be implemented.

Furthermore, we – as I'm the chair of the SCI, the Standing Committee on Improvement of Implementation, we had two issues on the table in the beginning of the year, and one is a quite important and critical one, it's the changes needed in the GNSO procedures for the election of the chair and vice chair, as we ended up last year in not having a chair elected. And there was some issues with the vice chair. So the SCI has been handling that issue very carefully.

I split it up – the group in two sub teams so that we could work in parallel in order to enable us to finalize the job before the next general assembly where the elections for chair and vice chair will happen again. So we finished the work as we need to have full consensus, everybody has to approve the SCI, which happened.

And the next step is that we will publish the recommendations and the proposals for changes in the procedures after the Helsinki meeting for public comment. And we will be in time for implementation for the next GNSO general assembly. That I think is a good job we did.

Apart that one, and I will then move over to other colleagues for the ExComm to give also their view and report on what we did. In preparation for elections and after having cleaned up the database we provided a platform for the members to – we created a profile for them so that they could enter all their information, their vision, the work they are doing, the topics that they want us to focus on.

So that we can promote what they do also. It's a kind of way of getting them more interested in NPOC. It's a first step that will be extended once we have collected more information.

And I got a message even yesterday still somebody added some information to their profile so it's still growing, it's still moving. And I think I can hand over

the mic now to Joan who is our Membership Committee Chair, who has been doing a tremendous work getting the right picture of all our members. So, Joan, you have the mic.

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Rudi. Joan Kerr for the record. So I'm just going to do a pretty quick summary. As Rudi mentioned, actually it was Maryam and I that worked on the database and cleaned it up and we do have 63 new members, our members.

From some of our calls it's obvious that we – it's one thing to clear up the database and to have a clean database but the biggest thing that has happened is that we need to engage our members and outreach as well. So that's something that, you know, as chair I'm going to really focus is how do we get our members to connect with us on calls and become involved when we're at conferences.

And not just be names on a piece of paper because that doesn't work. We need them to participate in ICANN. We need to educate them on how they can participate and give them information. So that's something that I'm going to focus on with the ExComm this coming year. And that's all I have to say for now. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Joan. Rudi for the record. I don't know if there are other colleagues who want to give some reports. Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, Sam Lanfranco for the record. One of the ideas that I had proposed earlier that was not supported by NPOC, was to use the opportunity of the comments on the comments periods on ICANN proposals to engage the membership. And it was felt by several that that was engaging them too late. I'd like to report that that now has been picked up as an initiative by ICANN itself and ICANN will be rolling out a program after this meeting in which they prepare briefing documents to go out to the constituencies to encourage them to get engaged in the comment periods as a way – as a kind of backend way

of bringing people more involved and then eventually into the PDPs and working groups.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. Rudi for the record. We know that, as there are many changes happening in the structure and in ICANN now, essentially due to the finalization of the IANA transition proposal and the review and report done by NTIA, it looks like things are in good shape. But there are still quite a lot going on due to the fact that there is this – these changes of the bylaws are going to have an impact on all of us and especially as we heard that there will be a quite important number of reviews that will kick off.

And in general it was, yes, it was Sunday during the SO/AC leadership meeting that we got a list of reviews that are on schedule for the next year – well, the next 12 months. And it is a big list as Tapani can probably confirm also. And they are requesting volunteers to participate in it again.

The big changes that the number of participants in the review team goes from 12-21 which means it's almost doubling the number of members that are needed for the reviews, that's really massive. Just a question of how this will happen and how this will be done. Not an easy point.

With that I think if there are no questions on NPOC's operations in the past months I could move on to the next item, it's NPOC financial report. I've put together, and all the details will be sent to the ExComm in the next few days, but I've made a summary of the three years – sorry – of the finance and account.

In 2014 we started with an amount of \$4000 – well, the account is in US dollars and the account is in Europe, which means we can have the conversion done in the same bank and the same account. It makes it a little bit complex with the conversions but I will give the figures only in US dollars, which makes it more easy.

So we started with \$4711.95 US which was the amount that we got from – in 2013 from PIR also. And in 2014 we started getting funding of PIR for \$10,000. That was initially for an event that we have organized in Singapore. And then altogether the cost of that event and operation was \$4756.81 US.

