ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
February 21, 2018
3:00 pm CT

Coordinator: Recordings are now started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Chris. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCUC pre-policy course Webinar on Wednesday 21st of February 2018 at 2100 UCC for 60 minutes. On the call today we have Bruno Santos, Carina Birarda, Carlos Reyes, Catarina Woyames, Claire Craig, Elsa Saade, Farell Folly, Khouloud Dawahi, Mauricia Abdol, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Shahul Hameed, Tomslin Samme-Nlar. And from staff we have myself Maryam Bakoshi and the trainer, Jim Trengrove. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Carlos.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you very much Maryam. Hello everyone. This is Carlos Reyes. I work with Maryam on the Policy Development Support Team. And in the background I have been working with the community now for about five years. I've been at ICANN five years. And we're very excited for this course. As Maryam mentioned we have Jim Trengrove here to present a training.

But I would first like to welcome and introduce Renata Aquino Ribeiro. As you know she's NCUC Chair and she's been super helpful in developing the course and ensuring that a course addresses some of the concerns that you've raised in terms of trying to prepare the NCUC for policy writing and make sure that we have you equipped to do so. So Renata I'll hand it over to you to see if you have any opening remarks.

Renata Aquino Ribiero: Thank you Carlos, Renata here. It's great to have the support of ICANN in our first policy course. NCUC has always been involved in (emerge policy) issues in ICANN and public comments, PDPs, Policy Development Processes and working groups. And we take really seriously our newcomers training with our newcomers' corner in our Web site. So it's great to have this in ICANN 61. And I am sure it will be a great opportunity for all our members in the sense that you can start from here to participate in much more positive in NCUC. So thank you again and Jim or Maryam if you would like to liken us on the next step, thank you. Sorry about the noise here.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Renata. I will hand over to Jim. Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay well thank you so much Renata. Thank you Carlos and thank you Maryam and welcome. I am Jim Trengrove. And I do appreciate this opportunity to talk with you, to listen to you to exchange some knowledge and some ideas during this Webinar and for those who will be at ICANN 61 in Puerto Rico. I look forward to meeting you and working with some of you as well during our scheduled training.

Some of you I know already from during my time at ICANN and I look forward to meeting new folks. That was one of my joys of my time at ICANN. You know, I'm glad you've decided to invest some time and energy into making yourself better communicators in order to become successful

particularly as a member of the ICANN community and the NCUC but also in your professional lives. Now you may already be a good writer and simply need some structure, some massaging of your content. And that's what we hope to be doing through these sessions.

NCUC members -- and this probably applies to the newer members -- I know we're trying to balance their professional lives with their volunteer work within ICANN. And some of you might be overwhelmed by the continuous flow of policy development processes ICANN unveils. And you might be struggling to keep pace. So hopefully this training and what we do in Puerto Rico will ease that burden quite a bit, maybe even make public writing, public comment writing fun for you. So a couple of thoughts as we begin.

During this first part of this Webinar I'll be sharing some practical information about public comment writing, some of the best practices I've come across. And then we'll look at some examples of public comments that I've chosen. We'll break them down a bit to show what I think works, does not work. And hopefully you have the links to the full comments, the four examples.

It didn't work to put all that test onto slides. But I've pulled some highlights from those comments and we'll discuss them. And if you don't have the full comments that's not a problem. You'll still be able to follow along by the content you see on the slides.

Now this exercise will work much better when we are face to face at the training sessions in Puerto Rico. But this today will give you a flavor of what we're going to do and actually allow you to go in some archive public comments and make your own analysis on substance and style. And of course in Puerto Rico we will write in groups and as individuals.

You know, preparing for this I raised some of my own questions which I don't necessarily have answers to but hopefully will with your guidance. For instance do you comment on everything? When do you comment as a constituency and when do you comment as an individual? And if English is not your native language how easy is it for you to write in English?

Some of these questions are contained in the writing survey that NCUC sent out in preparation for this training. So if you haven't yet responded please do and we'll have the results by Puerto Rico and looking forward to the results of that. Finally as we begin you will see photos of members throughout the slides from the ICANN community, members who you know are not members of the NCUC. I know they aren't as well. But they probably all write public comments too. And besides I wanted to dress up the slides with some pictures. So we should run about I think just 30 minutes through this and then some Q&A if questions if you have any. So let's begin.

