

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: NCUC Policy Writing Course Part 2
Sunday-, 11 March 2018 at 10:30 AST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Jim Trengrove: All right. So once again, good morning and thank you for being here. Welcome to ICANN61. The first meeting for anyone here? Second meeting? First meeting, okay. And second meeting? I know.

Maybe 20, 21, 22 for me. They all sort of blur together. But I have not been to an ICANN meeting in almost three years now. I think the last one was Buenos Aires in June of 2015.

I worked for ICANN for six years as the Senior Director of Communications and before that I was a journalist for 30 something years, a broadcast journalist. So I've done a lot of writing.

So we'll talk about that and my writing experience. But first of all I want you folks to introduce yourselves and tell us, you know, what your interests are and why you're here today. I've got some theories why you're here. But why don't we start over on this side with Shree.

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: My name is Shreedeeep. I'm basically a blogger/journalist and a writer. I currently work as an editor for a real estate magazine. Professionally,

I work in the writing and the journalism field. But, you know, technically I'm more associated with the IG, Internet governance.

From 2007 I was involved with, you know, as a founding member of Internet Society. And then in 2013 we stepped into ICANN. And, you know, the things started. We have been working in various processes.

And most importantly, I have an organization called RayZnews. RayZnews was an online media where, you know, in 2013 my Internet was not working. So what I did was I did research about Internet standardization in Nepal.

And with that research, I submitted it to the government everywhere. So that's how my journey started as a researcher. And in RayZnews last year we did a report about Internet Development Report of the Asia Pacific and the least developed countries.

So a lot of work, you know, a lot of advocacy, a lot of awareness of the things that we work in. Apart from that, we also have started a new project called Learn Internet Governance to reach out to the youth, you know, since there is not an awareness and capacity really not happening in terms of youth in Asia Pacific.

So we started this project with zero funding. We just reach out to schools, colleges. We develop toolkits. And we talk to people about how they should, you know, work their way in ICANN and ISOC and how they should be involved. And, you know, this is about me and thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Good, thank you. And I'm going to come back to you with another question or so. But, Farrell, go ahead.

Farrell Folly: Hello, everybody. I'm Farrell Folly. I come from Berlin. Actually, I do not have a policy background. I'm more technical. And I hold a Master of Science from

the Royal Military Academy in Brussels for 10 years now. And now I'm doing a Ph.D. at State Federal University of Munich in computer security.

The reason why I started working or joining ICANN is that I heard that most of the time policy writing people do not care about the technical implications sometimes so they can set up policies that are not applicable or that one cannot enforce in reality.

So that was the first reason why I joined was to just keep awareness and please pay attention to these. This is not feasible technically. You can do this and so on.

The second reason is that I see a very low footprint of presence of people from Africa. So I want also to join and bring the Africa voice on board. That's why I joined the NCUC. Thank you very much.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Olga.

Olga Kyryliuk: My name is Olga Kyryliuk. I'm coming from Kiev, Ukraine. I'm a lawyer. I have a Ph.D. in international law and currently working with Danish Strategy Council and also running my own NGO called Digital Defenders Partners.

And I write a lot on different topics and in different formats starting from different (democracy) papers and also proposals for finding/submitting to the donors and all this stuff.

But it's always important to know what is the format when you start writing something. That's why for me this policy writing course is important to not just understand how to apply and how to adjust your writing skills to specifically what is needed in ICANN and in NCUC. And that's why I'm really looking forward to hear how to do that.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Thank you. Cláudio.

Cláudio De Lucena: Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity. Good morning, everyone. My name is Cláudio De Lucena. I'm coming from Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brazil. And I'm a professor at Paraíba State University.

I'm a computer scientist and a lawyer. I have both backgrounds. I've been trying to basically get that what Farell is talking about here, which is a huge one.

I also am involved with internal governance. I've been working with law and technology for the past 15 years. I'm involved with ISOC Brazil and Portugal where I have been based for the Ph.D. for the spirit of Ph.D.

I'm also involved in other Internet governance forums, for like Internet Governance Forum itself. Very much involved with Internet governance schools in the region and in the rest of the world.

And I think what you're preparing here is a very good opportunity pretty much about what Olga said difference, but I write academic papers. This is the best, fullest experience I have.

The academia demands us in the last years to write a bit more simple things as blog posts to push forward in a simple way this theme so it's a different skill of writing.

We give interviews. We have contact with the media, different skills. And now I've been in ICANN space for about a year physically present. And it's clear that the skills that are necessary to push forward policy within the environment are different ones. So I think it's a great opportunity to have a little bit different there.

Jim Trengrove: Good. Thank you. Varsha.

Varsha Sewlal: Good morning, everybody. My name is Varsha Sewlal. I'm from South Africa. My day job is I'm the Master of the North Gauteng High Court. It's the largest out of 14 offices in my country.

And what I'm involved with in the day and what my passion is are two different things. My day job involves, and I oversee, an office of about 300 people where we deal with insolvencies and liquidations. And I'm also involved with assisting the department with drafting policies.

So I felt that over and above that, I'm a doctoral candidate. I'm hoping to submit my thesis in the course of the year. And my passion is ICT regulation in a multi-stakeholder model to enhance development in emerging economies.

So this is what my research is centered on. And I felt that this course would refine my skills and enable me to participate in the ICANN environment and in the Internet governance environment because I really believe that there's so many people that are marginalized by not being able to participate in the global economy. And it's really an opportunity that many governments are not pursuing adequately as mine being one of those.

So in terms of my goals and why I see this course as being important, I'm a huge believer in development and ICTs for development. And I will (unintelligible) old coined phrase, but it's my passion. And I'm really hoping that this course will be able to assist me in achieving that in some way or the other. Thank you so much.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Wonderful. Come on in. Andrea, do you want to read the names of the folks we have online? Do you want to read into the microphone? Are you seeing them on the - well, I have them here, I think. (Mariel Alopini), Benedetta Rossi, Dorothy Gordon, Elizabeth Andrews, Liana Teo, my former colleague, Mohibullah Utmankhil, Renata, good morning, Renata, the mother of all of us here, okay, and Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

If any of you folks online want to send in a message about - just a line about yourself and who you are, we want to make this as interactive for you as we are for the folks here in the room. Just, you know, where you're calling from and, you know, a one-line, two-line interest. Andrea will read that if you are able to.

And we're going to go, we have an arrival here if you'd like to introduce yourself.