I will, as I said, I will give all the figures on the ExComm list after this meeting too. We had also in LA a little event that was about \$550 US. There has been the hosting mailing services and so on for 2014. It was \$2535 US.

And we had some bank administrative costs that we have everywhere in the world. You have to pay a cost which was \$26.32 US. The figures are always with cents as the conversion takes place based on the euro. Which brought us with an amount of \$6878.23 US end of 2014.

And 2015 we got a funding again from PIR for \$5000. And then we had, again, the cost for the hosting, the mail services and so on for \$2678.65. In fact, there is a difference between 2014 and 2015 due to the conversion rate of the US dollar. And that left us with an amount of \$9199.58 US at end 2015.

Two thousand sixteen, we had already the administrative costs that, in fact, should be booked on 2015 but we only got it in 2016 on the account. And the hosting, mail services that I put into account are \$1799.98 US. That means that today we have, on the account, \$7388.70 US available.

That is in fact the overview of the three years finances of NPOC. I'm going around the table. Are there any questions about these figures, these amounts, this report? Yes, Joan?

Joan Kerr: Thank you, Rudi. So that was the money that was allocated – that we were talking about the special events that we were supposed to have in Marrakech and in Helsinki. That was the money that it was coming from for those events?

Rudi Vansnick: No, you're talking about the budget that is allocated by ICANN.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: That's different. That's different.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: That's not on this report.

Joan Kerr: Oh okay.

Rudi Vansnick: And I think that's something we don't have actually in – we don't have any budget allocated to us as far as I remember. They stopped giving and budget allocation for the constituencies two years ago if I'm not wrong. It's all covered inside the budget of ICANN itself.

Joan Kerr: So originally what was that money allocated for?

Rudi Vansnick: Sorry, I was interrupted.

Joan Kerr: Okay, what was the funding allocated for? Was it a specific thing or it was just...

Rudi Vansnick: Well, PIR has been funding and sponsoring us for if we wanted to organize events and so on, which was the first time the case in 2014 when we had that meeting organized in Singapore. And, yes, we could use it for events if there is any way we can really set it up. But I think we should count on what ICANN can support us in order not to use our own budget. But because it's work we do for ICANN, not for ourselves.

Any other question? With that I will give all the details with all the elements. I've sent already some information to the ExComm list but I will provide all the

little details after Helsinki. I've been putting everything together, but I need also some paperwork to add to it.

Something that I need to mention anyway is that as NPOC is not an official body, it's not incorporated, it's not really existing as a body itself, I personally have all the responsibility and I have to pay taxes as it is considered being income revenue so I have to pay some taxes on what is coming in. I'm trying to get rid of that misery but – you're laughing, Klaus?

That's, yes, the risk you take when you do something like that. Yes, Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay Sam for the record. The taxes issue, doubly (unintelligible). I think that we should have – even when they're nominal expenditures that it would be useful for the group to actually pass on them and make a motion and say yes we're going to spend this money for this, including compensating you, if you've got out of pocket expenses for something. And there's an invoice available for that so that we have a kind of accountable and transparent record of all the transactions. So they would be in our minutes.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, of course. And I'm discussing this with the Belgian government as they need to understand that it's not money that is in revenue for me but it's for the organization. But they – as you know, in Europe they are very anxious about what happens in the US at that point so there is a lot of discussion going about money laundering and that's where you need to do some checkups, yes, quite often.

Okay if there are no – yes, Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: I mean, it would also be useful to you if you had the transcripts of the meetings where the numbers were discussed and the decisions were made.

Rudi Vansnick: Sure. With that I think we can conclude this – well, yes, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, and I think we should – as we didn't have any kind of financial report along for the two and a half or so years, it's good idea to spend a little bit of the money which is left on the professional independent audit and I think that's a very good thing to do.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem. With that. Rudi for the record. By the way, meanwhile, I've got the results of our elections. And the results of the elections were done at – on 28th of June at 2359 UTC. And the results are as follows.

Chair of NPOC, Klaus Stoll. The Vice Chair NPOC, Martin Pablo Silva Valent. Communication Committee Chair, Juan Manuel Rojas. Membership Committee Chair, Joan Kerr. And NPOC Secretariat, Olevie Kouamie. I want to congratulate the members who have been elected. And with that I will, after this meeting, hand over the chair seat to Klaus Stoll.

