
LOS ANGELES – Fellowship Morning Sessions
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 07:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Good morning, fellows. Let's get settled in. Good morning and let's get settled in. Good morning, everyone. Wow. Seriously. I mean, that was worse than Monday. Good morning, everyone. Thank you. I'm running on about four hours. I don't know about the rest of you. So we're really going to have to work on it today. Because tonight is music night – yay!

This morning we have a full, packed house, and we are starting to run late. As you know, we had the room change and we've had some sinking issues with everything. So Olivier, are we ready to start the show?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We certainly are.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Beautiful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is a show, isn't it? Let's go into the slides, please. Oh, wow. That's gone really quick. Can we go back a couple? Because I took about an hour to get the first page working. We were way at the back. It was just snapped. Okay, fair enough.

Good morning, everybody. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. I'm the Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee and I'm going to speak to you today about the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large community. If

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

you look at all of ICANN, here – and I need my pointer, there you go. Imagine I've got a laser pointer. Then you've got the Board of Directors in the middle, and you've got different component parts of ICANN. And throughout the week you're going to have people coming from those different component parts, speaking to you about their community.

We are the At-Large community – that's the one over here, that deals with Internet users, Internet end users. Our main mission is to bring the input of Internet users into the ICANN policy processes. We're an Advisory Committee in that provide advice to the Board. We have one Board member, Sébastien Bachollet. He sits on seat number 15. And at the end of this week, we'll have another Board member to replace Sébastien, and that's Rinalia Abdul Rahim. Some of you might know her, as well. They're around. So if you do see either Sébastien or Rinalia, don't hesitate to talk to them. They're very approachable, and they love newcomers. And we all like new people to come in and help us.

That's what ICANN is like. It's a bit of an old diagram. The ICANN staff has grown a little bit much. I'm not going to speak about the rest of ICANN. Just one thing, the Nominating Committee in the middle selects some members of the Board, but also selects five members of the At-Large Advisory Committee. But we'll see that in a moment.

Let's go to the next slide. Now, as you know, the Board is always omnipresent. But we'd like to get rid of it. It just gives you a better idea of the fact that you've got a lot of different, very varied communities in ICANN, with several sub-multi-stakeholder models, if you want.

At-Large is Internet users, but it is somehow multi-stakeholder as well, because we're not dealing solely with civil society. There are also some

commercial organizations that are part of At-Large, and there are all different types of organizations. And that's because they all deal directly with end users. That's the primary category that you need to have.

Let's go to the next slide, please.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I appreciate you trying to make up time, but the interpreters may need you to—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, they're waving at me. That's why they were waving. I thought they were just saying hello again and again. Okay. Wavey.

So, the At-Large organizational diagram is as follows. We are divided among five different regions, and that's in order to be able to provide a reasonable input, balanced input from across the planet. Each region has got a leadership team, and is divided as a Regional At-Large Organization leadership team.

Effectively, our members are At-Large Structures. I've just described who they are. Then the RALOs, the Regional At-Large Organizations, have got these acronyms. For Africa, it's AFRALO. For Europe, it's EURALO. For Asia-Pacific, it's APRALO, etc., etc. And those RALOs select two people to go on the ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee. So you'll see on our ALAC, there are two people selected by their RALOs. And there's one person, as I just mentioned before, that is selected by the Nominating Committee.

That makes three people per region, a total of 15 people on the At-Large Advisory Committee, and they select somebody – in this case was Sébastien Bachollet, and now Rinalia Abdul Rahim – to be on the ICANN board.

We work as bottom-up. Not bottoms-up. Bottoms-up is when you have a big beer and you fill it and finish in one go. No. Bottom-up. If we go to the next slide, I'll explain to you what bottom-up is. Oh. Okay. What happened? Ah, there we go. That's more like it, Phew. Okay.

Bottom-up. So effectively the At-Large Structures are the bottom of the pyramid. They're at the grassroots level. That's why they're green. And each one feeds into their Regional At-Large Organization, and they feed into the At-Large Advisory Committee. And it's interesting because the range of inputs that you get is effectively quite well-balanced across the regions. The ALAC is really there to make sure that all of the regions are listened to, and the ALAC representatives from each region are there to effectively find consensus with the other regions and everyone else. So you've got ALS, RALO, and ALAC. Next slide please.

We've really skipped a slide, haven't we? I don't know. This is a bit jumbled. Let's go back a couple of things. There we go. That's, I think the person who did cut and paste did it in – yeah. Okay. That's why I wanted the first page, which I took an hour to do. But never mind.

So what is At-Large? At-Large is, as I said, the community of end users. They can be in organizations that are computer clubs, all sorts of associations, learning centers. They just represent the views of individual Internet users. There are 180 of them around the world – 177. We had an At-Large summit where we brought 150 people from

around the world in London just a few months ago, and we had a cutoff date for people to register for this in January, 2014. So in effect, we've gone from 150 to 177 during this year, and we still have plenty of more applications that are coming through at the moment in order to continue growing our community.

What do we do? Because that's an important thing. Well, the At-Large Advisory Committee is mandated by its bylaws, and by the bylaws in ICANN, to issue comments in response to ICANN public comment periods. Have you already gone into the public comment and all--? Not yet? Okay? That's – I need another hour for this. They're on Thursday. So ICANN just issues public comment requests, consultations, and one of the jobs of the At-Large Advisory Committee is to issue responses which are based on the consensus of our members.

We also issue comments on any subject, process, structure, policy, topic, pretty much anything that happens in ICANN as long as it relates to ICANN and it relates to end users and it relates to ICANN processes, then we are able to comment on it. As an Advisory Committee, we don't just need to wait for public consultations.

We also issue comments on external processes linked to ICANN. There was recently – not recently, actually; a couple of years ago – there was a consultation about the renewal of the IANA contract back when the government wanted to renew it, not now when they want to get rid of it. But back then, there were questions that the National Telecommunication Infrastructure Administration (NTIA) asked, and the At-Large Advisory Committee issued a couple of statements, bringing forward, basically, the view of end users about it.

We also take part in cross-community working groups in ICANN. Have you done cross-community working groups? Okay, well, they – they do exactly what is on the [tend], what’s written on the [tend]. They basically cross community working groups. They basically are working groups made up of members from the different supporting organizations and Advisory Committees in ICANN.

So we have plenty of our members that take part in those. We also have the ability to take part in Generic Name Supporting Organization (GNSO) working groups. They have many of them and, as you might know – have you seen anybody from the GNSO yet? Am I the first person here? Rudi? Okay. So Rudi yesterday was from the NPOC. I don’t even know what NPOC means, but NPOC everyone knows now. You are aware of NPOC. Excellent. Maybe you’ll tell me afterwards what it is. Not-For-Profit Organizational Concerns. There you go. I do know it.

The GNSO has got working groups, and they’re open to everyone to take part in. So we often have some of our members that then go in the GNSO working groups. So that’s another thing that we do.

Then we also relay the ICANN message to end users. Because if you go out there and I would say pretty much any country around the world, you speak to someone about ICANN and they’ll just look at you and go, “What is that organization?”

Most people out there think that the Internet just runs itself. The Domain Name System just came up and, hey, it works. In fact, obviously, if you want to get people involved in the policy processes of ICANN, you have to explain what ICANN does. You also have to explain to local

people around the world where ICANN is going, what are the changes, etc.

There's a lot of capacity building that we perform in countries around the world. Then one last thing on the slide, we coordinated the filing of new Generic Top-Level Domain objections from the community. When the application period ended for all of those new top-level domain applications, there were some objections that could be filed by various different bodies, and the ALAC was one of those bodies that could file applications on limited public interest and the other one was community interest – I think it's called community. But anyway, this period is passed. It was just a time during the application period of the new gTLD process.

That's just a few things that we do. There are a few others, but these are the main lines. Let's go down to the next random slide.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

I will. So I'm going to let the interpreters take a deep breath here, and I'll just fill in. So it is complex what is happening here in these last ten minutes. Olivier is doing an amazing job of trying to explain the most complex, in my mind, community within ICANN.

For myself, it took me longer to understand At-Large than it took me to understand any of the other communities. So if this morning is going by a bit fast, it's not just our speaker, because Olivier is amazing at getting a lot of information in a short period of time. And I mean that as a compliment.

So we have many alumni who are members of At-Large. So you need to just buddy up with them. They'll help explain it as it goes along through the day. Bottom line, the voice of the end user – and all of us are end users. So if you're looking for a place to start to hear your voice and to gain an understanding of ICANN, because the fingers of At-Large get to go into all the different parts, this would be a good place to start. But there are many alumni in At-Large, so don't feel like you won't be able to find someone who can help you through the maze.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are the interpreters ready? Get set! Thank you, Janice. Yes. So, bottom line, bottom-up. That's what it is. I do note, actually, a number of returning Fellows. So they've heard this already. I'm sure they can help their colleagues here. But it's true, you are all end users, and so this is why At-Large is really important.