Bruna Santos: Hi. My name is Bruna. I am the representative of the Latin American Caribbean Region at the executive committee of NCUC. So thank you very much for having this course. And sorry for being late.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, that's quite all right. And, Bruna, how many meetings have you been to?

Bruna Santos: This is my fourth meeting.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, your first meeting?

Bruna Santos: Fourth.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, fourth, okay, great. Wonderful.

Bruna Santos: It's been a year.

Jim Trengrove: Wonderful. So, Shree, you do a lot of writing then with your blog. Farell, maybe not so much. No writing, writing. Okay. Right, okay. All right. And I would imagine the three of you do a lot of writing as well.

What is it about - and you covered it a little bit, but if we can go around the room a little bit about NCUC and why you thought this is where you would

want to be. And let's just go in the opposite. You may have said it already, but if you want to just repeat it again and just why NCUC is attractive to you.

Varsha Sewlal: It's not that I know so very much because I've just come onboard so to speak. But it appealed to me because I thought that there was an opportunity to make a difference to policies.

And I thought that in some way or the other development will be involved. And there are numerous aspects to the NCUC and its mandate that I thought would be aligned to me even though this is my first meeting.

And there's so much more to learn because it's quite overwhelming in terms of all the information and all the different constituencies, but I think maybe somewhere within me it's already synced in where I would belong. Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Cláudio.

Cláudio De Lucena: Thank you, Varsha. I believe I've seen NCUC as a space with like-minded people, at least with the same interests. Experiences show that we do not have the same alternatives to reach our objectives and that is where the debate is coming.

But we are interested in the same issues and advancing pretty much the same questions. And also now when I'm coming back from the Ph.D. we're starting a think tank in the region to advance and promote digital rights.

So this has the face of NCUC change.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Olga?

Olga Kyrlyiuk: For me, this is the third meeting. And it all started just exactly a year ago in Copenhagen. And it appeared so at the first meeting, at the first session I attended, that was the one by NCUC.

And it somehow just felt naturally that I liked the environment and I liked the people. And since then I was following what has been discussed at the NCUC and it somehow feels that this is a community of, like, Cláudio said, of like-minded people.

And just that you can step in, you will get support and then you basically can make some difference. And that's why I'm coming from the field of (civil society government) and so basically this is the very right place to be.

Jim Trengrove: All right. Farell, you just want to follow-up?

Farell Folly: Yes. It was quite different, actually, like two years ago I have joined in (obvious) the NexGen PDP working group. And why being a member of that group? I just realized that, okay, there was a lack of room where I can talk about user interest. Because in the working group, we have to draft policies. That will be enforced toward end users.

So we need a room to discuss as whether these are good policies or not. And by browsing the ICANN Web site, I just came across the NCUC and I just decided to join the NCUC. That's why and how I get connected to NCUC.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Let's go to Shree real quick, follow-up. And then we'll go to Caleb and Elsa.

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: The reality is, you know, after joining ICANN, I was searching for - I was not feeling that, you know, I was not addressed in the other groups. And, you know, me coming from a least of loved country, I was just checking out the membership list and I could not see anyone from Nepal. And I was, like, so intrigued.

And apart from that, my focus area is freedom of expression Internet freedom. So at regional level, I'm very active on all of these issues. So I joined and then, well, you know, it has been a year.

I've been observing and trying to see how I can put forth an effort. And, you know, it seems that we need to re-collaborate and do a lot of capacity building in terms of South Asia and bringing people. Because the voices are nil there.

And there are a lot of issues in terms of what NCUC talks about or, you know, issues of Internet freedom and issues of freedom of expression as well. And privacy issues are there. So that's how, I'm like, you know, more connected to NCUC. Yes, thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Bruna.

Bruna Santos: What brought me to NCUC was the fact that I had been working with Internet related digital rights issues. And having left the government and coming to ICANN, the only place that made sense apart from the GAC, which are way different discussions and activism, if I'm allowed to say that GAC is a sort of activism.

The only good place to be, like, it seemed logical to go to NCUC because all of the things, like, we've fight and work for and develop within the GNSO are where things, like, were much closer to my work. So, yes, this is the place.

Jim Trengrove: Let's go to Elsa. Would you like to introduce yourself and then you can - we asked everyone two questions? The first is who you are and why you're here? And then what attracted you to the NCUC? So you can cover both of those.

Elsa Saade: Great. Thank you. Well, I'm Elsa Saade. I'm from the Netherland. And I got introduced to NCUC and actually the ICANN through the social program. I used to work in a human rights organization. Still do. I'm an activist back home. And I felt that the points in common in between NCUC and what I do are pretty much the same.

And I felt that if I put my efforts here and highlight them at least in North Africa and now the Asia Pacific region, I could put some context there when it comes to human rights issues and help other people also amplify our voices when it comes to civil society organization calls for human rights basically through NCUC within that very specific scope of work that ICANN does. If that makes sense.

Jim Trengrove: Good. And how many meetings is this for you?

Elsa Saade: This is my fifth.

Jim Trengrove: Fifth, okay. And Caleb? You want to talk into the microphone there.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: My name is Caleb for the record. And I work with the African Academic Network on Internet policy. And I just resumed that job as a programmer manager.

And I was always looking out for some way I could put my head within the ICANN community. I had my first fellowship experience in Abu Dhabi and I had to go to different (constituency) meetings here and there just to see way I could fit perfectly.

And I found out that the NCUC, the NPOC and the rest actually have something similar to the goals of my organization. And apart from the fact that we tend to walk towards digital rights, data protection issues, intellectual property, innovation and technology stuff like that that we do, I found out that I could do better within the NCUC and that is the reason why I'm here.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Now you all have worked to some extent in policy development. And those of you who have been here for a couple of meetings or so have done it within the ICANN system.

What, and especially those who have been here for a few meetings and have worked or tried to work through the policy development process, which spooks you about working in the PDP here? What do you find?

Is there anything intimidating or frustrating or, you know, hurdles that you're just not sure how to get over yet. And anyone can speak. Okay, Caleb, you've got your light on so go ahead.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Okay. So for me I think it's always very difficult when you are new to a community. You have to read lots of email threads, previous conversations and trying to follow what exactly is this conversation about, what is the topic they are discussing. And so it takes, like, for example, when I can succeed with talking about GDPR. Good for me. I actually read a lot about GDPR.

So I was able to contribute the whole point of my firm, but having to make public comments, write policies and all of that has been a challenge. So it's a different thing from doing the talk. It's a different thing from having to put it down in a very, very articulate manner where you can have a text conversation with other members of your community. So it's been a very big challenge for me.