So let's move on with Number 5 on the agenda, discussion of the ongoing international Red Cross issues with ICANN. And I think it's Sam who brought that to the table. Are you willing to report on that one?

Sam Lanfranco: I'm willing to open the discussion on that, yes. Thank you, Rudi. I was first prompted to bring it to the table when Carlos mentioned that there had been a discussion in GNSO without us knowing about it. And then I had gotten concerned because that was the – one of the issues that was responsible for the original creation of NPOC to begin with.

Sort of supplemental to that I went yesterday to the session in which the issue was being discussed. And what I want to report on is basically my impression of that session. Rudi was there so Rudi may want to add to this. Initially it was a discussion involving the International Olympic Committee, the International Red Cross Red Crescent and was distilled down to issues around international IGOs – international governmental organizations and international nongovernment organizations.

It has basically been boiled down to only dealing with international governmental organizations as far as I can tell and primarily the Red Cross. And it is basically down to some very narrow technical questions about how conflict resolution is handled on some of the issues and how that impinges on the international Red Cross's – I don't know if the right word is diplomatic immunity but its rights as a kind of international governmental organization.

And as far as I'm concerned, and I'd be interested in Rudi's view on this, that has almost nothing to do with the existing remit in the charter of NPOC. That NPOC could basically say to that one, it's – they've retained expert opinion, they have lawyers working on it. It's a very narrow technical question that has very little relevance to the rest of our constituency.

I see Klaus has a hand up so I'll quit.

Klaus Stoll: I was actually at the meeting where all that started. And I'm not the one who founded NPOC but basically, as you know, (unintelligible) got into the whole thing basically the meeting after. And look at the name of NPOC and there is a clue, operational concerns.

And it was operational concerns of NGOs of non for profit organizations like the Olympic Committee or like the Red Cross. This is what we were founded for, operational concerns. And its operational concern if the Red Cross has that privilege or the IOC has a privilege or not.

So it's a very, very close to our heart and it's exactly to our topic. Which complicated the whole thing and was the cleverest trick I'd ever seen in the book was to combine the Red Cross with the International Olympic Committee. Everybody has no problem with the Red Cross having the status and everybody has a problem with the IOC having the status.

((Crosstalk))

Klaus Stoll: No, because it's been now discussed for 5.5 years. Everything that could be said has been said. It just – because if we come to a decision, if we vote, if we get every single participant in ICANN to vote and say unanimously 100% we decide that and that and that, there will be a lawyer crawling out of the window and saying I challenge you on that. This is a non-resolvable issue.

So what we have to do is basically – I think it's very important that we have a look back at what the situation is, talk to some people in the – and I'm sorry to say, talk to some of the lawyers, and trying to find out if there's anything for us still to do. And I just find it very interesting because if you look at the history of NPOC basically it's one was created by two lawyers from parties concerned. And they don't even talk to us anymore.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Sam and Klaus. And based on the discussions that we had in the IGO INGO afterwards too yesterday, it's very clear that IGOs and INGOs can call on their immunity but if they are taken to court they have to take it down.

And, again, as Klaus was mentioning, it's the game of the lawyers that will decide in what direction they win or lose the game. I don't see a real – the problem is not resolved and I'm considering that that will go on for a while as, yes, business most often has more rights than the non-business community.

Yes, Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Well just to restate what was said earlier, and underlined it, I think that it essentially is – it's like an aggregate – aggravate inside NPOC and that we basically sort of decide. It will not be resolved. Any moves toward resolution will be taking place completely outside our remit, outside our domain. We should come back and focus on the not for profit sector and their concerns.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Sam. Rudi for the record. As we have a councilor among us I don't know if, Carlos, you have any vision on how the Council looks at these discussions?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, I mean, this is a long-standing issue that you are not aware what the Council discussed. I have no explanation for. But this has been in the agenda all the time. There was a webinar to refresh everybody on the issue. It was held on a few weeks ago, two three weeks ago. It was very thinly visited so nobody cares. The presentation was distributed. Mary Wong did a wonderful presentation specifically on the Red Cross.

And in the Board Council meeting we reminded the Board that we had written to the Board in May explaining the last discussions and movements and making them aware that we have no clear indication from the Board to the Council on this issue.