I'll give you an example of what a bottom-up process is. So this is a bit of a—oh, this is just one page. Fair enough. This is how we respond to public comment processes. It would be easier if I had – oh, there is a pointer. Okay. That's helpful. That's what I love about fellows. They come prepared. I don't come prepared. The top one. It's not strong – it's not. Okay. Burns through my skin, but, interesting. Ah, there we go. I've got to be just a bit closer. Okay.

ICANN asks for comments in one of their public consultations on the website. At that point, the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) discuss between themselves and within their region whether a comment is needed, whether there is really a response required. At the same time, there is also a discussion within the At-Large Advisory

Committee on whether a comment is required. Now, there's two ways: either a comment is required, in which case we'd better write a comment. If a comment is not required, if there's no consensus on requiring a comment, at that point we don't issue any statement or anything and we just say okay, that's something we're not going to comment about.

But if we do decide to issue a comment, then someone has to draft a first draft. We ask for a penholder, a volunteer – because we're all volunteers – so we ask for a volunteer to write a first draft based on the discussions that have taken place within the At-Large community. And sometimes they're very different discussions. People have different points of view. So the first draft of this statement might be reflecting many different views and not very focused.

That then goes on a Wiki page. You've been told of the Wikis? You're aware of the Wikis? Yeah. So it goes on a Wiki page where everyone else can comment. So you basically go in the comment underneath and you can say, "Well, this is rubbish, and I don't agree with that part," and this sort of stuff. And the penholder will then, after maybe five, ten days, need to look back at the comments which were received from everyone and write a second draft.

Sometimes, if there is consensus, the second draft is camera-ready, is ready to go, because everyone agrees with each other. Sometimes it's not. Sometimes there's more discussion required after the second draft is put on the Wiki. What's important is that when we reach consensus, we have a final draft, which is – there is consensus, ALAC issues a statement.

So when the statement is basically drafted, it then needs to be ratified by the 15 members of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and they vote on it. Every single statement we have, people vote on them. The Committee votes on them. Sometimes we have 15 votes in favor, zero abstentions, zero votes against. Sometimes we have ALAC members that don't agree with a statement and they will either abstain or they will vote against the statement.

But in general we never send something to the voting stage if we're not pretty much convinced that we've reached consensus on the actual statement itself. So we've never been in a situation where the ALAC votes against a statement's final draft.

As soon as we've ratified the statement, then the statement is released. It could be sent to the ICANN Board, or in this case it would be sent over to the public consultation forum, and some other cases, when we're at ICANN meetings, it could be delivered to the Board in the public forum with someone reading it from a laptop or from – what is it, I don't want to cite names, one of these handheld tablet devices. There you go, tablet. There's only one type that I've got in my mind. But anyway.

So this is the way that it works. The only problem that we have with public comments is that you might or might not be aware, but public comment periods – I'll come to you in a second – public comment periods are only 21 days initial comment period, plus 21 days reply period.

Now, how in the world can we have from here to here only 21 days? Bearing in mind some people don't speak English very well, bearing in

mind they have our ALS (At-Large Structure) representatives also might have to ask their local communities.

It's a heck of a lot of people to ask and get the response in 21 days. So usually we manage to send something within the initial plus response comment periods, within 42 days we've got a response and we're able to actually have a statement that reflects the interests of our community and the points of view of our community.

I think that's the last slide. The other one I'm not going to go into, the longer one. I've got another slide, and of course you'll have access to the slide deck, or hopefully to the full slide deck which is not randomized. You'll have access to it. And in there I also show how spontaneous public comments are drafted. There are a few more stages regarding finding consensus. You need to find consensus at RALO level, so at Regional At-Large Organization level, and then also find consensus across the world.

Three important links. The first one is the At-Large correspondence page. That's where we file all of our statements. So if you're interested in reading the statements that we've done in the past years, they're all here. They're not sorted too well. The website that we currently have is an absolute disaster. It was built in 2007, so it's – yeah. That was the Web back in 2007. But it was then – but we're getting a new website, but that will change. But judging that it's taken so much time to get down to do a new website, it might be a few years before that link changes. So correspondence is really important.

At-Large policy development – this is a little bit like going backstage and seeing how we built our statements. And in fact, when you go there

you'll see all of the statements at various different levels of drafting or voting or things like that, and you'll see also how we got to the past statement. So sometimes we have five lines in a statement, very short statement, but about 27 or 30 comments on just writing these five lines, because we disagreed on what needed to be on there. Sometimes consensus is found very quickly, so there are very few comments. First draft goes out, it's like "Yep, I like it," and then it goes.

Finally, the Working Groups – because we have to follow everything that takes place in ICANN, so everything in the ccNSO, gNSO, the country codes, the generic names, everything, we had to divide ourselves in Working Groups, because otherwise people would go absolutely insane. I'm on all the working groups. This is why I'm a bit [inaudible] sometimes.

But yeah, the working groups are really important because that's the way we actually share the load. It's pretty much impossible if you have a job or a normal life to follow all of the working groups.

Also, not everyone is interested in everything. I often recommend to people who want to get involved in At-Large, for new At-Large Structures that have just arrived, join a working group, what interests you the most, and then contribute. Another thing it's important to say, it's open to everyone.

So that's just a little thing. I don't know if we have time for questions or if I've gone way over my time limit with Rafik wanting to kill me at the back of the room. So we had – I saw the lady over here, and there were – I've got the mic, okay. Who has a mic? She has a mic? Okay, excellent.

Janice, if you can keep track of who put their hands up. Unfortunately I don't know all your names yet, but try and remember them.

BIONDA FONSECA: Good morning. My name is Bionda Fonseca, from Curacao. My question is regarding the level of the structure of decision taking. There must be a consensus on regional level, and afterwards on international level, as well? That's correct?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Of course, consensus is one of these relative things. If you have 90 people that say yes and one person that says no, you're not going to say there is no consensus. So it really comes down – finding where the consensus is comes down to the experience of the people in the RALO and also the experience of the people on the ALAC. I know that the GNSO (the Generic Name Supporting Organization) has defined what consensus is and they've got rough consensus, broad consensus, and whole different ways of what consensus is. But you do need to find it at regional level as well.

BIONDA FONSECA: How does it be monitored and tracked how the process...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's all manual, and the monitoring of the level of consensus is not tracked at the moment. We have a Metrics Working Group that is looking at various things. One, doing metrics on the performance of the ALAC Chair. And if there were metrics, I probably wouldn't be here.

Second, doing metrics on the performance of the At-Large Advisory Committee members, and then performance of the different people that have positions of responsibility.

But then, the other thing we will be doing is to track our processes to find out maybe the level of consensus, but also the impact that our statements have on the final policy that ICANN decides to proceed through. And that will probably be undertaken by my successor, who is Alan Greenberg. And I'll introduce you to him in a moment.

BIONDA FONSECA: Okay. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome. Janice, help. What? Don't let this guy – yeah.

WANDA PÉREZ: Hi, my name is Wanda Pérez. I am from the Dominican Republic in the Caribbean. I have a question. A few months ago, people from LACRALO – that belongs to my area – when they are in the Dominican Republic, we wanted to join as an At-Large Structure. But we have, there in my country, we have two groups. The IPv6 Taskforce Group is a really big one. It was interested in joining. And also we were [confirmating] and we are right now almost finishing an ISOC chapter, Internet Society chapter. But we had some challenges, because none of them are legal organizations in my country.

The IPv6 Taskforce [inaudible] never because we don't have the interest, but ISOC, we are in the process. But we are facing legal issues,

so many legal stuff to finish the whole process. But in the meantime we are interested in participating.

Isn't it a way to join, where we prove that we are a [big] group working, we can give some proof of that? Because we are very [known] in the country. And then we can join At-Large and then, in the future, when we solve all those problems, we can give the legal accreditation. But can I join – we [could in that time], and I really don't know if now we can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

So there is some flexibility with the acceptance of new At-Large Structures. There is a page on the ALAC At-Large website which explains what the requirements are. But we do understand that in some countries, having a legal structure is difficult. In some countries, civil society does not exist. So every organization that is set up needs to have a government part to it. We are not governments, we don't deal with governments. So effectively that is also a stumbling block. In some countries, as I said, no legal structure possible.

So in effect, we do have some flexibility. What's important is to of course have the website, have an active user community, and be able to prove that there is an active end user community and that the organization is active in dealing with end users.

So I would suggest is to perhaps contact the At-Large staff, which is, I think, the next slide says that – staff@atlarge.icann.org –and maybe inquire about this, and they will help you along the process and see if you could, or could not, apply. The applications are looked at by the Regional At-Large Organization leadership, and then they make

recommendations to the ALAC regarding accepting or not accepting an application.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And we are going to have to move to our next presenter. So just as we're going to say at every session – what? Send an e-mail to me and I will make sure that the e-mail gets to Olivier's staff so that they can sort it and get him the questions. And if throughout the week, he has time to breathe, read, or do anything, he will. But Olivier, would you like to introduce...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, one last thing. Alan Greenberg, known as The Victim, is our next ALAC Chair. So I'm standing down this year after four years, and I will be still around as vice chair, but Alan is taking over for me. And he has been in ICANN and involved in all sorts of things for much longer than I have. Do you want to say a few words?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. I'm a lot shorter than he is, but I'm easy to find. So if you have any questions, find Olivier, find me, find somebody. There's all sorts of ways to get involved. Olivier forgot that, in addition to having ALSes – groups – most of our regions also allow individuals to join. So you don't have to get 100 of your friends, necessarily. You can simply say, "I want to do it to." And on top of that, you can even participate in our working groups if you're not a member. So all sorts of ways to get involved. We welcome you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. That's very true, actually. You don't need to be a member to participate. The membership is only for the voting and stuff like that, but participation is open to everyone.