Jim Trengrove: So you find it's easier to talk about it than to sit down and write about it, is that?

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Yes. Having researched about - my reference was actually for the GDPR.

Jim Trengrove: Right, right. Okay. Bruna, it's you.

Bruna Santos: Mine would be the lack of full understanding of the question. Because half of the PDPs have been going on for years and years and years.

And considering that I still consider myself a newcomer to this community, and even despite the fact that I kind of understand and have the knowledge on the matter, I still don't feel as comfortable as I should doing this, like, positions because there's a lot of, like, backstage policy entailed.

And apart from - it's not like only going to a meeting and, like, stating your position. It's something behind that, like, talking to the working group members and finding yourself in the place of - in a respectful place and, like, in which people would allow you to do so and, like, help you to develop this position. So, yes, that would be mine.

Cláudio De Lucena: I have a metaphor that helps me see this. It's been my fourth meeting of engagement, although I missed the one in Jobo, but I did some remote involvement, which is exactly what brought Varsha into the meeting.

The metaphor I like to think is like it's a train running 120 miles per hour and we're just thrown inside. And when you're thrown inside the difference of speed makes you turn around and bounce. And I'm starting to settle now.

So I go into meetings and I see where the thread, where that argument comes from. But it doesn't happen the first time, absolutely. You don't know where they are. And it's tough because you're supposed to know the issue. You work with it. And it's tough to enter a meeting and not to know what happened to the thing until it got there.

So the way we curate the information so as to portray the state of the discussion is interesting. But I think it's something - there's no magic to that. I

think it takes time, really, as it's been with me. But it's pretty much the same concern everyone had.

Jim Trengrove: I was thinking more of race cars. But the train is a good one. But with the race or highway, like a beltway, you know, the onramp we talk about in getting people comfortable, getting on the onramp. But, you know, they seem to be narrow and short.

And I know there are a lot of efforts with a lot of programs and resources here at ICANN, which if you haven't - especially for the newcomers, if you haven't explored them, we'll make those available to you. Anyone else? Oh, Olga. Okay.

Olga Kyryliuk: Yes. It takes time. For me it is probably the most frustrating. Because for me personally, I always feel if I start doing something then I need to be contributing into something.

And here at ICANN it takes time just to understand what is going on. Because it's not that always new working groups and new work texts have been established. It's more about that you need to catch up with what is already in the place.

So it's just that you don't probably feel that you have already read enough, you already know enough that you can start contributing. And this is the most confusing thing. But I think at some point the more you infer, the more attend then you can start to feel that yes, probably this is the right moment to be more involved.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Elsa? Is it Elsa?

Elsa Saade: Yes. It's Elsa, yes. I think the two keys that I learned so far is that one, you need to focus on one thing, on, like, one kind of issue. And just delve into it,

just drown there so that you understand it fully. You can't just, like, throw yourself everywhere, I'd say.

And the second key is to realize whatever you're going to be putting in there is going to be binding eventually, which is something that is very rare in any kind of multi-stakeholder form anywhere around the world, even the IGF. There's nothing that's binding. While in ICANN, everything is binding.

So these are the two keys that I keep in mind. Just be focused on one issue. And make sure to keep in mind that whatever you just say out there is going to be binding eventually, hopefully if you push for it the way you should. And you read well. So I guess this is what intimidates me sometimes as well, right, so.

Jim Trengrove: So then do you find like-minded people within the NCUC?

Elsa Saade: Oh, definitely. We do have our fights, basically, within NCUC, which is very normal and natural, I would say, and which enriches the conversation further. But definitely we have the same kind of vision I would say.

Jim Trengrove: Right. Farrell.

Farrell Folly: To me, coming to the working group makes me confirm (one of my topics). Most of the time people fight each other instead of talking about the policy itself.

I think that if one can separate the logical between trusting the policy and their own interests or the business interests, it would be easier to write the right policies because what I can read through in there most of the time is most of the people think they are right because of their own business interests. And they want to defend that point but not focusing on their logical and their real reason behind drafting the policy.

And this is a big challenge because when you fit that situation, or as you will see the guy would not agree, only if it matches with its own interest. So that is the biggest challenge to separate own interest and the logic behind drafting the policy within an ecosystem.

Jim Trengrove: I see. Okay. In all of this, while you have full-time jobs for the most part or studying a great deal of time. And as you said, there's so many policy initiatives going on at once that it's hard to keep up. And so hopefully what we can do here with this writing course is provide some short cuts.

As I said, there's no, you know, right way and there really is no wrong way to write. But there's a way of, I think, streamlining the process to make it easier for you to make sure that you are checking all of the boxes to make sure that you are covering what you need to do.

And it's always better to write shorter, simpler, brief, direct but not always easier to do that. So with a little bit of training in what we're going to do today, hopefully we can accomplish that.

You know, I think you're here because you want to personally develop your own writing skills for your professional reasons but also for your participation in NCUC.

I would think that also that it shows the fact that you're here on a Sunday morning and willing to spend several hours here, there's a - and I was thinking this as I was researching this over the last several weeks and months preparing for this, to me there's a leadership quality in being able to want to be here and to improve your communications because not only to develop a larger stable of penholders in helping to develop the policies and commenting on policy for the NCUC, but that you think that you have leadership skills and it's nice for people to step up and be able to admit that.

So hopefully we can get you more comfortable in that position as well.

Do we have a newcomer here or just leaving? Okay. Okay. Thank you. All right. I'm sorry? Why don't you sit here?

Bruna Santos: I'm sorry. This was a closed course due to budget limitations. I'm so sorry about it.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Thank you, Brunna. Well, here's what we're going to be doing today. We're going to be going through - and anybody here on the webinars that we held? Oh, good, wonderful. And for those online, we're going to be going through some of what I consider best practices. And, Andrea, if you want to get the slides ready, we can start with that.

And we'll be doing that, we'll be going through the slides. And stop at any point. When I was doing the webinar, I was just sort of kind of rushing through that with no questions at all. But if you want, feel free at any time to stop because we have time to discuss anything if there's any clarification or comment or disagreement. That's fine.

First, let me quickly tell you about myself. As I said, I was a journalist for 32 years or so. Took some time off. When I quit my job, and that was 10 years ago, and luckily fell into ICANN in 2009.

But my training in writing and it was a lot mostly in broadcast writing, my first job was working at a small public television state in New Jersey. And we had no commercials. And we had very little video.

So we had to fill the half hour show with something and it was writing. And there was only a producer and myself. I was a desk assistant, but you just did a lot of writing. You did a lot of writing. And you had to get it done by 8 o'clock when your show went on the air.