And we reminded the Board that they owe us an answer there. There are some propositions there. It's not an international organization sadly. The discussion is very, very limited to the second level. It's not even about the top level. So it's really the doldrums and the Red Cross people come to all meetings and speak to everybody but there is not a sensible proposal like how do we deal with the first – with the top level and how to get you closer either to the trademarks or to the international organizations so it lives in the limbo. But certainly nobody has a clue what the next step is; I mean, the Council or the Board or the NPOC. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Carlos. Rudi for the record. Well, I think as you mentioned, it's a question of trademark, non-trademark. And quite often trademark means it costs money and probably that's something the (unintelligible) also want to avoid to get – to pay for all the trademarks across the world and...

Carlos Gutierrez: I mean, if you're a local Red Cross organization, at least in my country they are collecting money all the time. I don't understand they don't have \$100 a

year to protect their domain name at least at the second level under the ccTLD. And even the ISOC Costa Rica chapter got a one-year free from our ccTLD and we pay only \$20 a year after that. So I guess any Red Cross can come to its ccTLD and ask for an NGO approach but the issue really lacks any vision, mother, father, relatives, whatsoever.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Carlos. Sam, you...

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, my sense, listening to the – what – of the discussion I have heard is just that there's a fear of an issue ending up in the courts, period. Because that triggers some other questions. As far as NPOC is concerned, I don't know if I should propose that we have a motion but I think we just view it as an issue for which we have no position.

((Crosstalk))

Sam Lanfranco: No.

Rudi Vansnick: Red Cross, there is the British one, we have three national Red Cross members. I was in contact with the one in the UK. And I sent them even a request to respond to one of the questions that happened in PDP. And they asked me, well, give us time; I'm still waiting for their response. It's two months – more than two months ago. So it's very unclear what's the goal of Red Cross is in all these discussions. I have the impression that they rather would like to see somebody else taking it up and finalize it rather than themselves like going to the end of the discussion.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the record. But seriously, I mean, what you just said it's absolute – when we talked and talked and talked about it. The danger – and the advantage here is this is everything NPOC is about. And on the other hand, as I said, I mean, we're talking about it now for five years. I think there is somewhere where we have now to – for NPOC what our lessons learned out of it and how do we as NPOC have to react to that.

And I think one of the answer is quite – is screaming into our faces, quite simply, we have to be more systematically active in the actual policy making processes and monitor that somehow better and participate in the working groups and so on in a different way. It's not about just participating, it's about having a strategy behind it.

And that is – and the – it's fairly impossible with the kind of minimized membership we have at the moment. But it's something we can start working on. And I think that will attract members back because a lot of the bigger NGOs and so on, have very, very similar problems and IGOs. They're very, very similar problems.

And one of the position of us could simply be can you help us to solve that problem. And that's going and saying we are your voices and we're fight for you and say, by the way, we're supposed to fight for you, but we have no idea what to do. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Klaus. Rudi for the record. With that we are in fact entering into Number 6 of our agenda. With this item, as we didn't know the results of the election before, I thought it was important to have this on the agenda. But as I will no longer be even part of the ExComm, I would like to leave here the discussion and allow the new ExComm to take up the future of NPOC after the elections. I have to mention to you that I will step down from all the working groups after the Helsinki meeting.

There is one mandate that was asked to me to stay on until the end of the year as this is a mandate by calendar year. And I've committed that I will do my best to finish that task. It's the SCI where I will keep the work done until the end of the year. Probably we will not get any new stuff on the table as the two issues are finalized now. We will see if that's going to end.

So with that I would like to hand over the discussion about the future of NPOC to the new ExComm. I don't know who wants to pick up this point as I think it's important that the new ExComm decides on what way you would work.

Martin...

Martin Valent: Yes, just to say I will step in the water and try. I think we have to draft a plan that we all can agree on and we can all know and so far we have already tried a few things. We have learned what works, what not. I agree with the fact that we should be working with the big INGOs like Red Cross simply because I believe we have such synergy that if we manage to get them to work with us that would really, really, really improve our work.

So that I believe we have these two different things. One is policy work, the other one is outreach. I believe we have to have this different programs for each one. We already have that logic. I would continue upon it. A big question that I cannot answer is regarding how is NPOC going to evolve in the environment of NCSG. I think that a lot of that has to be answered yet. And if it's going to be relevant to our plan and until we actually knows (unintelligible) how that is going to evolve, we have to continue creating a working plan for the next year.