You know, I found this comment from Kathy Kleiman who I - if you know the NCUC you know Kathy. Decisions at ICANN are made by people who show up, people who scream most loudly. Well yes that is one way to communicate. But actually there are three skills I think that you need to communicate effectively -- speaking, listening, and writing. And in order to succeed and communicate no matter what your definition of success I think you need to be able to do all three. You need to verbally communicate your ideas. You need to listen to comprehend the responses, synthesize them and then summarize it all in writing.

Now I'm not saying that you need to activate all these skills whenever you discuss an idea in the hallway outside of ICANN meeting or at night at the hotel bar but you always ought to be able to process information in a way so that if the issue were important enough and timely enough you could organize

your thoughts and lay them out in a document, a position paper or a public comment.

Now the leadership of the NCUC recognizes that the public comment process as the most effective way for its members to participate in the development of ICANN policy. In fact I saw that it dedicate the first five pages of its revised operational procedures document from this past fall outlining specific steps on how the NCUC should comment. The new specific guidelines to me however as I say, raised some questions for NCUC members among them how prepared are members to collaborate in writing public comments? How many have collaborated previously and what qualifies - what qualities and what skills are required to be a pen holder?

These questions were behind the idea of the survey that we sent out and an attempt to get a general idea where NCUC members are with their writing skills. Now developing writing skills in confidence of more NCUC members will broaden the pool of available contributors to the communities public comment effort. It will infuse it with diversity and new ideas. And the result will be an NCUC that speaks with a stronger community voice and with increased influence.

Now the - this proposed training program is designed to prepare NCU members, NCUC members to effectively collaborate with one another towards the objective of developing a succinct coherent response to issues raised during a policy development process. Now if you spent any time with ICANN either at one of its annual meetings or online with the working group you know there are ample opportunities to communicate your ideas but there are also ample ideas being communicated. So you need to compete for attention.

Sharpening your communication skills and it's your writing skills that we'll be focused on I think will give you the advantage. Now reasons that you write, well it's an opportunity to build NCUC status within the ICANN community through thoughtful constituent feedback. You can make your voice heard. It's a chance to share diverse opinions on policy within your constituency as the first step towards collaboration on a policy. And it's the opportunity to engage with others outside of ICANN not only as an NCUC member but as a member of the ICANN community.

Now planning your comment, it's important that you understand the rules and the process of the public comment and the public comment period. You should weigh the content of what you want to include in your public comment with the length. That needs to be balanced. You need to identify specific areas of concern that you'd like to address. And you clearly - you want to clearly be able to state your reasoning.

You want to research. You want to get research to support your claims and you want to be able to present evidence. And you want to establish your expertise as a constituency or an individual. But you want to distinguish your comments from all others and then add examples for of personal stories that effected members of your constituency to support your position and then acknowledge why - you have to acknowledge the opposing views, the one's you're opposed to and then explain why my position is the best position.

Now you're going to have to structure your writing. And we'll go through this a few times here today. But first of all you need to address it to a specific group or individual. You want to state the policy or issue of concern and your position on it. You want to introduce your constituency and again why it is uniquely qualified to comment on this issue and again describe how your

comments, how your constituents would be effected, positively or adversely by the policy issue.

You want to recognize again the opposing views and offer solutions or alternative and explain how your position actually improves the policy. And then you want to close your comment with a compelling summary and a call to action. Now since you've entrusted your valuable time and attention to me I think it's best that you know something a little bit more about me.

This photo that I used to introduce myself, I'm the tallest of the four there, was taken in (Yuraven) Armenia either 2010, 2011 with a few members of the Internet Society of Armenia with whom I visited including the founder of (ISOC) and Armenia (Igor Nacortu Tuminan) who's the father of the Internet in Armenia. And I went to have breakfast with these folks and was fascinated to hear (Igor) tell stories of the early days of the Internet especially how Jon Postel, the father of ICANN personally handed them the license to administer and manage the new country code for Armenia.

I spent 33 years as a broadcast journalist producing news and covering politics in Chicago and Washington DC. I worked with some great people. That's the late Gwen Ifill in the bottom left-hand corner, a journalist I worked for at the PBS News Hour.