And now, over to you, Janice. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you very much, Alan, Olivier, thank you. And just quickly, our alumni that are in At-Large, if you're in the room, would you stand up? Just one moment. Just stand up, if you're in At-Large. So you have all this help here to understand the At-Large. They won't leave the room without making sure that you know, so you won't be alone if you go to the At-Large today or at any time this week. Rafik, would you like the handheld to be here? Would you like the handheld?

RAFIK DAMMAK: It's okay. We don't have any slide anyway. Hello, everybody. It's a little bit hard to come after Olivier. And also I didn't prepare slides because I think it's much better to have more interaction and getting more question to understand what's [inaudible] group. So if I understand correctly, you had yesterday – yeah, you have yesterday, a presentation from Rudi, it's about NPOC, the Not-For-Profit Operation Concerns.

The Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is a part of the GNSO. And did you get any chance to know about the GNSO, how it's structured? Okay, good.

So we are a part of the Non-Contracted Party, and so the GNSO is organized by a Stakeholder Group, and each Stakeholder Group can have, or not, constituency. For the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, we have the NCUC, the noncommercial user constituency which is the oldest, and it was even there before the creation of [NCHE] in 2009. And we have the Not-For-Profit Operational Concern, which was created in 2011.

I do think we are the only space, really, 100% for civil society. The ALAC, it's much more civil society and also include business members. We are a civil society part within ICANN, and we're really focusing basically on the generic names, generic TLD. And we tend to have quite diverse membership. For now we have around 400 members between organization and individuals. So this one of the difference compared to other part of the GNSO. Usually they don't accept that much individuals. We at NCSG accept individuals.

On the other hand, as we said, we represent the civil society, so we care a lot about human rights, privacy, data protection, about development issues. For example, in 2010, we worked with ALAC through one of the cross-community working groups on application support for new gTLD. And in that time, we were basically the only group within GNSO to advocate for that.

So I said also, we are diverse, so we tend to have much more different point of views, and that's why we work for a rough consensus, trying to find and to build a common position on policy, GNSO policy.

Since we are involved basically in GNSO, we either respond to public comments for opened PDP, or we encourage our members to

participate in GNSO working groups or cross-community working groups. So basically we try to defend, really, about the registrant's point of view. Also, user. To care about human rights. Within ICANN space, talking about human rights is not always easy. Also, about privacy. I think if yesterday you attended the WHOIS session, we tend to have a different point of view about this issue. We are more about the protection of user, about the protection of data, to defend activists, and so on.

I think [inaudible] really quick presentation of what we are, what we are doing, what we really care as issues, but I know we have some NCSG member here. So can you just show up? Don't be shy. I also know that we have also some applicants. Just quickly, hopefully we will approve some of them soon.

I know that some are a little bit concerned, but since our work is really based on volunteers, we don't have any admin support – we get admin support, but we don't have a lot of ICANN staff like the ALAC. So we really do a lot of things – yes, the truth, yes.

Really, a lot of work is done by volunteers, so that's why we try to encourage people to join us and to share the workload. And so to participate in policymaking or they join a working group is not easy, but we try to help them to get involved and to learn. It's really quite good learning experience when you join a working group.

So maybe we can open the floor for questions. Yes?

OMAR ANSARI:

I have a question for you, if that's okay, Janice. My name is Omar Ansari. I'm a fellow from Afghanistan. It's very good, and this presentation as well. At the beginning I was thinking At-Large is like extra large, a new t-shirt size. So now I know better.

You had a slide where the discussion process, if there were any comments needed by the two groups – At-Large and there was another one. And there were arrows that were connecting the two initial committees. It's not there, so I could – the first one was comments by At-Large, and the second one was, again, it was connected with the other arrow, where the two committees first initially start the discussion. And if there was a comment, then it goes to the next level.

Is it like the committee on the top has the ability to make an independent comment and the other one joint comment? How is that work?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. I'll make this quickly, then. A quick answer. So the two committees, one was the Regional At-Large Organization. So it's only for one of the regions. And the other one was the At-Large Advisory Committee, which covers all of the regions. It is true that some regions might sometimes have a different point of view than the overall At-Large Advisory Committee, and we have had some regions issuing a separate statement from the At-Large Advisory Committee. But in general, because of our [parametal] structure, all of our regions feed into the At-Large Advisory Committee.

And I wanted to answer another question which I think always comes up. What is the difference between At-Large and NCSG? Rafik has touched on this, but I think there's one point which needs to be said.

NCSG is one of the component parts of the Generic Name Supporting Organization. They are, if you want, in the trenches. They do the heavy lifting in the Generic Name Supporting Organization to make the policy, build the policy, etc. Whilst At-Large primarily comments once the heavy work has been done in the Generic Name Supporting Organization. I think that's one of the component things.

And we do have many members who are members both of the NCSG and of the At-Large. And, in fact, they find that it's always really good, because they're able to actually liaison and bridge between the two communities. And we work – most of the time we agree with each other. There are a few parts that we might not agree with, but on most topics, we do.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, and also we had, yesterday, a session between NCSG and ALAC. Okay, as you saw, we are quite open and [inaudible]. Yes?

BEN TOWN: Hi, my name is Ben Town. Thanks for coming out. I was wondering if you could help clarify the distinction between NCSG and NPOC?

RAFIK DAMMAK: NCSG is the Stakeholder Group, and NPOC is a part of the NCSG. Because this is comes with the idea from the Board in, I think in 2008,

2009, about the restructuring of GNSO. And in that time, the idea was to create much more high-level structure with the Stakeholder Group. And for NCSG we can have many constituents. For example, you want to join. You don't need necessarily to join a constituency. You can just be a member of the NCSG. And so you can join one or two constituencies, and with the [chart] you can join up to three. However, just for now, we have two. So we do a lot of work, really, at the stakeholder group level. So we [inaudible] a lot of our position.

Even for example, for the GNSO council, the election is at the stakeholder group level. So we elect the six people from the stakeholder group. If you compare, for example, [inaudible] with the commercial stakeholder group, each constituency sends two people.

So we try to be much more broader, and why we ensure the diversity – you have the constituency, but we try really to build a lot of our position, a lot of our work, at the Stakeholder Group level. And that's, for a civil society, it's quite important to not divide, and to [inaudible]. That's why you have the NCSG and at the bottom you have NPOC and NCUC.

BEN TOWN:

So if I had a non-profit, would it be better – how would I decide between joining NPOC or NCSG?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

First, you join NCSG. I mean, it's a good question, because what does it mean? What does it mean to be not-for-profit? Even ICANN is not-for-profit. But it doesn't mean it can join us. Also, the International

Chamber of Commerce is not-for-profit. That doesn't mean it can join us. Because it's really, you need to have a non-commercial mission, a non-commercial interest.

So when you join NCSG, and you are eligible to join us, you can join both. So because really it's not about your states of non-profit or [inaudible]. Both have a non-profit in [NGOs] Why NCSG also have individuals. So it's really to find which you are interest, what they are [defending], which is their mission.

NCUC tended to defend more human rights, privacy, development, because it's also the oldest one. When NPOC was created, was supposed to defend the operational concerns. So some organization, they have some interest to defend the concern they have when they are using the domain for their service as not-for-profit. What I can advise you, join NCSG and then you can see which structure it's fit you.

BEN TOWN: That's really helpful. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes.

OSAMA TAMIMI: Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Osama Tamimi and I'm from Palestine. It's my first time as a fellow. My question is are university students involved in your communities so they can act like investors in their campus and spread the word and create an awareness at their universities? Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: University I think can join, I think. We have also a lot of students. When I joined NCSG at that time I was student, too. But, you mean, going to do outreach and awareness? We try to outreach but we don't have a lot of resources to do so, so we try, whenever we come to an ICANN meeting, maybe try to meet with a local and with the limited resources we have.

So we have a lot of academics and students within us. I think many that they really maybe an information, a policy, an Internet policy and so on – they join us because it's good opportunity to learn by practice how to do policy. Because you will see a discussion about policy making is not just an abstraction of policy.

OSAMA TAMIMI: Okay. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And from a university outreach standpoint, I'm really glad you brought it up. It's a big topic for us at ICANN right now: how to do engagement. It's a hit or miss, I have to say, from my perspective, since I joined in 2007, to when we actually take the time to plan to do outreach in a community. I think Fadi has enlightened us a bit and tries to stretch out, but it really would be helpful.

And on the community Wiki – Rafik has put us on the community Wiki here in the room – under GSE, there is a tab for communications, and we share all of – most of – the PowerPoints and handouts that are used in our speaker bureau or any time that our Global Stakeholder

Engagement team is out doing outreach. Any of you can download those PowerPoints to use in universities or to use in your communities and download those handouts. It would be very helpful. But it's a very point about getting more structured.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I said we have a lot of academics, professor, student. Even myself, I joined as a Master's student, and even I was a GNSO Council, I was also a Master's student. We have currently a Master student at GNSO Council, so we are very welcome the academic part. Yes, sorry.