I did that for a few years and then went to Chicago where I worked in local news and did an hour news program. And there you're doing not only writing stories, you're writing what they call voice overs over video. You're writing teasers to go into the commercials. You're writing promo copy. So you're writing all different types of material at that point.

I went to - I worked for the news hour, the PBS News Hour, in Washington for several years and covering the U.S. Congress mostly but writing about complicated issues and trying to explain them to the general public. And I really enjoyed that challenge.

I did some documentary work and that writing is different as well. And then came to ICANN in 2009 and worked on promoting and the messaging for the new GTLD program and then also the Eye on a Transition. So to me there's just been a lot.

I did some blog writing. I worked in Azerbaijan for three months and I did a daily blog called from the View from Baku. If anybody wants to go online, I still think it exists there.

But the news experience for me always had deadlines. And I think that helped because if you've got a lot of time to get something done, your mind wanders all over.

Andrea, I don't know if you have any of those slides. Do you want to pop up one of the quotes that I gave you? Let's see if we have it here. The longer one by T.S. Elliott, I think.

It could be the other one. Okay. And I'll read it for those who can't see it. When forced to work within a strict framework, the imagination is taxed to its utmost and will produce its richest ideas. Given total freedom, the work is likely to sprawl. So that's T.S. Elliott.

Do you agree? Actually that came to me at 2 o'clock this morning when I woke up. And suddenly all of these ideas started coming to me. But I think it's helpful. So when you know you have deadlines, I think you're forced to hit them. So that's important.

Okay. If we can go to the slides, Andrea. What's that? Structured procrastination, I like that. Okay.

So this is - I showed this quote on the webinar, but I like it. It'll be interesting to see if anybody wants to comment here. Decisions that ICANN are made by people who show up, people who scream most loudly.

And I love Marilyn Cade. And I don't know if you know Marilyn Cade. I love Marilyn Cade. Were you? Yes, she's wonderful. I met her. She's from Washington. She's with the business constituency, I believe. She's always up for the public comments when the forms up and it's there.

But she speaks out and she speaks her mind and she's well known. And that's important. And so I don't know if screaming is the word, if you can go to the next slide, Andrea.

Okay. So it's not only screaming, but it's communicating. So as I said on the webinar speaking, listening and writing. And I want to change - Andrea, could we change?

Andrea Glandon: Yes.

Jim Trengrove: Thank you. We're going to go through these, I think, fairly quickly here. So speaking, listening and writing. So speaking, of course, you want to verbally communicate your ideas. You want to listen. You want to comprehend what others are saying. And then you want to take it all in and you want to summarize it in writing.

I was also thinking a couple weeks ago say what you mean, write what you say and mean what you write. So if you follow that process, you're going to - if you can verbalize it, if you can condense it in writing and then once you're done writing, look at it. And is this - are you nailing what you want to say? So that's important. We can change - here, next one, please, yes.

And when I talk to (Farsi) and then Renata when we were arranging this training session, it was important because the NCUC recognizes how important it is to communicate and through the public comment process as the most effective way for participants in the development of ICANN policy.

And in the operational procedures that the NCUC revised in September, it dedicates the first five pages of the procedures to commenting and public policy on the public comment period.

Go to the next slide, please. And, you know, this workshop here it's to prepare members, prepare you to collaborate towards developing a succinct coherent response to issues raised during a policy development period.

So when I was reading that and the photo is quite good and quite specific -- if we can change slides, Andrea -- several questions arose. And one was that - is that the next one here. Okay. Good. Yes.

So, again, how prepared are members to collaborate on a public comment on a policy issue? And how many have collaborated previously? That's a legitimate question I want to ask all of you. Who here has already been sitting through collaboration on public policy? Okay. Cláudio, go ahead.

Cláudio De Lucena: Interpretation of human rights, small contributions.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Farrell? No, okay. Bruna?

Bruna Santos: I wanted to comment on the new frequent procedures for digital technologies so.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. All right. And did you work with a penholder at the time?

Bruna Santos: I was the penholder.

Jim Trengrove: You were the penholder. Okay. And, well, that's good. Anybody else here been a penholder? Farrell, you've been a penholder? Go ahead.

Farrell Folly: Actually, I know the NCUC representative to the NCUC political committee. But before that I've been the penholder for many public comments, especially when it's become more technical because that is where I'm most comfortable.

Jim Trengrove: I see. Okay. Bruna, tell me about what qualities, whether you had them or not -- and I'm sure you did -- but what qualities are important in a penholder?

Bruna Santos: I guess probably organization will be, like, the first one and average at least knowledge of the subject that you're planning to work on because NCUC works a little differently in the public comments. It works more collaboratively. So other than we have a volunteer penholder, but then the public comment goes to the policy committee.

So the policy committee reviews the comment and they can add, like, some more stuff in case they think that the first comment that was submitted wasn't good enough.

So in my case, I was like, very - it was a little introductory, the public comment that was submitted. Then the policy committee, they improved it. So maybe some, like, be willing to collaborate with, like, some fellows around the constituency also and, yes, I'll say a good level of amount of knowledge in, like, organization specifically.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. How difficult, or was it difficult at all to get input from others on the comment itself? I mean, was it like pulling teeth trying to get people to respond because we all know that during a public comment process the timeline is very narrow and the train is moving along as you're waiting to get feedback.

Bruna Santos: There was, like, - this one was especially hard because it was about (unintelligible). One of the public comments of the frequent procedures result. And it was a PDP that was already going on so they had just concluded the first phase of the PDP and then they were starting the second one.

So I was, like, caught in the middle of a big enough fight and discussion. So this was actually one of the, like, hardest challenges for me at ICANN so far. But it also taught me a lot. So from that, I ended up, like, engaging that working group and then this, like, led me somewhere. It was a good thing to have done so.

Jim Trengrove: I see. Good. Who here took the survey? Oh, good, good. Wonderful, Great. We have those results in and maybe tomorrow we can go through those. I think we had 18 total.

If you haven't taken it, you know, there's still time to do it. But it would be good for my purposes to find out where all of you are as far as writing and comfort in writing and also help Renata as well.

We can change slides, Andrea. So the reasons we write. To develop writing skills, you develop your confidence. Do you agree with that, Shree? Okay. And it helps organize your thoughts, your policy ideas and the information supporting those ideas.

It broadens the pool of available contributors to NCUC's public comment effort, infusing it with diversity and some new ideas. And the result is an

NCUC with a stronger voice and a unified voice, a more unified voice, I should say, with increased influence.