I propose we do this in the next few months to take our time and to do a proper management plan for the next months.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus Stoll for the record. First of all, I think we should look back and I want to thank Rudi for two years of his work and what he did. And he's acknowledged the emphasis and all the hard work you put in there so first of all, thank you, Rudi.

The second thing which I would like to talk about the future of NPOC and I want to make several fundamental changes. And there first change is that as

chair, I don't understand myself as the decision maker or leader of this one, I literally will push this down now to people like Martin, Poncelet and everybody in the ExComm, but also in the membership. I'm expecting that the major initiatives and the major changes and the major proposals, the major things, are not coming from me. I see myself as a coordinator, but not as a decision maker. And really trust on people, as I said, Martin, Poncelet, and everybody else, to do this job.

Because, look, if we replace Rudi by Klaus, you get all the same again. And that doesn't work and it didn't work in the past so we have to try something new. So everybody who has been elected or not been elected, you're still called on. And the leader of all this and the leader of NPOC is you, not Klaus.

The other thing is on the very practical term, because it's always a problem, and I'm sorry that I'm bringing it up, it's about travel. Nobody in the ExComm will automatically be nominated for the next travel slot for the next ICANN meeting. Everybody, including me, has to prove, before they are nominated, that they actually have a job to do at the next meeting. If they don't have a job to do in the next meeting they will participate remotely.

And that will open us up – first of all it would make us more productive, and secondly, it actually – the members will have a chance to do things. For example, some of the – of the stuff which was done in Argentina is important that we enable these people to stay in the ICANN meeting rotation, whereas other people like me, maybe we can do it – even as I chair I think I can do – Hyderabad looks like I can do the same stuff in Hyderabad remotely than being there.

So and this is the kind of changes I really would like to make. And again, the important thing is this is not now the era of Klaus, this will be the era members. That's my idea and my proposal for the future – very rough proposal for the future of NPOC.

With regards to outreach, please allow me, we worked over the last few weeks on a very comprehensive membership and outreach plan. And we realized, for example, also financially, it doesn't work if we put out an outreach plan and looking at ICANN to fund it or looking at ourselves or own budget to fund it. We need partners and we need a little bit of – little bit of more cash than what we have around usual.

So in preparation there are already some talks going on. There are already meeting have happened for – where basically some partnerships are agreed and this is something which now that the election is over, will be made public. And nothing is decided, it's all just for discussion but there is a lot of groundwork already been done and that can be implemented.

Again, it will not be implemented by me; it will not even guide it or driven by me. It's there for the members, for the ExComm to take and to do it or not. Now I've spoken too much anyway.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Joan. Oh yes, Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much. This is Carlos for the record. And first of all, I want to remind you that I'm not a representative of NPOC in the Council and my term in the Council ends in Hyderabad. So if you want to know what's happening in the Council you will have to do something about that.

Second to what's urgent, there are important things, there are urgent things. I mean, there are two very urgent things. I mean, in two hours or one hour we will be discussing the follow up of Los Angeles discussion. What do we want for the future of the Non-Contracted Party House, if I'm right. So this is – we had a proposal and we had a questionnaire and we're going to discuss the feedback to the questionnaire.

And this is, I think, very urgent because also this week the members of the team that should take the task to review the GNSO procedures in terms of

the adoption of the adaptation of the new bylaws to the transition, is going to start very soon. And that's going to affect the whole GNSO and that's going to affect NPOC as well.

So I don't know, Martin, if we have months. I think we have a few days to decide together with the Non-Commercial User Constituency because we are drafting the charter. We are between – if we are going to have representatives only of the stakeholder groups or if we are going to have representatives of the constituencies only or a mixture of both, cannot be too many people. Some people have strong opinion how it should work. If it should be limited to two people for each stakeholder group. And that would make 8.

And the clock is running because we expect the new – the transition legally to be over by November 1, I think that's what I heard. So this is an urgent task where NPOC has to fight for its internal recognition within the GNSO Council at all. So that really I strongly recommend that is taken immediately. And I don't know if it's Klaus or Martin or both or all, but those are things that we have to follow up as soon as possible starting today and starting tomorrow when we do the GNSO Council wrap up. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Carlos. To add to that, as I'm one of the two people that took the lead in putting it on the table because nobody wanted to start the discussion about reviewing the future of the GNSO from the bottom up, Tony and me, we have been working in the background quite a lot to get things on paper. And have visions on what is possible and possible scenarios. And we have been even querying a time slot in this Helsinki meeting, and unfortunately we couldn't do it really earlier than I think it was last Wednesday, Maryam, if I'm not wrong, that we got a time slot for the NCPH meeting this noon.