INGA CUCER: Good morning. My name is Inga. I'm from Moldova. You mentioned that At-Large and also NCSG are part of GNSO. No? Or?

RAFIK DAMMAK: At-Large is an advisory committee, so they have much more broader mission. They can do – I think they can make advice about any topic. Why we are really focusing on generic names.

INGA CUCER: Considering again that NCSG is part of GNSO, does it mean that every other ICANN structures, like NCSG, must be part of one of these supporting organizations or not?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. You have several supporting organization and advisory committee, and each one it has a different way to be organized. For example, the

ALAC is organized really by geographical [partition]. You will find the same for the ccNSO, they have also for the five region. For the GNSO, it's really more by stakeholder group.

Let's say – GNSO is small multi-stakeholder structure within ICANN. We are more organized by stakeholder group, so you will find the business side, the non-commercial side. You will also have the contracted party, those who have contract with ICANN. So that's the difference. It also means more difference in terms of interest.

When you're organized by geographical [departition], sometimes it's much more easy to [define] at regional level. In GNSO, diversity can differ. We tend to be much more diverse than our colleagues in the Commercial Stakeholder Group. I don't even talk about the [registrar]. I think mostly they are from North America and Europe. The structure, the organization, it has some impact how things are done in those supporting organizations.

INGA CUCER: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to add just one thing because you referred to GNSO and ccNSO. Again, obviously, the GNSO is non-geographic, because it's the generic names like .com, .net, .org, and the ccNSO is geographic because it's .uk, .de, .it – the country codes, effectively. So that really is I think the big difference with that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Don't be shy. Yes. No ALAC question, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When it comes to cities, are they geographic, or non-geographic? .california, .losangeles, .berlin.

RAFIK DAMMAK: They are generic, because for – responding question about ccTLD, that's funny. Because ccTLD, you can be a country code when you are in the ISO list. There is the ISO list, that if you are there – it's not [necessary] country can be territory and so on, then you can get a ccTLD. If you are not, so that's why many came throw the new gTLD program to get .berlin and .newyorkcity and so on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where do they sit in the structure?

RAFIK DAMMAK: They are generic. It's a good question. Because with the new gTLD program, we may really need to rework the structure again. And that's why, for NCSG, we really prefer to have a Stakeholder Group organization to not have every time to change. So when you have a stakeholder group, it's much more broader. So the problem now about this new gTLD program, you have only the registries Stakeholder Group. The registry, they can create within them interest group.

The problem you have, those gTLD, you have also the .brand. They have interest to create constituency. So that will, for GNSO, as a whole, is to

think how we can reflect what's happened with the new gTLD program within the structure. It will take some time.

That's kind of [rised] question, should we just have a Stakeholder Group? It will make things more easy. Even for you. You need to join GNSO, and the NCSG, and you are thinking to join constituency. It's a lot of hierarchical level that creates a lot of confusion because it's not clear what the difference. Now we have to do that, maybe. We don't know. That's up, I think, closer to the Board, if they want to initiate the process. But there is no ongoing GNSO review, because there was a restructuring in 2008, and now let's review it. We see it was successful or not. Yes.

[ADANA BARRES]:

Hi, my name is [Adana Barres]. I'm from Trinidad and Tobago. I'm interested in human rights. I see that there's a session on human rights in ICANN. Will the NCSG be involved in that session?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes. We were in discussion – it was, for NCSG we always advocated for human rights within GNSO. It was not always easy. There was a kind of opportunity with a report from the Council of Europe about ICANN and human rights. And from there, there was a start of discussion with them. It's led by the Council of Europe, but they want to have more cross-community initiative.

I think they had opportunity to meet, for example, with ALAC on Sunday. So as NCSG, we kind of involved with them, and we are in discussion. Yes, please join. It's Wednesday. Please join. I think it's a

good start for ICANN. We talk about human rights issues much more broader, with the whole community.

Who? Yes.

BIONDA FONSECA:

Hello. My name is Bionda Fonseca from Curacao. Is there a strategy in place how to tackle and how to outreach to the upcoming markets? I'm from the Caribbean, and I encounter in our business communities and our not-for-profit organizations that they are very eager to participate in this kind of associations. Do you have a strategy in place right now to attract the upcoming markets? The Internet penetration in our region is growing very rapidly, and your organization as well. How do you cope with the rapid growth of all the...?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

First, we have members from the Caribbean.

BIONDA FONSECA:

Yeah, I know. I don't doubt about that. I mean the ratio of participation from all of those communities.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes, but just to explain. We need to [inaudible] that, because the geographical diversity I think is still a big problem within ICANN. We have members, and quite active. The outreach is not easy task when it's just volunteers. But we try to do it in systematic way. If we are like moving around regions, we try to do outreach, maybe trying to have

pre-event before ICANN meeting. It's really about policy, just to explain what's happening, why it's important to be there.

Because the problem with ICANN just really [narrow limit] that if you are an organization, the question for you, "Why I need to be concerned what's happening in ICANN? How much resources I can put there and how much influence I can get if I spend time there?"

So as basic strategy I'm not going to say we have elaborated strategies. Really, as our members, our active members, they also do the outreach within regionally, and depending when the ICANN meeting is, we try also to outreach locals.

When we go, for example, like last time, the IGF, we had a workshop about developing countries' participation in policy. And in that time, we try to have panelists from the different region, and we had representative from Trinidad and Tobago.

So with those different – maybe we can do much better, but it's need a lot of resources and it will also put much more workload in the volunteers. But yeah. I'm not saying that we have elaborated, but it's more systematic approach that where we are, we try to outreach people. We also in the event and conference. But also by topics. For example, about privacy, we try to contact those we know who are really interested about privacy, because that make much more sense for them to be involved with.

BIONDA FONSECA:

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: [inaudible]. Yeah?

KRISHNA KUMAR RAJAMANNAR: Hi, I'm Krishna from India. My question is on closer to that. When we talk about our inclusive platform, does it include people from various political leanings and religious ideologies? Because in real world, I see that we are all divided based on these things, and it is pretty hard to reach a consensus on human rights issues. So how do we reach a consensus in NCSG with respect to these issues?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Well, to reach consensus, first we need discussion. And so everybody can share his position or his point of view. We have this difference of [various] background and interpretation, and we try to work in common position. So you have to convince others, but it's also in rough consensus, and we try to find that common ground.

And I say we have many from developing countries, so for example, they may push for more about developing issues, about economic and social rights. That diversity which will much more nuanced position on complex issues.

What will happen, we have discussion mailing list, and some people volunteer to draft a statement if there is public comment. And then it's put on the list and people can add comments, can edit, can ask for wording and so on. So there is process to reach a rough consensus on positions. Okay.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Rafik, thank you very much. Much appreciated. I almost feel like taking my words back about At-Large being the most complex when we start to talk about GNSO.

RAFIK DAMMAK: There is nothing simple in ICANN.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: There isn't. And that's exactly what I'm going to say. It takes time. That's what this week is about. So I really appreciate the questions this morning, though. That's the whole point of this. Ask the question. If it wasn't the answer that clicked, think about it, ask it again. Rafik is here. Alan. Olivier. As we said, there are folks from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and from At-Large that are within your own alumni group. So please don't be afraid to ask the questions. Rafik was almost a fellow. He almost had to get up at early morning hours, but was selected to be on the NomCom instead. So thank you very much, gentlemen.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Janice, for those who want to join us, it's quite easy [inaudible], NCSG is and we are still wondering what is it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a quick commercial break. We've got brochures in the corner for At-Large. The guide to being an At-Large Structure in yellow, beautiful

color. And we've also got these invitations for the NARALO showcase, so North American Regional At-Large Organization showcase tomorrow afternoon, Wednesday – evening, sorry. Tomorrow evening. I think it's about 6:30 until 8:30. There's going to be a show with a hoop dancer. But you'll also be able to – seriously, seriously, native hoop dancer. Really good. You're also going to be able to learn a lot about what the Regional At-Large Organizations do, and this is open to everyone. So thank you. And back to your program.

BILL DRAKE: You guys did NCSG and ALAC together? He's hijacking your session. All right. Hijacking sessions. Very good, Olivier. You're an imperial force.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm very scared of you, so I do have to go. I wouldn't dare hijack your session, Bill.

BILL DRAKE: Good morning. Shall we? Good morning, everybody. I'm Bill Drake. I teach at the University of Zurich in Switzerland, and I am the Chair of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) which you've probably heard a little bit about already, and which I mentioned to some of you at the event the other night is one of the two constituencies with the NCSG.

Actually, NCSG was kind of born out of NCUC in a weird way. NCUC has been around since 1999, since the beginning of ICANN, and has been the focal point for civil society activism around a lot of issues such as

human rights, freedom of expression, privacy, other civil liberties issues, development, etc., etc., in ICANN for those 15 years.