And I think we'll go through this on how that can be a benefit to the penholder as well. You can change slides.

And it's also an opportunity to build the NCUC through your constituents through constituent feedback and share diverse opinions as the first steps towards collaboration. And that's where you're able to assist the penholder in putting forth the policy that the NCUC supports.

Another slide, next slide, please. Okay. And it's also an opportunity to engage outside of ICANN. I know the NCUC goes to the IGF. Any of you represented NCUC or been at other conferences and said yes, I'm a member of NCUC? Yes. Okay. Okay.

Okay. We can change now. So let's get into the writing, what I think are the best practices. In preparing for this, I went through a lot of public comments and we talked about this on the webinar.

The public comment tab at the top of icann.org lets you into current public comments, recently closed public comments, upcoming public comments, archived public comments. If you want to sit and read public comments all day long, you'll be able to do that on icann.org.

But, Andrea, change slides. Here's what I found though. Vast differences in the quality of that. You're nodding your head, Cláudio. Vast differences in the thought process that went into putting them together, the structure of the comments.

Not that there needs to be a uniform structure, but there should be a structure that's coherent and is easy enough to follow. Clarity and clarity in the message delivery and finally the effectiveness of the public comment.

So when you're going to start, the first thing you need to do -- if you could change -- the first thing and a lot of what I was reading in preparing for this, I found this quote here and I'll read it if it's cut off.

It says others inspire us. Information feeds us. Practice improves our performance. But we need quiet time to figure things out, to emerge with new discoveries, to unearth original answers.

So when you know that you're going to be jumping into a policy, rather than just, all right, let's get everybody together and start shooting out ideas, you need to sit with yourself first and do it.

I read - there's a book called Presentation Zen, and the recommendation there is do not open up your laptop. Sit there with a pad of paper and a pen and just start charting down ideas and writing freeform and do it that way. You're going to spend plenty enough time in front of your laptop and the keyboard.

So it's just good to step away from that and then just make notes and then you can visualize things, I think, easier that way as well.

Change slides. So planning your comments, the first thing you want to do once you sit down. You're by yourself. You're meditating a little bit. Now you're clearing your head. You're identifying the issue that you're going to comment on. And then you're going to determine specific areas of concern. What do you want to talk about in the public comment?

And you want to limit your concerns. Now if you were an individual submitting a public comment, in most cases you may just want to look at one issue that you feel strongly about, especially if you're going to do it outside of the NCUC.

And we'll talk a little bit about individual comments and also working within the constituency. But you want to limit your concerns and focus on that.

Now if you are a penholder and you're doing an NCUC comments on the fiscal year '19 budget, 2019 budget, which just recently closed. And we'll be talking about the budget a little later on. You'll probably have to hit a lot of issues at once.

But when you do that, you want to do it under a broad umbrella. So you want to make everything that you describe in the body of your comment that it originates in your introduction. That it's somehow is focused there.

So someone who is reading your public comment is going to know right away oh, that's where he or she or they are coming from and here are the details. You know, you don't want to have - and we'll talk about the structure. Actually, we'll do a paragraph by paragraph structure as well.

But you want to be able to do a broad umbrella so that people in that first introduction know where you're coming from and then hit the points. And then you don't want to start adding points that maybe you hadn't referenced earlier as well.

So, you know, it's a balancing act between limiting your concerns, but also you want to be able to cover your bases as well. We can change here.

And when we talk about limiting, there's this comment here. Do only what is necessary to convey what is essential. Carefully eliminate elements that distract from the essential hold, elements that obstruct and obscure -- we can change -- elements that obstruct and obscure, clutter, bulk or in addition confuse perception and stifle comprehension whereas simplicity allows clear and direct attention. And that's from Richard Powell.

Next slide, please. So planning your comment. Whether you're doing it by yourself or sitting within a group, you want to develop your reasoning. And, again, you're not on your laptop. You're with a pad of paper writing these things down.

You want to develop your reasoning. You want to develop your research that's going to support your reasoning. And you want to gather some evidence as well.

You want to determine in advance how your position would actually make the policy better. You just don't want to say I want - let's just change this policy. You have to give reasons why you want to do it. And especially for the penholder, you want to reach consensus on what your message is.

Now, again, if you're working with the team as a penholder, you want to reach consensus and you want to send that to the penholder. You want to collaborate, of course, with the penholder and the others on the team on the content supporting the message.

Again, what are the issues? Choose your targets and take aim. And then you want to release the penholder at some point. Go at it. Put words to print, create the story, tell it completely and set the process in motion.

Bruna, I don't know if that was the - how smoothly your penholder situation was. But anyway, let's go to the second stage of public comment writing.

Now structuring your comments, you're visualizing what the comment is going to look like. Well, who are you writing to? I mean, who are you addressing? Is it a specific group or an individual? Is it the chairman of the board? Is it a staffer? Who is going to be reading it?

Again, state the issue and your position on it. And explain why your constituency, and certainly in this case, the NCUC is uniquely qualified to

comment on the position that you're taking. You want to separate yourself from everybody else, I think.

Next slide, please. You want to describe how your constituents would be affected by the policy as stated. You want to suggest an alternative. And you want to explain, again, how your position improves the policy. And you want to close your comment with a call to action with a compelling summary and a call to action.

That's fine. You can stay there. So I came up with four, through some of my research what everybody seems to agree on, to be respectful, to be direct, to be brief and that will help you be convincing.

Next slide, please. All right. Now you've opened up your laptop and you're writing your comment. Now this is a five-paragraph structure which I'm going to show you, which, of course, is just covering some bases. I mean, it's not - you don't have to stick to five paragraphs, of course. You may do five pages if you really need to.

But Paragraph 1, identify yourself and state the policy at hand and specify your opposition or support. Recognize the work of the volunteers who have put the policy together. And that's where the respect part comes in.

But in the Paragraph 1, that's going to be your introduction. So you want to establish who you are, why you're here and what you want. There's got to be an ask. I mean, you have to let people know right up on top this is why I'm writing.

Next paragraph, please. Paragraph 2 is when you start to drill down a bit. You support your objection. Order your support with reason and evidence. And again, this is where you want to explain why you or your constituency is qualified to comment on this issue. Next, please.

You want to connect to the people you represent. So if you're saying I'm here representing the NCUC, you want to explain briefly who they are and what their interests are and how they will be affected.

And, again, this is where you distinguish your comments from others. You want to see if you can make your comment stand out, be different from everyone else's. Next please.