The building up on the right is the capital where I spent 21 years covering politics. And that's me with Bill Clinton in an interview that we did. And if you have time sometime if we're in Puerto Rico I'll tell you about that interview. It was the day the Monica Lewinski story broke and it was quite a day, quite an experience.

But throughout all my career just dealing with a bunch of different communicators and I brought - tried to bring those skills to ICANN when I came over. I became Senior Director of Communications in 2009 to 2015 when I left ICANN. The last three years I was on staff with the official title. And I worked (Rod Beckstrom) and Fadi Chehadi, Peter Dengate Thrush and Steve Crocker and hundreds of wonderful staff members. And among the projects that we worked on I was - led the effort to create, promote and market the new gTLD program as well as handle the communications for the IANA transition. I've done a great deal of work with ALAC with NomCom, with SSAC, the GNSO, with the GAC, with all the community groups.

And I know I've enjoyed sitting down and speaking having recorded interviews with Rafik Dammak and William Drake, Milton Mueller. And so I was thrilled to get an invitation to come back and work with you all at ICANN 61 in Puerto Rico. So I want to talk a little bit about how you get to the public comments. And for me it begins with the ICANN Web site.

You know, I think the Web site does a pretty good job relaying information about all that is going on. And I say that having been somewhat involved in revisions in the Web site during my time at ICANN. And I think it has just gotten better. So if you were knew to ICANN you can click through the Web site for hours and you begin to piece together a picture of ICANN, its mission, its structure, its operating procedures, its communities and the many issues it addresses.

And if you go along the top of the page of icann.org you'll see three tabs -- Get Started, Policy and Public Comment. The Get Started gives you - offers a beginner's guide to the IANA functions participating in ICANN, ALAC. There's a new covers program.

On the policy you click the policy tab, you learn about developing policy at ICANN on the DNS and ICANN supporting organizations, the gnso.icann.org. Go there. I'll show you how to participate, how to make a public comment, volunteer for a working group, information on operational policy and general practice.

And the third tab and the one we want to focus on is the public comment. Now as the Web site states, public comment proceedings feature proposals initiated by a working group or department. And if you are new to ICANN especially to the public comment process then the four options this site offers for your exploration really does open up the world of ICANN. You can click on any one of the four tabs and you can get lost in a good way reading through the comments on dozens of issues that really trace the history of policy making within ICANN over the years.

There's the open comments, those issues that are currently open for your comment, the recently closed issues, comments which gives newcomers an idea where ICANN's focus has been for the past several months, upcoming comments that gives you an idea about potential upcoming public comment proceedings to help you and your community set priorities and plan your future workloads and archive comments which you can explore at your leisure tracing the road through ICANN's policy development process all the way back to 2007 and their earlier comments there as well.

But once you jump into that pool of public comments you're going to find very little similarity among them. You're going to find vast differences in the thought process, in structure, in clarity, in message delivery. And as a result you'll find vast differences in overall effectiveness.

Now there's no one right way to write a public comment but I think there are plenty of wrong ways to do it. And so I think four things to keep in mind when you sit down to write a public comment. You want to be respectful. You want to be direct. You want to be brief and you want to be convincing.

Now I've chose four comment examples from the archives in no particular order but I chose them for reasons which we'll discuss. And this is, you know, one of the things that we'll be doing at ICANN 61. We'll be choosing, reviewing, dissecting public comments and discussing what works and what doesn't work. And that's going to help us when we actually sit down and start writing some comments.

Now one of the comments I chose, let's see, there we go. Anyway let me see if I could bring this down here. Go back up and bring it back down. Okay well this is called Non-commercial Stakeholders Group comments on the draft recommendation of the Cross Community Working Group on accountability of Workstream 2 on SO and AC accountability. And this is the introduction. NCSG welcomes the draft CCWG accountability W2, WS2 recommendation on SO AC accountability. These recommendations are an important contribution to strengthening ICANN's overall accountability and in particular that of the ICANN community.

Now however, you know, if you drop down to the conclusion which I have done here it basically repeats the same information, NCSG welcomes the draft recommendations. They're an important contribution to the evolution of the overall accountability of ICANN and its community. So the conclusion then misses an opportunity to really drive home whatever points the NCSG wanted to make. I think the conclusion is quite soft. You want to be able to finish up strongly and as I said come with a call of action. It's just the language is the tone is soft. It's almost apologetic I think.