When the GNSO was restructured in 2009, they created the Stakeholder Group and put us in the Stakeholder Group. So most of the members of the NCSG were and still are from NCUC, by and large.

We have – can somebody click? Should I just sit over here and do this? Should I put my glasses on so I can see it? Anyway, we have at present about 360 members from around the world. Two thirds of our members are from outside the United States. And – no mic. I'm not awake yet. Okay. I'm good. Thank you.

About members. Currently, 357 members from 81 different countries, including 95 non-commercial organizations and 262 individuals. And that will grow after this meeting because at each meeting we have the NCSG Executive Committee, of which Rafik is the chair, which meets and reviews applications to join, and so the membership goes up after each meeting. But in any event, that's a snapshot of who we are at present.

As I say, many of those NGOs that we have are very involved in human rights, civil liberties, freedom of expression, development-type issues. Some of them are really quite interesting. The Church of Reality, for example, which is – but some are large, like EDUCAUSE, which is an organization for university networking, and then some are smaller advocacy organizations, etc.

What is unique, I suppose, in terms of membership, is that NCUC does have individual members, which NPOC does not. Individuals can join NCSG and join neither constituency as well, although not very many

people do that. So basically, this is where most individuals who want to join and participate in the civil society activities in the PDP process of the GNSO and new gTLDs – how's that for a sentence? – would go. These are all acronyms they've totally digested now, so that's good.

NCUC has been very active over the years in working within the ICANN context to do advocacy around these issues, and often that's been a challenge, because of course the dominant thrust of a lot of ICANN policy-making is much more geared toward the interests of the private sector, and so we have often had much to do in trying to influence policies around the edges and try to bring global public interest dimensions into the policy outputs of the GNSO.

And we've had some success, I think, in doing that, particularly with the restructuring of the GNSO in 2011. As Rafik will have told you, there are now six councilors, members of the GNSO Council, who come from civil society, which means that we have a good chunk of votes. And very often in order for the GNSO Council to pass things, they have to bring us on board or get some of us to sign off on what they're doing, and this gives a certain advantage and influence and an ability to try to shape policies a little bit, and at least maybe take some of the sharp edges off of policies we might not like otherwise.

When we talk about how do civil society actors actually influence the policy process, this is, I think – and I made this point the other day in that little meeting that we had standing over there – same room? – when we had the breakouts. I'm very involved in civil society activism in a number of different Internet governance spaces, globally.

And if you spend time around the United Nations or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris, or the IGF process, etc., etc., you know that generally speaking, what civil society people can do by way of trying to influence the agenda, is to write written statements often objecting to things that have been proposed by somebody else and asking for changes. And then it becomes a kind of difficult process to actually get those changes embodied in the outcomes.

What's very interesting and unique about the ICANN environment is that, actually, we have a vote. So the form of participation is really quite different here. This is a much more genuine form of multi-stakeholderism. You can roll up your sleeves, get involved in the process, and actually influence decisions that then shape the global Internet.

And we have done so for 15 years, and I can name many cases where we have been able to participate quite effectively in getting our concerns reflected in some policies. I can also name many examples where our views were not taken on board. This is natural. You don't expect when you participate in any kind of negotiating process to win all the time. Sometimes you're in a minority, sometimes people just don't share your viewpoint because they have legitimate different interests, and that's fine. That's inherent in the process.

So this is democratic bottom-up decision making with civil society injected into it. So it's a very interesting thing for us to be here and be doing these kinds of activities.

If you look at our website, there's all kinds of information. This website was built by the members. We had no financial support or anything else from ICANN. Basically, this is all volunteer labor you're looking at. And you may see that picture. I'm not quite sure why that picture is on the NCSG website. This is actually a workshop I organized for NCUC at the African School of Internet Governance in Durban in 2007.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Rafik's hijacking from you.

BILL DRAKE: Rafik's hijacking from me. I'm going to have to talk to him about that. Well, Rafik's a member of NCUC, so that's okay. I let him go. Anyway. But if you go on our website, you can find out all kinds of things about what we've been doing over the years. You have both history of NCUC, information about how we're governed. We have an executive committee that's elected every year and a chair that's elected every year. I'm in my second term.

We have a travel support policy that we've just established. Starting in Marrakesh, we're going to make \$2,000 available to two people per meeting to be able to attend ICANN meetings out of our own funds, because there isn't enough support directly through ICANN to get people on the ground. So we're going to use our own money to try to do that.

You can participate in NCUC by simply being a member of the listserv and the dialog discussions that go on there, and then from there, you can participate with us in a number of different activities. And Rafik has

mentioned these. Whether it is writing inputs in public comment periods or making policy statements, etc., just being around the meetings and lobbying, getting to know the different actors from different sectors and working with them to try to bring our concerns to their attention, getting engaged directly in GNSO working groups that actually have function-specific tasks that they're trying to take care of to design particular inputs that will then go back to the GNSO Council for adoption.

Organizing events, we do a lot of that. I organized a big conference in Singapore earlier this year on the NETmundial meeting that was coming up. It was a cross-constituency meeting where I brought together people from across the ICANN universe to talk about all the difference that were going to be addressed in the NETmundial, and we made available the position papers and statements of all the different groups, and so on. But we've organized a number of different workshops at different meetings on different substantive topics, as well as three policy conferences, big policy conferences.

So we do that, and we also do things like participating in other global Internet governance environments, including the Internet Governance Forum, where we just were in Istanbul and had two workshops there that were very successful, that explored some very important issues relevant to ICANN and the larger Internet governance environment. And we participate in some other kinds of meetings as well.

If you look in the archive, we have a document library that was put together – actually one of our members is a librarian. You can go

through here and find, actually, scores and scores and scores of NCUC policy statements and other documents going back over 15 years.

Basically, then, NCUC is one of the component parts of civil society participation in ICANN generally and in the GNSO process specifically. And it is one that is very focused, as I say, more on the public policy advocacy kind of stuff. NPOC is, by mission, focused on operational aspects of being an NGO, a non-commercial entity, in the Internet environment – so protecting your trademark and so on so that if people try to abuse, if you're the Red Cross or something and they try to abuse your website to make money and scam people, whatever.

Our focus is less operational and more the external policy environment. We're trying to affect the extent to which human rights, freedom of expression, privacy protection, access to knowledge, development, and other kinds of global public interest objectives are reflected within the GNSO policy process. So that's what we're all about.

We meet at ICANN meetings repeatedly, at many meetings over the course of the week. But there is one in particular – can I find it? Let me find – is there a link to the agenda of the conference? I could do that. Don't be logical with me. Ican.org, then slide down – you've done this before, haven't you, Janice? Where is it? Okay, Los Angeles, ICANN 51. Click. Oh, this looks completely different to me. The mysteries of the ICANN website are something to behold.

But anyway, I will eventually get to where I'm trying to go, and then I will stop and take questions, just to show you that directly after this meeting we have a meeting of the NCUC that goes from 9:00 until 12:15 today. So directly a half hour after this meeting. And the agenda is an

interesting one, I think. I try to use the opportunity to bring a lot of different parts of the ICANN community to come in and talk with us about different issues.

So as well as talking about some internal matters, we'll be having a visit from the ICANN Nominating Committee, then we'll be having a visit from Theresa Swinehart and David Olive, two senior policy people at ICANN, to talk about the accountability and IANA transition policies and how these have been recalibrated to take on board the concerns that have been expressed by NCUC and other players about the way they were being conducted.

And then we will have a visit from the people of Council of Europe. We had in London a meeting for an hour – a very interesting meeting – with people from the Council of Europe who had just released a report on the status of human rights in ICANN and how to advance them more effectively. And we're having them come back for a follow-up discussion today. And then I should also add, finally, on that note, that while it's not listed on the program, there is an open meeting tomorrow afternoon at 1:15 in I believe the Encino Room, that is intended to be the beginning of a cross-community dialogue on human rights, where some governments from the GAC as well as the Council of Europe and civil society and other players will be coming together and trying to lay the foundation for a larger process around human rights at ICANN.

So you are most welcome to attend either or both the [our] Constituency Day meeting which start at 9:00 today, or that other meeting tomorrow. The constituency meeting will be in the Westwood Room, which is just down the hall, at 9:00. So I will stop there. And any

questions you may have, I'm happy to – I took my watch off over there and I don't know what time it is.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: You have time. It's 8:26. We'll give you a couple more minutes because we're running a bit late. We're going to start here and then move our way over.

BILL DRAKE: And please say who you are when you – yes?

ANNA SECKA SAINE: Good morning. I'm Anna, from the Gambia. My question was if you have a university student and you wanted them to join ICANN, would your group be the best group to join or would it be ALAC?

BILL DRAKE: It depends on what their interests are. I'm involved in both sides. On the At-Large side, I'm a member, have been for five years, a member of the Board of Directors of the European At-Large Organization. Now, the way At-Large is structured, you have organizational members. Only the NARALO has individual members. Am I right? I think it's only NARALO that has individual? Who does? APRALO does too? So two of the five RALOs have individual members.