You want to propose your alternative solution with a plan of action. You want to list some key indicators of success that will show that your plan of action is working. And if you can, present a timeline to monitor success.

You have to let the people know, hey, this will work. This is how it's going to work and this is when it's going to work. Even if it's not, do it anyway. You could convince them that you are.

And Number 5, be compelling in your summation. Again, express appreciation to the policymakers for their volunteer work. But here's where you have your call to action. Leave them with an idea of we need to move this forward. This isn't the end. That this is the beginning. And, you know, we're anxious to keep pursuing this.

So why does all of this matter? Well, again, you're all busy people. And if you look at that simple five paragraph solution, and again, it's a format with flexibility. You can massage the content and your opinion.

You can fashion it into a convincing product. But again, if you're short on time, I think that if you just followed these five points, I'll call them points as opposed to paragraphs, you're going to feel confident that you checked the boxes, that you supplied the information that you should be applying to let it all in.

We're going to do some writing exercises in a moment. And Andrea has passed out, I think - do you have one of those for me here, too? Let me just take this one here. Okay.

I've chosen several archived comments. Some recent, some not so recent. And so in a moment we're going to take time to read these through and I'm going to let you know what we want to do with these.

But getting back to this short description here, these five paragraphs, to me it's almost like the elevator pitch. You know, you've heard that term the elevator pitch?

If you're getting on - this letter here is to the board and to Rod Beckstrom who was the incoming CEO in 2009. So if you have this several page letter typed out to the board and Rod Beckstrom, but you're at a hotel and you step into the elevator with Rod Beckstrom. And you say, Rod, let me tell you, I've got some concerns.

Well, I'm going up to the penthouse, so you've got 45 seconds or, you know, two minutes. Give it to me, you know. So you ought to be able to describe whatever your concern is, whether it's going to be 10 pages long, 7 pages long, 1 page long, you ought to be able to give that elevator pitch in that time.

And if you can talk it that way, then you can write it that way. And then fill in the necessary information there. What's that? Well, that's exactly what it is. And then you get people interested that way. And you can keep it brief.

And, you know, then it occurred to me, again, maybe around 3:30 this morning that the elevator pitch in a sense, when I see several pages of public comments coming out and I'm wondering, well, who's reading these? Is it the staff that's reading these? Is it members of the board or members of the policy committee that's reading these?

The elevator pitch actually is like the executive summary. And if the staff, and I'm not as attuned to those who have gone through the policy development, if the staff is reading all of the comments and doing summations of comments or presenting them to the board in materials, and I had, I think, a question from (Nick Showey) in the last webinar about how does the board get its information?

And this past week I spoke with Rinalia Abdul Rahim who just left the board and also with Steve Crocker, the former chairman, and asked them about how they look at their public comments.

And Rinalia, especially said, you know, if we see a summation or something that strikes us, we'll go back and read the full comment. But if the staff is doing that, it occurred to me, well, why don't you do that instead? You supply the summation. You know, you put it in your words. Let them get the one pager rather than have them take your seven page and write their own one pager.

That way, you can write an executive summary and the public comment. That's just an idea. I've not even discussed that with Renata. She may be pulling her hair out at me suggesting this. But I think it's a faster way of getting people up to speed.

I don't know if anybody has any thoughts on that. But I just think that it's a way of getting through it. Varsha?

Varsha Sewlal: Well, I actually agree with that because I don't think anyone else would be in a better position to summarize what you've said, what's your vision, other than you. So, I mean, in any event I think it's important to be able to write succinctly so that your essential points are captured. Because the average reader is not going to read seven pages anyway.

Jim Trengrove: Olga.

Olga Kyryliuk: I'm just curious, in general, is there any kind of, like, advice how one should read the comment? Because it's clear, especially nowadays, people don't read the lone papers. So they just want the idea and probably just a few clear points of the reason why you want so or not.

The same as you say, like, it's just a summary which might be enough. Then is it really best to spend that much time on writing, like, dozens of pages of the report just to prove their idea if indeed you can make that reasoning in just probably few sentence, so just one page.

Jim Trengrove: Anyone have any comment? I think it is worth doing both. Yes, go ahead, Shree.

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: I think because, you know, like, you can't just get the summary out of the thing. So just to support the summary also, you need the background paper. So it's more like, you know, having it there. It certainly supports the summary.

Jim Trengrove: And the full public comment is where you're going to put your research and your supporting evidence, I think. Andrea, go ahead.

Andrea Glandon: I have some comments from the remote participants. The first one from (Alopini). This course is a really good idea and I think it should be extended if possible outside an ICANN meeting and try to do it in French, too, to try to make the information accessible to the entire community.

And then I'll go forward with another one from Renata. Ha, ha, ha, not a hair puller, Jim. Indeed there is a lot of strategies we need to think to make participation easier. Maybe investing more in visual informational materials.

Jim Trengrove: Well, that's my wheelhouse, the visual information. I've done probably 200 interviews here during my time at ICANN. And I think my last one was with Rafik in Buenos Aires.

But I also found another interview that I did with him. And actually, my interviews with Rafik and Bill Drake are up on the 58 email onboarding information that was sent out as of last summer. I was happy to see. It was good.

And boy did I learn a lot. I mean, that's the best way to learn. I mean, it's kind of cheating. But if you're doing interviews, you just sit there and ask them questions and you learn a lot. And that's what I'm doing here today with you.

But, sure, certainly aside from writing visuals, graphics, you know, I produced four extensive videos when I was here at ICANN. And I worked a lot with the ALAC in promoting their big push at the London 50 meeting.

But I also worked on a video, an animation, on the new GTLD called The Dot Has New Friends. I don't know if you've seen it. That was a lot of fun. That was just, like, let's just do this. And that's on YouTube.

I did one on the IANA transition and did one on the key signing ceremony back in 2010 when it was the first DNSSEC key signing ceremony in Culpepper, Virginia.

And I didn't know what the heck was going on. It looked like, you know, people going into cages with keys. And it's a secure place. And interviewing Vint Cerf. And there's been, like, 400,000 hits on this video. So if you look that - I mean, I just don't know why that's taken off. But I understand a little bit more about that now.

But you're right. So video, animation, there's other ways of doing it. Short little videos that you can put on your Web sites, even in your blog. You know, I

don't know - are you doing video with your blogs at all? Yes. I mean, it's just good to throw little video clips in there just to. Yes, yes.

So, anyway, so go ahead.