For instance it says here - let me go to this one here. NCSG also looks forward to further discussion as to whether the recommendations as a whole adequately address the important issue of preventing capture. Well what do you think? Do they? I mean do you have an opinion? And if you do have an opinion on whether it does or not you should state that.

So again the comments itself come across somewhat I think apologetic in its tone when we go to here. Despite the 25 recommendations there remains a broader question that does not seem fully answered. And on that issue of capture as issue raised by the NTIA regarding internal capture by a subset of SO AC members do the recommendations in Track 1 fully address this fundamental question? The recommendations appear to partially address the issue so and it goes on.

It would be useful to understand how the recommendations completely address the issue of capture in more detail. And I'll go one more here. NCSG suggests that it might also be useful for there to be a fuller understanding as best practices one to one. So, you know, the issues of concern are there and some of the concerns are well - are expressed. But the language to me it seems passive and almost too pilot. And I think if you're going to write a public comment you want to be more impactful, again more direct.

Let me give you another one here. This is on structure and this is the Non-commercial Stakeholder's Group on the draft report for public comment, on the review of the at-large community by ITEMS International. The comment includes 22 paragraphs. Let me see if I can get this. There we go, 22 paragraphs broken down into five issue subheadings but there is no relationship between the numbers and the issues. The numbers are almost there to reference the number of paragraphs that they have there.

Now the introduction as I said earlier is where your tone and the attitude that you want to set is established for the duration of your comment. Now the introduction here graciously welcomes the opportunity to comment. The NCSG would like to provide comment and then it lists several issues in which it agrees with - in fact agrees with the filings of the report that at-large has been dominated by a few people. It is too focused on internal committees. It is not focused on holding ICANN via the board accountable. But the introduction continues on with some lagging concerns that NCSG has.

There's a perceived mission of overlap between at-large and the NCSG's constituencies, random selection rather than marriage based selection in the appointment of at-large leadership roles should be looking into. And the concern over the idea of new gTLD auctions to be used to fund the ongoing activities of at-large. So if - there's that part there.

Okay so again, you know, the author - the author's want write into a point by point by point list of concerns without first introducing themselves, their and characterizing how they view the reports overall, again a missed opportunity to sort of to hit the - hit in the introduction of hitting hard at being direct at being gracious but setting yourself up and then doing your point by point. Now the second - I said there were five sections. The second section titled is relationship between NCSG and the at-large community. All right that's fine.

The third section title is random selection isn't perfect but could it be better than the status quo? Well we've already discussed random selection. It was already addressed a few statements earlier. This statement - this section restates the issue and asks a question. The same thing happens in the fourth section, opposition to new gTLD auction proceeds fund being used to fund the

ongoing activities of at-large unless that is the community's decision. That's the headline title of that section.

So once again it states opposition to the issue which we heard about earlier at this time with caveat. Then there's another section called other observations. Let's see if we have that here. Yes other observations. Let me go down.

Yes there we go. Anyway other observations where it's really just one other issue concerning the structure of ALAC and could have been titled as such. And so although these issues are valid and the opposition is apparent the structure of the comment I don't think is well formed. And then there's the conclusion. (Unintelligible) the conclusion here. Here we go. This is the conclusions right.

The conclusion said - and it's basically one paragraph that simply repeats what was said in the first paragraph. It welcomes the opportunity to respond, again a missed opportunity to summarize your overall concern. And still you can appreciate the people who put the report together. And then I'm going to do one more example here. And this is an individual Alex Gakuru. I don't know if you know Alex and I'm not sure when this is from but this is an individual comment that he made. And I like this because he's Chairman of the ICT Consumer's Association of Kenya, an irrepressible individual Internet user's right lobbyist which I like that his attempt at humor there but hereby making a personal view of the IRT proposal. So that's his introduction. It's short, it's simple, almost too short and too simple. How do you feel about it Alex going into this? Sort of characterize what you're about to say and then get into your point by point.