So if you're an individual student, and you want to get involved, you can make choices based on what you think you want to be involved in. Now if you get involved on our side, you're focusing on the policymaking

process and providing inputs to the process. So we are actually a policymaking entity. The advisory group At-Large provides advice to the Board, but does not directly participate in the policymaking process. So it just has a different role.

The At-Large is multi-stakeholder, as Olivier I'm sure told you. They have both civil society noncommercial users and business users who are members of At-Large. So they serve different functions, and many people are in both, like me.

So it's just a question of how you want to allocate your time and what you find the most interesting. If direct engagement in the policy process affecting gTLDs is your interest, then we would be probably the place you would focus. If you want to be involved in broader kinds of discussions around ICANN generally, etc., then you might concentrate on the At-Large side. But again, these are not mutually exclusive options. You can do both. And many people do. Yes? Who have we got?

HANANE BOUJEMI: Good morning, Bill. My name is Hanane. I just want to ask you, do you have an idea if the session today on ICANN and human rights still taking place, and will you be participating?

BILL DRAKE: You're talking about the one today?

HANANE BOUJEMI: Yeah.

BILL DRAKE: That is very unfortunately a GAC session. It's a half-hour meeting. It's just very badly labeled, the whole thing. We had some issues. I don't know why – we were given explanations, they don't make sense to me – why the open community discussion of human rights is not listed, cannot be listed, on the ICANN agenda. But it's not. The one that is listed on the ICANN agenda is a half-hour preparatory meeting for the GAC members to talk about human rights to get them teed up and interested in the issue.

So that, I think, is at 9:30 today. So that conflicts with our meeting, so a couple of our members will go over and watch that and then come back to our meeting. But the meeting that I was talking about is tomorrow, Wednesday, at 1:15, and that is an open meeting for the entire community to talk about human rights issues. Yes?

KRISHNA KUMAR RAJAMANNAR: Hi. Krishna here, from India. I'm a first-time fellow.

BILL DRAKE: Congratulations.

KRISHNA KUMAR RAJAMANNAR: While going through our website, you mentioned that the website was built without any funds from ICANN and it was [entirely] by users. So I want to understand how NCUC functions without funds, or if there's funds, who are all the sponsors? Just for my understanding, I just want

to understand how it functions, being a non-commercial entity without funds [inaudible].

BILL DRAKE:

There's a very simple answer here. None of us gets paid, and we've never had any staff support to do anything until just the past half-year. We began to get some support from the Engagement folks to help organize outreach meetings, so we had a little meeting on Saturday where we invited some people to come in and hear about civil society at ICANN. And starting two weeks ago, we've been allocated ten hours a week of a staff member's support for maintaining the website and things like that.

Everything else that's ever been done over the past 15 years has been done by volunteers. We do raise some funds ourselves. I write to the head of PIR (the Public Interest Registry) and CGI.br, the Brazilian registry, every year and beg for money. They give us a little bit of money and we use some of that money to help some of our members attend meetings. That's it. They have no influence on our decisions, and we are not flush with cash, but we have a little bit of money in the bank that we can use primarily to get people to meetings. Yes?

KRISHNA KUMAR RAJAMANNAR: And what is your motivation in being part of NCUC? What is that one thing that drives you to work for NCUC?

BILL DRAKE:

I'm crazy. I have been a politically committed person for a very, very, very, very, very long time, going back to the Vietnam War, to tell you how old I am. And so I just believe in the global public interest and promoting certain kinds of values in the Internet environment. I'm also, because I'm an academic who studies global institutions and cooperation in Internet and related technological environments, I have an intellectual interest in how governance works here.

So for me, it's a combination of political commitment and values and intellectual interests that I guess would drive me. Everybody's motivations are different, but generally speaking, the civil society people here, as in other international environments, whether it's people who work on the Human Rights Council at the UN or people who work in disarmament or whatever, basically you have to be driven by commitment to a certain set of values and norms. You have to be a person who cares about how things are done and making sure that there's an appropriate balance, in our case, between commercial and non-commercial objectives in the making of global Internet governance policies, including within ICANN. So that's really what it's about. Yes?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

Can we take a – oh, I don't have a mic.

[ADANA BARRES]:

Just really quickly for my clarification, because it's not on the schedule, the meeting for tomorrow is in the Encino Room?

BILL DRAKE: Yes, sorry. Thank you for reminding me. The last information I received – the staff changed it a number of times, and we don't have an official confirmation – but my understanding is that the human rights meeting is tomorrow in the Encino Room at 1:15 until 2:45 PM. Yes, sir.

[SAUL]: Good morning. I'm [Saul] from the Gambia.

BILL DRAKE: Hi.

[SAUL]: When I came to ICANN, I was pretty much – there was not much of civil society. And now it seems it's taking an important place in ICANN. [Albeit] I think it's still in the fringes in ICANN, because ICANN invariably deals with technical issues. Do you envisage a situation whereby this NCUC would actually operate outside ICANN? Because in my opinion, I don't think the aspirations that people expect from NCUC can be achieved in the ICANN setup.

BILL DRAKE: That's an interesting point. Well, NCUC participates, as Rafik told you, in NCSG, the umbrella group. And NCSG is formally represented in a coalition of coalitions around Internet governance issues that do things like, for example, nominating people to be representatives of civil society in various global contexts.

So, for example, I was, for three years, on the Internet Governance Forums Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Committee. I'm stepping down because I don't have the time to do it. And they are now in the process of gathering new nominations. And so we collaborated with colleagues in the Internet Governance Caucus, [inaudible] and other, the Association for Progressive Communication, and other global networks of civil society activists, to engage in things like the IGF context and so on.

But our primary mission is definitely focused here at ICANN. And I would say that while the issues are nominally technical, the technical issues really very often have strong political, social, cultural dimensions to them. There is nothing purely technical about whether or not you're going to adopt a domain name like .amazon, or whether you're going to have a WHOIS registry database with all the personal information of the world, all users who have websites, which can be accessed by law enforcement people looking to track down human rights actors in authoritarian countries.

Many of these questions have strong sociopolitical dimensions. They're technical, and that means that it takes a high level of expertise to engage them. But nevertheless, I wouldn't say that we are limited by the fact that the work is complex and technical. It just takes time.

And as I said to somebody the other day, and I should conclude, there are different levels of engagement people can find depending on their own interests and skillsets and so on.

Some people join NCUC and NCSG and they just limit themselves to being on the listerv and reading about what's going on and keeping up

the discussions. And then sometimes they jump in on the discussion, and then sometimes they start to get more energized and find that we're doing something that they particularly care about, so then they get more directly involved, and maybe they stand for election for one of our positions, maybe they joined a working group in the GNSO, etc., etc. You can participate at a level that meets your particular skillset and time constraints.

And so I would say I wouldn't let the fact that everything looks very technical at first blush scare anybody off. There's a learning curve. But there is also time to, through osmosis, get up to speed, find out what's going on. And of course, many colleagues are very willing to help new colleagues in trying to understand exactly where, in that technical environment, the political and the social and the other issues come to fore and have to be addressed. Okay? Janice is waving at me like she wants me to go away.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I do.

BILL DRAKE: She does. Should I take one last question? One? Sorry. We'll talk another time. Who's after me?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Tracy will be coming up right now to talk. So Carlton, again, if you want to send the question to me for Bill, I'll get it to Bill. If you'd like to go



with Bill as he's running to his meeting, you can run alongside of him and ask the question. Thank you, Bill, so very much.

BILL DRAKE: You're all welcome to come to the Westwood Room at 9:00 and join our meeting, too.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Don't anybody look at the screen. Avert your gaze. For those in our remote room, Tracy, we have all alumni in the remote room, so Tracy is here, Hackshaw, who is the current vice chair of the Government Advisory Committee. And Tracy has a slideshow that he's going to show. So for the remote room, I don't have that slide set yet, but I will get it to you, because I know the names here in the room, so I'll make sure that I get it to you as well as to the folks here in the physical room.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Hi. Good morning, everyone. How are you all feeling this morning? Good? We talked last night, yes? All right. So I'm going to put just three slides up. I have got it down to an art now, so I have the three key slides that I need to present.

My name is Tracy Hackshaw. I'm currently one of the three vice chairs of the Governmental Advisory Committee. By a show of hands, can anyone show me who's from government in the room, that's from your government? Do you know who your GAC rep is? Yes? You know?

[UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER]: We are new. We are about to join GAC.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Excellent.

[UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER]: Yes. We will be probably one of the 147 already there.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yes, there's a bit of a race between us and I think ALAC now. I think they're competing to see how many members they have.

So the Governmental Advisory Committee in ICANN is not as bad as you may have heard it is. It's government – I know it seems like a big bad wolf kind of thing. And we're going to be in this room after, as opposed to the tent, so that's good news for those who are coming to meetings.

It really is a situation where the government seeks to participate in a multi-stakeholder process. While within the GAC themselves there may be governments who have particular views and so on, it's important to understand that the GAC operates as a group, on consensus basis. So there is never any – well, it's very difficult for what we call capture of the GAC by any one or more groups of governments to do anything that may attempt or appear to be in anybody's views different to what you believe. So that's very important to understand that we work on consensus.