Andrea Glandon: From Dorothy Gordon, this is an interesting discussion given that we usually insert many protocol type paragraphs. I like the idea that we could use more graphics in multimedia, especially for some of the long-running policy issues.

Jim Trengrove: And who is that from?

Andrea Glandon: Dorothy Gordon.

Jim Trengrove: Good. Thank you. So I've found - in my research I found this letter from, I believe, it was Rod Wickersham who wrote this in 2009 to the Board of Directors and to the CEO Rod Beckstrom. And you'll see the title here called - is this available, Andrea, up on the site, this first letter?

Okay. We'll put it up there. And what we want to do here is we're going to be doing some writing. And as you write, we have all your emails. So Andrea if you can send an email out to all the members here at some point so that we can collaborate, collect the information and distribute it the same way.

And also anyone online who wants to look at this and submit their own writing, they're not going to collaborate, probably with others. But I'd be interested in hearing their thoughts.

So this is not actually a public comment, but it was just filled with information. And I thought with - I'm not going to comment any further on it, but I just want to give you guys a few minutes to read through it. Take your time if you need to get up and stretch your legs for a moment, but let's take maybe 10, 15 minutes to go through this.

Read this through and then I want to get your thoughts on it. And then we'll talk about it, and we'll move on from there. Everybody have a copy of this here? Okay. Any questions at all?

Okay, you know, underline things. You know, draw pictures on it if you like. But let me know what strikes you. Remember what we just went through about being brief, being direct, being respectful, being convincing and see if this does. And let me know how effective you think this letter. So I'll put this down for a few minutes and give you guys some time to look at this.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: How much time do you think we need for this? Ten, fifteen minutes? Ten minutes, okay. So let's come back at - we'll make sure that we're back here, well, five minutes before the hour. How's that? Okay.

Cláudio De Lucena: I never use a pen anymore.

Varsha Sewlal: When I have to go, I'll just sneak out quietly and when I can come back, I'll sneak back in. Okay? So sorry about it.

Jim Trengrove: Yes. Varsha has to leave because she's being pulled in many other directions here. So she has an obligation. She'll be back.

Varsha Sewlal: Yes. My negotiations have failed for the fellowship.

Cláudio De Lucena: You can leave for the newcomer's day.

Varsha Sewlal: The newcomer's day, right.

Cláudio De Lucena: A little space for negotiation.

Varsha Sewlal: Yes. We do have a lot of laptops in there. They know that. I don't even carry it because (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: You have a question? That's the one I wanted. That was one of the reasons I chose that so. What do you want to talk about?

Varsha Sewlal: I've never wrote a letter like this in my life. But you can say the same thing.

Jim Trengrove: But not yet.

Varsha Sewlal: But not yet.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, sorry about that.

Varsha Sewlal: In case anyone was falling asleep. Just make them do jumping jacks or something.

Jim Trengrove: Yes. I did ask because of the lights I thought it might get warm in here. But if you're cold. Oh, they don't. Well, I'm cold.

Okay. We're back and we're going to get you on your feet here in a few minutes so for those who didn't get to stretch their legs. I hope you've all had time to go through it. And without commenting myself, Varsha, you had a comment you wanted to talk about.

Varsha Sewlal: I must admit I'm a complete newbie. And I think I'm very struck by how emotionally charged the correspondence is. And I haven't come across a letter nor have I drafted a letter which was charged as emotionally. And I think it was written in the first person as well. I've never written like that before. Just a small comment.

Jim Trengrove: Yes. Caleb, just one second. And, Varsha, I should mention also that Rod does write that this letter comes from nearly 150 individual and organizational members of ICANN. So you say it's very personal, but you wonder if everyone had buy in. Okay. Caleb?

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: First of all I think the letter is very, very long to convey the message. Now, I think probably in the first few paragraphs it was a bit too direct, like you were trying to direct, like, say, because you never had the opportunity. It was a bit direct, too direct.

And from the beginning, there was an initial call to action. Right. I tried to do, like, sorry.

Jim Trengrove: Yes. That's a good point. And I'll just point one out here. We appeal to you to address these problems before permanent damage is done. So that's a request and a charge so.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Yes. And a call for action from the beginning.

Jim Trengrove: Right, yes. Which is good.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Which is actually very good. And I like the fact that you guys made lots of references to certain documents. And for a newbie, who is probably going through this draft, here is the challenge he is going to have.

Take for example in the second item, which says ICANN staff revised transitional SESG charter. I guess you were referring to material a newbie has to go read. But it was also good that you probably stated a quick summary of some of those items for someone to actually have to look at.

But I just feel that it should be more explanatory, like, given the fact that a newbie is also going to read the same material at some point in time. So those are just some things I noted, I don't talk about the rest.

And then why do you use of if you want to use like, an apostrophe, say the bots, the sic, then use a dot f. Just wondering why you want to do icons and then use the s as against the usual writing principles. Just wondering. It's just my own personal opinion, too.

Jim Trengrove: I just wonder if that's a problem with the fonts that just came across. Yes, that may just be the way the font translated.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: So those are some of the - but I have quick just now.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, good. Well, save your thought. That's good. Andrea, if you want to - you say you have some responses online as well. Sure. Olga, good.

Olga Kyrlyiuk: Well, I think it's very good written indeed. And getting back to my previous comments when I said that you can probably make it shorter, I found that this is quite - I didn't find it to be too long.

This is my description of what they want, what they call for. And this, I believe, corresponds to those high points that you have mentioned all before. And also probably this is somehow emotional because this is very much a very critical issue. So this is really very important to the constituency and that's why they also show their emotions through this text.

But also, I think, this is respectful, but this direct because you need clearly to convey your message. And if in this case you are not clear enough and you are over polite, then probably you don't get the results you want.

So I think this is very well balanced in terms of what they want and in terms of how they present their ideas.

Jim Trengrove: So you think it's very direct but still respectful.

Olga Kyryliuk: Yes.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Cláudio.

Cláudio De Lucena: No. Sorry, sorry. I was going to address the structure, but it seems we do have an executive structure in the beginning. And then it works. The executive summary itself which is considered to be before they start addressing each one of the questions, it summarizes everything. So in a one pager, it conveys the message.

But structure wise it seems it's going fine. I wouldn't say at all for me the language seems too much offensive.

Jim Trengrove: You're saying it is or it's not?

Cláudio De Lucena: It is. It is. And it's not only in the most patent offensive terms. But I think there are expression marks, communication marks, that are used, like, need to understand, expressions like that, are too offensive to me. And I understand it's a cultural issue also.