And he does that very well I think, free expression, the proposal will curtail online expression which would be counterproductive to our ongoing efforts on

expanded IPv6 online expression space, fair use by overprotecting and advancing trademarks IRT will further serve to criminalize innovation from remix of older works for private and for fair use. Competition, as corporations grow competition may be stifled. So a good listening of his concerns there but his closing comments very simple. Therefore in view of my above concerns I pray that ICANN rejects the IRT proposal.

So let's get into the structure after those three comments, designing and writing an effective public comment. What you want to do? The first stage is plan your position. So you get together.

You need to understand your policy. You want to understand the position you are taking for or against it. And, you know, it's you want to know your audience and what you hope to achieve by writing your comment. Now you may have several issues within that policy to which you want to respond. However if you can it's best to limit your comment to a specific concern and nobody's tried to group several issues within a larger concern and present it that way.

Again you want to research your comments. You want to know the policy and the facts surrounding the policy so you can submit a fact-based comment and one that relies on specifics rather than generalities. And you want to determine how your position would make the policy better. You have to be able to support your claims.

And then the third stage is write your comments. And actually we can break this down paragraph by paragraph if we want. Our Graph 1 you want to identify yourself and state the policy at hand. You want to recognize the work of the volunteers who put the policy together and then you want to specify, specify your opposition or support to the policy or a part of the policy. You

might well be exposed - opposed to some aspects, supportive of others but you want to be able to explain that broadly in your introduction.

Second paragraph, you want to support your objection or your claim with reason and evidence. You want to explain why or your - why you or your constituency is expertly even uniquely qualified to comment on this issue. You want to connect to the people you represent. How will they be effected by this policy?

You want to share their perspective. You want to identify and experience and again you want to distinguish your comment from others for other groups. Next paragraph. You can use this to propose an alternative solution and present a plan of action to make your solution work. And you do that by identifying key indicators of success, maybe even present a timeline that could monitor success.

And Paragraph 5, be compelling in your summarization. Express your appreciation to the policymakers for the opportunity to respond but again restate your concerns, your objections and urge a call to action around your alternative solution.

So I said we had four comments. Here's the last one. And this came from Robin Gross, IP Justice Comments. And I believe this comment from an individual, I believe it click all or most of the boxes for being an effective public commend.

It identifies the organization and its purpose and mission says right there what the IP Justice does, non-profit in San Francisco balancing intellectual property rights with Internet law and policy. But then you have to immediately state your overall objection in the introduction to the IRT proposals. IP Justice is

opposed to all the major proposals contained within the IRT report as being beyond the bounds of trademark well and beyond the scope of ICANN's technical mandate. So it identifies several issues in particular but groups them under that one strong statement in the opening paragraph.

And then she goes on to list individually the issues and the reason for her opposition. The IRT report proposes you shift the burden and the cost of protecting brands over to Internet users and away from private companies who benefit from the privileges of trademark protection. We are concerned about the harmful impact on freedom of expression, particularly criticism and non-commercial speech by the proposed rules.

And IP Justice was further opposed to the biased composition of the IRT Team and the secretive manner in which it did its work. So pretty strong language, very direct. The tone to public comment forceful but respectful. And it recognizes the efforts. Let me go back and see if I can just line this up.

Recognizes the efforts of the volunteer despite its hard work and long hours which we all recognize and appreciate the IRT Team failed its mandate to find the solution acceptable to all. So they don't offer solutions or a - one solution. ICANN should ensure other stakeholder's views can be heard and not only the IP constituency by providing travel support to the non-commercial users and others who have significant concerns with the proposals but no resources to participate.

And finally she finishes with a strong conclusion and a call to action. ICANN must not allow the constant threats of intellectual property lobbyists prevent organization from introducing new gTLDs and creating Internet that benefits everyone. And here's the call to action. Please do not - whoop.

Please do not all the threats to hold up the process any further by continuing with the IRT report in any form. So really strong, very passionate as well. And I would imagine this probably was an easy one for Robin to write. Again she brings a good deal of passion to the issues. And that's important to have if you're going to sit down and write a comment.

You don't want your comment to look perfunctory. And during my research I came across quite a few that came off as an obligation rather than a passionate, a mission of love to get your point across. Now I realize it's also different if you're writing as a group or if you're writing as an individual. You have different obligations.

And if you're writing as for the constituency you may have to address a total issue with several points. And if we're going to - and if it's going to be long it's going to be long. But if it's got structure it's going to hold together.