What's also important to understand is that in the GAC itself, the governments that are represented there has been growing over the

years. So while initially there were governments who might have been traditional in what we call the OECD process, which is the developed world, over the last five years or so we've seen a very rapid increase in countries who are not part of that world, and from the African region, from the Pacific region, from the Caribbean region, from Southeast Asia, and other countries that would not traditionally be a part of the process.

And it's very important for those in this room who don't currently have a GAC representative on the GAC to ensure that when you go back home, that you inquire as to why that may be the case. It's very easy. They may not understand or know about ICANN, and may be difficult for them to come to meetings. But joining the GAC doesn't mean you have to actually journey to a meeting. You can join the GAC and participate in remote discussions on a mailing list.

So if anybody who can check the website, it's very easy to find. It's gac.icann.org. Look for your country. Look for your rep. And if one of you don't see your rep, maybe an opportunity now is to go home [inaudible] to look to see, to ask them "Why are you not on this very important group of governments in the world who are meeting three times a year and so on?"

And if you see your rep, and you don't know who it is, very important that you talk to your rep. GAC reps are like me. They're people. They're human beings. They're not these guys in suits who walk around and don't talk to anybody. They talk to everybody. In fact, if you stop a GAC rep in a meeting here, it's 99% certain they will stop and talk to you and

engage and have a discussion. So please don't see them as being different to anybody else.

Have a chat. "I'm from Country X. I'm from Country Y. I understand you're the rep for my country. Here are my concerns. Here are my issues." It's very important to get that dialogue going, and I think that's something that we don't see as important, or we don't see as happening, many times. So keep that going.

All right. So just quickly on the slide. So the GAC's role is to provide advice to ICANN. So we're one of the – I'm sure by now you'll understand the AC vs. SO – yes, they do? – AC vs. SO concept. So we are an Advisory Committee. But the GAC has a reasonably unique status in that GAC advice is perceived to be different from other ACs, and while that is not entirely true, in the bylaws there is a process [to do] with GAC advice, so to some people, that means it's true.

I know the ICANN Board takes all policy advice seriously. The AC process, as you know, generally happens after policy has been implemented, and there are efforts to change that that are going on right now with, in our case, the GNSO, to bring the GAC into an early engagement. It's been going on for some time. So that there's advice is not given at the end but rather throughout the process, so we don't have a situation where in the policy process the GAC advice comes and derails all the policy that will have been developed over a period of time. So that is going on as we speak.

But the ACs generally speak at the end of the process. Even if there was advice during a process, they are also able to provide advice at the end of a policy process. They're also able to provide advice at any time to

ICANN on any particular issue. And that advice is generally given in the form of, at the end of a meeting, so in the GAC's case it's a communique. That's listed as advice. Some people write letters. The GAC also does write letters to the Board, either during a meeting or intercessionally between meetings. That's also perceived as GAC advice.

And on the GAC website, again, there's a [register of] advice. You will see the historical list of all the GAC advice items that have been given. That's very important to understand for those who are trying to look at the whole ICANN process from the very early days with the ccTLDs, straight up to the .xxx issue, and on into the new gTLD and so on. You'll see a whole stream of advice documents, and the way the GAC Board responded to those advice documents.

In some cases, it's an acceptance, a singular response: "We accept." In some cases it's "accept with reservation" or "accept with discussion to be had." And on rare occasions, there's a rejection. And you would see one or two cases where that process evolved to what may not had been consensus at the end of the day.

And the point I'm going to make is that the GAC and the Board have a special relationship in the sense that – and you may have heard about it in the entire meeting already – in the bylaws, if the ICANN Board rejects GAC advice, or wants to reject GAC advice, it is not as simple as it may seem.

So attempt to reject GAC advice, and you will have seen on some discussions of having a two-thirds majority, a change in the bylaws, to do that. But if before even that comes, the Board decides to reject the advice, they must go into intercessional or intermediary arbitration type

of proceeding with the GAC to discuss that we intend to reject this advice, let's discuss.

Normally before that happens, you attempt to see discussion before even the rejection. So the Board may flag some concerns. "We think we have a concern with this issue or that issue." Sometimes [they'll bill us] what's called a score card, and let's attempt to resolve it before we even accept or reject. And that's been going on in the new gTLD process for some time.

Very important that you understand that even before the decision is made, there are attempts to negotiate and arrive at a consensus between even the GAC and the Board. So the Board and the GAC would meet, they would discuss, and then the GAC would return to meet a consensus and arrive at some sort of response to what the Board would have said. That can go over a period of months or even years, literally, until at such time when the advice is actually accepted.

So it's very rare that advice is rejected. However, the point is that it's possible for the advice to be rejected by the Board. When GAC advice is accepted, it tends to form part of the policy process, because the GAC, as you will read in this presentation, it seeks public interest.

So I know you'll have heard that discussion, on any group that you attend – civil society, what is a public interest, and so on. So from a Government perspective, and take it for what it's worth, the government is, in most cases, an elected democratic institution within society. What you'll find is that they, by definition, represent the public interest through a democratic process. They're voted in by a certain percentage of the population.

People will say, “Well, what about the other percentage?” It’s unique in that sense, but they do represent the public interest by definition. So you’ll tend to find the GAC issues relate to public policy concerns, consumer issues, international law issues, issues that may not be necessarily issues that are discussed either in the private sector type discussions or even a civil society.

However, over the last few years we found quite interestingly, the ALAC and the GAC have come to quite similar conclusions on certain issues based on the fact that we do both represent the public interest of civil society on the one hand through the user group, the user community. The ALAC represents these bodies in a similar to the NCUC except the ALAC is a group type organization, mostly [inaudible] institutions, and the GAC represent the governments.

You tend to find that they do come to some sort of agreement on issues, and sometimes even produce joint statements, especially for developing countries or consumer issues. Because if there is an issue, if it’s a business that they’re discussing, they may have a joint position that they will adopt. So you see those kinds of things being adopted.

When you come to the GAC meetings, especially today, you tend to find those things being discussed. So on Constituency Day, many times the constituencies will cross-meet. So today you will find I think ALAC is meeting with the GAC today. We met the GNSO already, unfortunately, on Sunday. So if you missed that, you’ll want to have seen that meeting, which is quite long and interesting.

But the ccNSO meeting with us today, and so on, as well as the Board, which is apparently the highlight of the meeting when the Board and

the GAC meets on Tuesday afternoon and has the interchange, which could be quite entertaining depending on what the issues are. In fact, [inaudible] that meeting, and check the agenda. So today is where you see the issues being discussed.

And when you come to a GAC meeting, it could be challenging because you have to see – well, in this case about 70 countries, all having their say. And of course they all speak from a certain position, and it's quite formal, in some cases. But it's very good for you to learn and understand how those positions are adopted, because they do come from what we call our capitals or administrations, and they're not personal views.

And the GAC itself doesn't represent. So if you are a GAC member, it is very difficult for you to come to a meeting and represent your personal opinion. You're supposed to represent the opinion of your government, and by extension, your country. Of course, public interest and your personal views, except for where you have technical expertise or policy expertise, are left out of the equation, and as I said, no one individual or country can sway an entire GAC, because it's a consensus based operation, and we don't vote – at least not yet.

So it's a consensus-driven process, and it takes time. And coming to a meeting, I think you would see a very good example of how a consensus is derived in the midst of conflict or differing opinions.

I encourage you to look at the GAC website. I encourage you to, as I said, join if you don't have already membership. And again, in this meeting in particular, you're going to find some interesting discussions

on you've heard about human rights, you heard about the bylaws change and so on. It's moving forward from the new gTLD issue.

For the last few years, new gTLDs have been the major issue. So we're now moving forward into the other issues that affect the Internet. There's an ITU meeting coming up, actually, next week, which I'm attending, and many of the GAC members will also be in those meetings and bringing the ICANN perspective into an ITU meeting, which is going to interesting on its very self.

So you're going to start seeing petitions being formed. And if you're interested in that kind of where the Internet is going next and the ITU meeting, which is going to make another step forward, come to a GAC meeting. Come to a meeting today and tomorrow before communique drafting, and understand what's happening.

And if you don't understand the public policy issues, quick look at the website, a look at the advice. Very straightforward. It's hard to read. Inform yourself on the issues. So I think that's it for my few minutes. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

I know we're just going to have a couple questions here. Just to point out, Tracy's comment about the GAC meeting with the Board. It's often become quite the place to be. He's absolutely right. Throughout the day today, you will see Board meeting with each and every of the community groups, so it's really kind of a good way to get a little snippet of how the Board and that community's relationship is, and the topics

that are important to that community, because that's where they're going to raise it to the Board.

I'll be in a couple of those sessions myself. I find them a really good way to kind of get a quick summary. If you're not quite sure which group you want to be in, you might just stay in one room and just let all the communities rotate in throughout with the Board. So look into the schedule.

Tracy, we just have one question from remote that I'd like to say: "GAC is becoming more and more important and influential in ICANN policy process above all in the new gTLDs delegation. Where does the strength come from to get more engaged and more involved and influential in policy?"

TRACY HACKSHAW:

I'm [not] going to take that bait. I think what has happened is that it's pretty straightforward. The Internet has evolved to a point where it's become more important generally in the lives of many countries.