It was really difficult to find a way to get it on the agenda. But it's on it. And I will still look with Tony and lead it this noon. But after that I would like to see somebody from NPOC taking over that position. Martin. Or sorry, Joan.

Joan Kerr: Thank you. Joan Kerr for the record. So, Klaus, I just wanted to clarify something. The – you mentioned partnership going forward for the – we're on future after the election. What is the nature? What is the reason, and the purpose for the partnerships? And also, one of the things that we haven't done as an ExComm is to clearly engage our members how will the partnership help us do that?

Klaus Stoll: Joan, thank you for the questions. Actually really good question. I think that one of the problems with Internet governance, and is quite simply that you can't actually work inside silos. To be – if you work inside the silos that means you work in your constituency and you work in the nonprofit sector, in our case, for example, alone. You don't get very far because basically you need to reach out to the private sector and the government sector for minimum, to get things done.

And so, for example, what I mean with partnership is to give you very concrete example, is it's very important for us – I think for us as NPOC but it's open for discussion – to partner with other Internet governance forums like the business and like the IGF. There's a lot of – there is a lot of activities going on there. There is especially – in the – with respect to our members to – why is that relevant to our members.

Because it is – with the sustainable government goals, our members are active in the sustainable development goals. They're trying to do things. These things are not happening in ICANN, these things are happening in other fora. And we need to connect and we need to coordinate and we need to be visible in these things to make it happen.

The practical reason is quite simply so how do we pay for that? And to be absolutely honest with you, there are – there are corporations and foundations around which would like to support this for good reasons, (unintelligible) reasons, social corporate responsibility reasons. And simply

taking the advantage of saying we do that. And I think, as long as we – as long as we stay completely transparent and ethical and non-binding, we should take advantage of that to do this.

Joan Kerr: I just have a follow up question. So I'm not against partnership, of course, I actually agree that you cannot act alone. But one of the things that we really, I think as an ExComm, didn't do in terms of our responsibility as an ICANN constituency was policy. We're not involved enough. So how, I mean, I'm not saying we don't do this, but we have two major things to go forward.

From a – I'm always speaking from a membership point of view. To engage our members, obviously we'd like to increase them, but also to get more involved in the policy portion of what – responsibility that we're supposed to do. So are we going to be – it's one thing to have partnerships to get funding so – and which chair is going to do that. But I think it's loud and clear that we don't engage our members enough and we don't participate enough in the policy process. So I just want to...

Klaus Stoll: Sorry, Joan. Absolutely right. And I refuse to comment any further and put it over to Martin.

Martin Valent: And to quickly answer, I think or add something to Joan's question or concern, it's compatible, I mean, we are talking about looking for the senior G or the help of the NGOs or big partners, but the truth is afterwards the outreach plans have to be absolutely aimed to policy development. I mean, there's not – that – (unintelligible) incompatibility. Is not a reaching out to these partnerships, it's not in the same aim or goal of (unintelligible) members to policy.

And as we have later a meeting with Janice, we are actually trying to approach this from a more scientific matter and from expertise on how to actually get the members that we can get from outreach involved in the most

effective and efficient way. So in that sense I don't see that – that's just the aim of it at all at the end.

Tapani Tarvainen: If I may? I'm not an NPOC member but I'd like to make a few points. First, I'd like to also thank Rudi for all the hard work you've been doing for a long time. And second, just a suggestion for NPOC, do run a candidate for the Council elections. You should have a councilor, although you won't get one if you don't even try.

Sam Lanfranco: Two comments. One is just to remind us that the Workstream 2 committees are being formed now. People are being recruited. So one of the things we need to do is populate those. Several of us have populated some of them so that's one of the high, you know, the high ranking agenda items.

The other is the comment about partnership and engagement. I represent the Canadian Society for International Health. Our perspective around the Internet has to make sense in terms of what we do as an NGO. Many of the policy issues are of no win for us. They're just not what we're interested in. So what I'm doing, beyond NPOC and beyond ICANN, is starting from the sustainable development goals, Number 17 happens to be enhancing partnership as one of the 17 goals.