So anyway so that's the part of it here. You know, we can talk about the fury of public comment writing. And we can dissect the work of others and we can learn from it but writing is doing. And that's what we'll be doing at the training sessions of ICANN 61 and I hope to see you all there. So we have some time for questions and answers or questions. I don't know if I'll have the answers but if anybody does have a question or a comment they can go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Renata here. Thanks Jim, great presentation, just raised my hand here to address also some of the comments we have just seen. So we had (unintelligible) comments and collect those comments as we do our policy committee NCSG using NCSG comments. I would like to and questions. And you've mentioned in the first comment about the tone be apologetic. And some may interpret that being polite of being soft-handed into the issue sort of presenting it initially without a strong statement could possibly make the

comment be better received or discussed in (FINA) like backing the bunch for later. Would you agree with that that it's - there is - there - are there advantages on being polite as well in the comment or you really think we should just go - be impactful and direct from the first line as you presented on the last comments? So I'm just wondering about that what's the limit there. Than you Jim.

Jim Trengrove: Well I - that's a good question. And, you know, I tried to stress a couple of times during the presentation of the importance of being respectful and gracious. And I think all of that comes out in the comments. I mean I - there are no personal attacks. But it's a way of stating your opposition to something. If you do it in the form of a question like do you really think or do you think more is needed?

If you have a position on that, I mean if you're asking that question then you must believe that yes more is needed. So it - to me it's better to put it in that direct way than asking a- than backing into it that way. So you can be direct as Robin said, you know, despite the hard work of the volunteers. And we appreciate their good work. I mean things like that help.

But again this is your public comment. And if you're speaking for the constituency or it's the constituency that is speaking you want to be impactful. So I agree, you don't want to go for the juggler - jugular as they say. But you can be impactful but be direct - and be direct but you can do so of being respectful and without attacking anyone.

Okay (Shavu) asked wonderful - I got a question, how's the collective comments being coordinated within the constituency? Well we've gotten a few and I'm wondering if you're talking about the survey. And Renata I think we're going to - I know we got a few comments back but we're hoping for

more and so we're going to wait another week or two or you going to send them out again? I - we can discuss that off the call here. But I am very interested in seeing the results of it. And so if more people can participate in the survey that would be helpful.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: All right just before we go on to the other question yes Jim I'll send you via email some comments we are working on. But just for a practical point of view of (Shavu)'s question we have the policy committee in CSG who ask - who shares the calls to volunteers for our comment. And hence we all collaborate in a document. Perhaps Jim if you could address (Shavu)'s questions as so when we have different views in the constituency or when we have - when we need to collaboratively add it - a document reach its final form? How does one negotiate the survey?

We actually we had some members who were - but how does (unintelligible) work? So perhaps if you could address it this way? Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Yes it's interesting because you're talking about compromise. And I saw the specific outlines in the operational procedures from September on how to write a public comment. And it was very specific. And if you haven't seen these -- and I think we'll be able to get the resources out to everyone to make sure you have but I know that I was impressed by the almost a date to date progress of the pen holder attracting comments co-mingling the comments doing a draft going back. I mean it - there's a process but in the end it's how strongly do you feel about the process or have you - I mean how strongly do you feel about the issue that is the constituency going to go out and soften its position on something because somebody doesn't like anything or if somebody doesn't like something should that person issue something as an individual comment and make the constituency comment stronger? It really is a trade-off.

And I think what's nice about it is the ability to sit down and talk. And I know that it's hard to do face to face when people are all over the world. And it's not easy to do when you're sending notes back and forth by email. So I'm not sure how you folks get together all the time and discuss things. I mean I've been and my wife does international calls and she's been using Zoom and you can really, you know, you're seeing the people and you're hearing their voices and you're seeing their expressions. And I think it's more worthwhile doing it that way than maybe trading emails and notes where you really can't get the texture necessarily or the tone of what the person's trying to say.

Again, you know, I covered the US Congress for 21 years and I saw - and that was at a time when the Congress was actually getting things done. And they were trading off and they were making compromises. And so it's how strong did you feel about the issue and can you put your signature to the final document or do you need to go elsewhere or do you need to off by yourself and do your own document? I see multiple attendees are typing. I'm concerned now.