So as I said before, whereas in a previous iteration, the OECD type countries were concerned about it, more developing countries are involved. And the issues are not just moving in ICANN, they're moving in other spheres. So it's moving in the UN spheres, it's moving in the sub-regional spheres.

So you tend to find people who may not have been involved in Internet issues or ICT issues, getting involved. So trade and ICT, climate change and ICT, and then the Internet being one of those major thrusts, filtering into those discussions.

You tend to find countries themselves understanding more and getting more involved. As such, they're getting more involved in ICANN and the issues – it's kind of a self-reinforcing circle, if you want to call it that, or cycle. So it's basically bubbling up to the top of many countries' agendas and becoming very important.

PATRICIA SENGHOR:

Hello, Tracy. Patricia Senghor, from Senegal. Still in line with the first question and the reinforcement of the GAC and the PDP process. Could you tell us more about the proposed bylaws, revision changes, regarding the consideration of GAC advice within the Board?

TRACY HACKSHAW:

All right. I will basically repeat what I have heard, because I don't want to get into the, necessarily, the controversy about it. So I've heard that the Board takes decisions on two-thirds majority anyhow, so this is simply a reinforcement of what happens in any event in the Board. And that's coming from Board members who've said that, so they themselves are perplexed at whole debate.

The process of this two-thirds, moving to two-thirds acceptance of GAC advice, is something that came out of an older process called accountability and transparency review, ATRT 1, and was not adopted yet. The ATRT 2 pointed it out, and because it's part of that process, the recommendations that have been left back have been taken forward, so that's 2010, I think 2013 or 2014. So you have a four year old – I can't remember the exact date – recommendation that's kind of hanging.

So it's simply a process where the GAC said "Well, let's take the recommendations that have been left back and move them forward for adoption as others have been." It's just unfortunate that this one happened as the time in which it's come and the environment in which it comes in seems to have created a little bit of a problem. But really, yes, it's straightforward. There's nothing sinister or it happened even before any of this gTLD process came up. So it's simply a process that's being followed. So that's what I've heard. So the debate about it I'm not going to get into, but that's what I can transmit back to you.

PATRCIA SENGHOR: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning. I am [inaudible]. I am a first time fellow from India. I have two quick questions. The first one is, following up on that question about the proposed amendment to the bylaws, where a super-majority will be needed to reject GAC advice. Is that the case with any of the other Advisory Committees' advice as well? Because if it's not, it sounds like the GAC is becoming more equal than the other sort of stakeholders in the multi-stakeholder model.

My second question is could you talk a little bit about the nature and the quality of developing country participation in the GAC? Thanks.

TRACY HACKSHAW: So let's quickly address you for this question. A supermajority is probably a bad word to use. As I said before, the Board doesn't adopt

decisions on minority or even – they adopt majority decisions of that nature anyhow. So I don't think it's something that is unique. And as I said before, it's not something that is sinister. So I would not want to get any further into that discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But what I meant was, if the Board was to reject ALAC advice, for example, would they similarly need to act with a two-thirds majority?

TRACY HACKSHAW: It depends on what's in the bylaws. And I don't have the bylaws in front of me. Very governmental here. I don't have the bylaws in front of me, so I won't be able to comment on how the other ACs are treated. I do know the GAC's advice is in the bylaws and that's why it's being treated that way. How did I do, lawyer? Any lawyers in the room? Was that a good one? All right.

Developing countries' participation is improving. We could have had more voices, so we're seeing the numbers increase, but still the voices in the room are still that of much the developed world. So even after you're there, the voices that are being raised, the voices that are being expressed on e-mail lists in and in the room still are quite silent. So I would want to see that increased.

I have no doubt that the quality of the people who are there are at the level that they need to be, but I think the engagement in the issues and the engagement in the ICANN specific issues might challenge some developing countries because they are highly technical issues of DNS, which – people who may be ICT, broader type people, or they may be

engineers at a different network engineers, but they're not looking at DNS issues specifically. So depending on what topic it is, you may have more participation, higher quality of participation, but generally speaking the volume of the voices in [inaudible].

[ADANA BARRES]:

Hi. I have a follow-on comment, a statement, and a question.

My first a statement is thank you very much, Tracy, for being my mentor. It really was a wonderful experience. I learned a lot from you. And I know that volunteering, you volunteer your time, so I'm very, very appreciative of that.

My follow-on question is so far in my participation here in ICANN, I realize I'm becoming very passionate about being pro-Caribbean. So what is the Caribbean voice like on the GAC? How many countries from the Caribbean are represented on the GAC? Because, as [Krishna] was referring to developing countries, but I want to developing countries, but I want to be specific. What is the Caribbean voice like on the GAC?

And my final question is I realize there seems to be some schedule changes today. Will the GAC be here in this room all day? And thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you for the statement. To the Caribbean, Albert could probably give you the exact figure, but I think it's nine countries from the Caribbean, including those who are not only English speaking – so Dominican Republic in that list and so on. There are how many countries

in the Caribbean, Albert? 20? 28-ish countries in the Caribbean. So it's still very small.

But those who are there tend to be loud enough. We have Jamaica there, Trinidad and Tobago there, Grenada there, Barbados has joined, St. Lucia has joined, Dominica has joined, [inaudible] from the English-speaking side. So we're getting there, but it's still, again as I said before, the issues are now bubbling into the Caribbean.

So you'll tend to find – like for the ITU meetings, that's why there's more participation from the Caribbean. They may drift into ICANN meetings because ICANN issues are being brought up at the ITU.

So whether that's a good or bad thing, I think it's positive in the long run, because even if they don't agree with ICANN being brought up at the ITU, they have to understand what is ICANN, so I'm going to come to an ICANN meeting and understand. And many of these – Grenada in particular – they have that issue. "What is ICANN? I'm hearing about it, so let me come to a meeting."

But again, for those who are in the room who are not from a country who – not just Caribbean – go back home and express that it's very important to be at ICANN meetings because it's coming up in other fora and they need to understand what it's about.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

We're going to take one last question, and I'm going to ask Arsene. If you noticed if you've been asking questions, I've been trying to go to others that haven't had a chance to ask a question this morning. So

we'll end up with Arsene, because we do need to turn this room over and get ready for the GAC meeting for the day. Arsene?

ARSENE TUNGALI BAGUMA: Thanks, Janice, for this opportunity. And thanks, Tracy, for the presentation. I have two quick questions for you, Tracy.

Being in the GAC, I don't know for how long you've been there yet, but I would like to know from your experience, what have been your best moments in the GAC and your worst moments in the GAC? That's my first question.

And the second one is from your experience, I know you've been in so many other meetings across the ICANN, what's your feeling about how the government behaves? I know they have different behaviors depending on all those different meetings in ICANN, in IGFs, in those ITU meetings. What can you say about how gov representatives behave? And I'm sorry, I'm Arsene Tungali, I'm from the DRC.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you, Arsene. Since [inaudible] are coming into the room for a GAC meeting, I will be very hard-pressed to [inaudible] that last one. But I would [inaudible] the first one.

Yes, I think my best moment was seeing – I started in the GAC officially in 2010, and my first real challenge was the .xxx, and I remember in San Francisco where there was a bit of what we call a standoff between the Board and the GAC. I remember the GAC all getting together in a huddle. It's called a [GAhuddle]. And we all pulled together and

discussed – depending if what your views are, it's not really important, but we all got together, not in a sidebar, it's a huddle, to kind of agree as how we're going to treat this issue that's coming forward.

And there was real camaraderie. It took five minutes. It was a five-minute huddle. And everybody in that huddle, they're really passionate [inaudible], how do we deal with this issue? And seeing that happen in the GAC, my first [inaudible] meeting, it [inaudible] process.

My worst times was when consensus was hard to build, and those who did not understand the issues of consensus and how a consensus [builds] were frustrated, and then the frustration spread. When one was frustrated, everybody got frustrated, and it became a frustrating experience while they were trying to build consensus. So that was my worst experience – that feeling of frustration as we're trying to build consensus, but it's hard to get that through, and it seems that people are not trying to build consensus, trying to – they're frustrated. And that was my worst experience.

The other one, well, you have other GAC members in the room. You could ask them.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE:

I think that was a good way to turn it over to the other members in the room. Tracy, thank you very, very much for your time. I know you need to get into your day. Again, if anyone has questions for Tracy, I'll provide his e-mail address. And send them to me, I'll make sure they get to Tracy.

If you need any assistance during the day for your meetings, remember Constituency Day can be a little difficult. You have members of almost every community group here amongst the alumni. We have the ICANN booth for you to go to for advice. If nothing else, stay within the Board meetings where all of the communities rotate in to talk to the Board, and that's a good way to better understand the different communities.

Remember at 5:30 – and I do need to check the schedule to make sure we haven't changed the room. I'll send out an e-mail. At 5:30 we are meeting with Melissa Cooper. That is a mandatory session for us at 5:30 today. I'll send out a reminder e-mail.

I want to thank the interpreters. I know that for the record, for the remote question, I forgot to say the individual. It's Mamdou, from Senegal, for the record. So thank you everybody. Have a great day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]