But starting from the constituency's self interest in terms of their remit, their charter, their mission and vision and working backward to ICANN to say, okay, if ICANN is going to approach them, if we are going to approach them as NPOC, we don't have to – we don't want to go out and try and strong arm them into being volunteer labor in the policy positions that we see. We have to help them understand how these policy positions relate to what they do.

And if we don't do that my advice to them is do not show up. Period. If all we are is like in a religious organization saying come join our religion, it's up to us to explain to them why what we do is relevant to what they do. And without

that they are not coming. And I'm saying that as a development economist who works with those groups outside ICANN.

Rudi Vansnick: I see that the discussion is falling down. Still as an NPOC member, I have to mention you that – and it should be on your priorities list, that there is no chair for the policy committee, which is, to me a really bad sign about participation in policy. So I would encourage the new ExComm to focus on getting somebody on that seat.

Klaus Stoll: As a reply to that, Rudi, you're absolutely right. We – but we shouldn't bind it on a person, we are all policy. This is what we are all about. And we have to find a way that we have – yes, we have somebody who is responsible for coordinating the policy stuff, that we find way to do the policies together as a team in NPOC. And that the policy chair, or basically is the megaphone of the person who basically transmitted.

Carlos Gutierrez: I want to give another view from the Council. I mean, the policy work is very simple. Is absolutely very, very simple for the next two years. Is only three subjects and they're closely related to each other, is very, very simple. Is right protection mechanism, Whois and subsequent rounds. And everything is bounded – directly bounded together. I'm very happy that I hear Martin is particularly interested in the right protection mechanism and is going to follow that one.

We just need somebody for Whois and we need two, three people or 10 people or 25 people for the subsequent rounds. That's it. That's policy. And if you don't like ICANN policy, you don't need to be here. You can move to ALAC or to any other place. So it's very, very simple. And as Tapani just said, I mean, we're wasting our representation in the Council. I mean, that goes all together, is the same, is the representative in the Council, the policy coordination and getting people together to participate there.

I thank you for suggesting my name. We are under great stress. We have to present a first draft of the competition review in Hyderabad. And that's a lot of work, and that's everything I can do. And I really have to concentrate. But because I am part of the team with this support of the GNSO. So that's my responsibility until the end of the year.

But I think it's a very clear – I mean, I've been four years here and – in ICANN and sometimes I wonder what's happening. I think this time is very, very simple, is Workstream 2 of accountability and three PDPs. And they overlap in many, many, many issues so it's a very, very clear policy agenda that ICANN has. It's rather simple.

So I think it's very easy to explain that to any partner or any member. And if you ask me, what my perspective is, why I'm here it's very simple, I mean, particularly for developing countries or underserved areas, or NGOs working in development is for me the same, you have two possibilities.

Either you get a sensible domain name for your community, project, NGO, or so or you end up in Facebook. Okay, that's the choice. I mean, that's very, very simple. I mean, either you keep your freedom, your privacy, your webpage, your initiative, your collection, or you do it in Facebook.

And if that's not important for all developing agencies, they haven't gotten it, as you said.

And I can explain that in five minutes. I don't know if they will understand me but that's the reason why I think we have relevant work to do everywhere in the world closely related to the domain name system. Either you are at the third level with Facebook or Google, or you have your own presentation card. Thank you.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam for the record. I agree with you completely. Except...

((Crosstalk))

Sam Lanfranco: But, when I am talking to them and we talk about that choice, second level, third level, which is, you know, where I come in at, they agree or they don't agree, they see the challenges for them at their level and in their resource constraints they say, we need to work on this at our level, but we don't have the resources to come up and work with you on those working groups. We have resource constraints, we have technical constraints and so forth.

So one of the approaches is to go not to them individually but to go to the groups that represent them and work at that level so that's one of the strategies that I, as a private member of NPOC, will be doing.

But it's for them to see a viable win in terms of how they deploy their limited resources in the short run. There's no disagreement on that bigger issue. But they can't get into that – they can't afford to get there for the most part at this point.

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, Sam. I was just wondering I think we can round up – I think we handled every item that we needed. And thanks, Carlos, for your – the beautiful picture you made about the two ways you have in life, Facebook or no book at all. Thank you all and, yes, it's my last ICANN meeting for this.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much.

END