Claire Craig: Hello? Can I ask a question now?

Jim Trengrove: Sure, absolutely.

Claire Craig: Okay this is Claire Craig. I'm trying - I have a comment and two questions. First thank you for this presentation. I thought it was very straightforward and very easy to follow. I particular the idea that you had so many examples that made it really easy to see and understand what you were speaking about.

My first question is I am a newcomer to the NCUC so how do you know when it is appropriate to do an individual comment on a policy? That's the first

question. And secondly as a newcomer is there some kind of grace period? Should you wait out and, you know, look and see what is happening before you step into the fray and decide to make comments and issues?

Jim Trengrove: Well Renata I'll let you jump in it but I would say I would do the second first. I would wait unless you feel that there is a disaster is imminent if you don't comment. But I think what you need to do is - and especially if, you know, it is a good practice of the pen holder to be able to do that to go out and collect different opinions and put them together to see if you can form a policy out of that.

But that's - actually that's one of the questions I raised earlier in the Webinar presentations is when do you go alone and when do you do it as a group? Now you are a member of the group and you have to weigh your allegiance there with your own - well I don't want to say your own moral beliefs but, you know, are you able to compromise. So it says a lot about you rather than what you should do. It's - it comes down to how you feel about whether you feel so strongly that you need to go individually or maybe save that for another time. Renata?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you Jim and thank you Claire for your questions. Renata here. Indeed it was - it's always I would say almost a waiting game to see when a comment goes out and if you are ready or (unintelligible) next one. So it's a common - I think it's a common state of mind for newcomers.

Will however go - another way from what Jim said. I think that specifically NCC indeed we are a civil society so we are spread thin. And we are digital rights practitioners, activists researchers. So there are very few of us and listening to our perspectives it's very unique and very important in ICANN. So

I would try to collaborate in now our document so everybody could collaborate. So try and do a collaboration.

What could happen is that you don't get incorporated in the final document as (Juan) mentioned there. So that would be adventurous let's put it like this. But I agree that doing exercises is quite a good idea like getting comments first and so on. Thank you Jim for your reply and you have lots of questions in queue here. Let's see how (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Oh I see oh hold on. Here we go. I'm a the wrong - this may be a rhetorical question but will we have access to this PowerPoint? I believe so. And I think also because - and I think Carlos and Maryam will be able to talk about that. But yes I think these PowerPoints and I know the slide deck will be sent out. We talked about that earlier today and probably the recording with it.

Yes, and also I didn't talk about ICANN Learn. I don't know if you're familiar with that. That was just developing when I left ICANN. And it's sort of the educational arm. And actually I had that in my initial slide deck. But I think ICANN learned that, you know, you can set up your own course - your own curriculum for learning about ICANN. And there is a course introduction to the GNSO which is Course Number 131.1. And you sign up and it just gives you the quick facts and it just you can finish the course and, you know, put in the answers and it's fun. It's interactive and it's a good learning experience and it gets you - really get anybody ready to go into a ICANN experience. Again you can pick and choose what you want to focus on. But the ICANN Learn information is good. ICANN Learn will be at the training session in ICANN 61. And apparently we will be recording this on video and editing it so that we'll be able to present it as a - in the course curriculum.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Jim Renata. Just now so many comments and questions. That's great...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: (Unintelligible) yes.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: ...(unintelligible) coming.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Yes they're - I'm just seeing them now.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Do we have - yes.

Jim Trengrove: (Unintelligible) the working group (unintelligible) comments enjoy the work (unintelligible). Well it's interesting, I'm reading (Ron Wickersham)'s comments. The majority on the working group works hard to marginalize the impact of unwelcome comments. Okay. Penholder practice exercise suggestions?

Well that's what we're going to be doing in - at ICANN 61. We're going to take turns being penholders. So I want to be able to design the training so somebody that we can take turns being the penholders. But - and at the same time take turns writing individual comments as well.

How does the ICANN board view or weigh consensus policy position or comment from the community if relevant? I think the consensus policy because - you know, if you can get a - it's a policy. It's not necessarily consensus policy. I mean if you - unless you deliver a policy that is watered

down, soft, you know, kind of half addressing the issues, not as strong as it could be, you know, maybe then the board would look at it says, "Oh that's a consensus because they couldn't agree on anything." But at the same time you could have a strong public comment coming out of the NCUC that is strong, direct and it's consensus as well. So, you know, it comes down to again the tone and how it's delivered.

And if it's direct, you know, you - I think you - and through the writing you can mask any differences or any pushback that you were getting as long as you can get your members to agree to the language. How to assess the effectiveness of a public comments? Well are people talking about it? Are people on the board talking about it? Does it change? You know, ultimately you want to impact the policy.

So are you - I mean I was not in doing policy work so I - and I certainly have never been on the ICANN board but, you know, if the public comment is strong and it's from the constituency and it's, you know, it's - I'm not saying that individual comments don't have impact but I think if I get a strongly worded direct fact-based solutions offered well written structured comment from the NCUC that looks like it knows what it's doing, that it knows what it want, it knows the solutions other than what's being proposed, and if you offer all of that I think that could be very impactful because what you don't want to go in is complain about something and not offer anything as a solution. Okay am I missing any other comments here? I think I'm caught up so far.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: I think (Belowi) close your mic. We're not hearing you, Renata here. She has her hand up...

Jim Trengrove: Oh okay.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: ...and her microphone's (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Okay well go ahead and speak.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: But yes I think she - her hand is down so she will try and (unintelligible) maybe. But Jim just so I think we covered most of the questions here. So as a - as also we are - we had so many points of views, we had comments and questions. If you - if anyone would like to also give feedback on the Webinar. I would like to give a feedback to Jim.

Jim, I really like the part where you say planning is good and you give a few pointers on how to plan a public comment down to each paragraph. So that could be something like I don't know, a cue care, a chat list we have always at hand. Thank you. It was very good - thank you very much.

Jim Trengrove: Well, you know, Renata and I like what - you had written an email to me several weeks ago talking about the - and I think I've even included some of your language in the presentation about the balance of people with their normal lives and volunteering with ICANN and oh no, now I've got to write a public comment and where do I start and what am I - you know, so by the end of this training yes, we could do a checklist and check the boxes. And it's almost formulaic and it may ease your mind that you just have to plug I and then of course massage the content. But you plug in the elements at the right location. So it's formulaic but it's also flexible.

So I'm not saying you have to have five paragraphs. Maybe you have ten paragraphs. If you look at Robin's comments there were no headlines. There were no sections. It was one letter. It was short. It was brief. But if you're writing for a constituency and you've got a penholder and you've got other people bringing in comments, you know, you're probably - and you're

addressing a policy, a broad policy, you're probably going to have to go longer and address a lot of issues.

And also one thing I didn't mention but it just occurs to me, you know, when I said, you know, address the opposition, don't be afraid to address the opposition or - I mean you should recognize the opposition. But it - even if there's opposition within your constituency don't be afraid to recognize that as well and to say, you know, we did struggle with this because right away if you don't do that somebody may call you on that and say, "But isn't it true that, you know, 25% of your members don't like this or, you know, this or that?" If you bring it up first and how you worked around it then you can show that you're a group that can work together and even though you have your differences you can come to a consensus.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you Jim, Renata here. That's great feedback. I really like that. I said if you were a mad scientist here when you said that or it could be formulaic, so the made sciences of commerce -- very, very interesting.

I would just - I think we had set aside 60 minutes for this call so just a quick time check for that. And then we are right on top of our hour. I would thank Jim very much for his amazing presentation. And we will have another one tomorrow. We can also come up with other questions and answers everyone. But we wanted to do this in two different time zones so that our members can participant.

And again we will share more materials, work a little bit more towards Puerto Rico. And do know that we will have a line participation as well in Puerto Rico also for NCUC sessions. So it would be great if you could join us again and become even more engaged in NCUC. Thank you once more Jim.

Jim Trengrove: All right thank you and thank you everybody for attending and for taking the time out. I know you're at all different time zones and have to have other obligations, responsibilities so I appreciate this very much.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone for attending the call. Chris you may stop the recording and disconnect all lines. Thank you so much for your time today.

Jim Trengrove: All right, thank you everybody.

Maryam Bakoshi: Bye-bye. Thanks Jim.

Jim Trengrove: Bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Bye.

                            END