But the language seems a little bit too - I'm not a native. But the language still seems a little bit too offensive to me. But in terms of structure it's interesting that, in the one pager, they do have the message.

And then if you want to deep dive it down, they address the other issues. Although they number it differently, they state three issues and then go into four. So that confuses it a little bit for the reader.

Jim Trengrove: And then two points, and then I want to come back to what Caleb was talking about the newbies, that's a problem.

And I don't think there's an easy solution to that because you don't want to recreate the wheel every time you start writing about a policy thinking about

all the newcomers are here. Let me explain what we've been talking about for the last three or four years. You know, you don't necessarily want to do that.

You know, when I was working in television covering the U.S. Congress and let's say we were doing reconciliation on the budget, which was a complicated subject. Or we're talking about military base closings, which is a more substantial topic that you can get your arms around.

But you might have viewers who were following you every night or following you throughout the progression of the policy. And it's always a question of how much background do we need to supply? You know, do new viewers start here?

And it's also a problem in television because you've got a finite amount of time as well. So you can't just say I'll put an extra page and a half or two pages in. You know, you've got to - well, in public television we have a lot of time compared to network. But you'd still have just a few minutes to tell your story so you have to take shortcuts and you're taking chances like that.

Andrea, do you have some?

Andrea Glandon: Yes. From Dorothy Gordon, tone is whiny in some places using language that would encourage blowback. It is way too wordy and some of the background history could have been put in a different document. However, the three wants are clear.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Bruna.

Bruna Santos: Just with regards to the language as well, it's maybe behavior that some of us that are lawyers we tend to take on. Like, we tend to overdue stuff and do, like, these really fancy words and language in order to communicate, like, a really quick and direct message.

So we do these some sort of avoidances and big turns in our speech so that we can make it, like, fancier. And I also think...

Jim Trengrove: Because that's what you're paid to do.

Bruna Santos: Yes. But I also think that sometimes this language, it's not only reinventing the wheel for newcomers, but maybe making the language more simple so everybody gets what you're saying. And being very eloquent is important, but it's not much of a help when you want to deliver, like, a direct message. So, yes, I was forgetting what I was going to say but then I can come in again, yes.

Jim Trengrove: Elsa, do you have a comment?

Elsa Saade: Yes. I think at this point in time it's in 2009. I think at this point in time there was an urgency. And I feel like it was one of the first real threats that this group of people were put under, right? So I feel that going through this there's a sense of urgency.

There's a sense of being offensive, but at the same time trying to be respectful, making a balance, like, putting your foot down and proving that you know a background on all of this. Maybe because they had the sense of urgency, they felt that they had to put everything on there, you know?

But at the same time, like Cláudio said, the fact that they put the three points in the very beginning and then explained them further on in the letter, I think you can just read the first page and understand what they're saying. And if you want to know more about it, then you can just go through it, right? So that's what I thought.

And plus, like, following up with, yes, let's have a chance to meet face to face and let's have a deadline of one year is also a good thing, I felt. Like, they put

a timeframe for themselves. They also made a follow-up ask for a face-to-face meeting in case the letter didn't go through.

So I felt it was balanced, not entirely bad.

Jim Trengrove: Yes. And somebody said it is long, but it is pointed. And there's a lot of information there. There's lots to comprehend. Farell?

Farell Folly: I just want to say is to make the letter itself shorter and put everything else in an attachment or in an appendix so that the board will read the letter as one or two pages. And when they are interested to know more about the rationality, they would just look in the attach.

But the letter as structured it seemed like all are part of the letter and if you don't read the whole part, you don't get the total. So that's kind of structure.

The second thing is strategy. The request for a meeting. That means that they have an opportunity to explain all that stuff so they don't have to go so deep in the letter at the (center). Always want to show, okay, what if you don't accept a meeting or what is the consequence of what we are talking about?

But it was to my detail and I'm afraid at the real meeting they will have to rehash everything they have stated in the letter or they won't have any new arguments at the meeting.

Jim Trengrove: What's that? Go ahead.

Bruna Santos: Just what Farell just said, these types of structures they are so different from what I was used to doing while at the government because we have, like, this special, like, regulatory tax, which is called - unfortunately it's a book that we had at college. Maybe you can help me. (Travada)? Yes, does that make...

Cláudio De Lucena: It was closer to an executive order.

Bruna Santos: Yes, it is an executive order. But whenever, like, they write the executive orders, they tend to do the considering. So they have like five and four things they list beforehand, which are called the considering, which is just like considering ((Crosstalk)).

Cláudio De Lucena: They would be recitals. They would be recitals, yes.

Bruna Santos: Yes, considering that, blah, blah, blah. And this is also, like, for me, I usually consider it a bad way of writing because you take too long to deliver the message.

Jim Trengrove: I think in U.S., it's whereas. I mean, the resolution, whereas this and whereas that. And that's extremely formal language.

Bruna Santos: It sort of, like, take you away from the main, like, goal of the document, so, yes.

Jim Trengrove: Andrea.

Andrea Glandon: From Dorothy Gordon, I do not think it was good to say before permanent damage. It should have been turned positively and said something like so we continue to work together for the long-term growth of the community.

Another comment from Renata, the issue about having the message right in the beginning is that sometimes it can be a bit truncated. Item 1 ask is easy to understand, but two or three already are more layered or is this my impression? Maybe I ran out of breath to understand after first ask.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. One thing and I wonder is it focused? Even though it's long, is it focused? All right. Well, here's what struck me when I first read this. Or maybe the second time I read this. Call to the ICANN board to correct

problems with the NCSG charter, big issue. And while we're at it, to address continuing misconceptions.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So it's like - right, right. I want to thank Mr. Wickersham for supplying this. I mean, I think the background, the information is very important. I didn't ask his permission to use this because they said it's always easier to apologize than it is to get permission. But I know he was on one of the webinars that we did.

Go ahead, Andrea.

Andrea Glandon: From Alapini Muriel, I find this letter a bit too detailed. It could have been better summarized for a better understanding of the message. Did the NCUC have positive feedback?

Jim Trengrove: Good call. I don't know that. But we can find that out. All right. Well, I think it seems to be pretty unanimous that it could be streamlined shortened so that's what we're going to do.

So what I'd like to do is maybe take the four of you and the four of you and you guys go up to a flip chart and do a one-page elevator pitch, executive summary, however you want to call it.

See if you can pull out the key elements of this and put it into one page, let's say the five paragraphs. You know, we'll just see if that's possible. Let's spend - how much time do we need, 30 minutes to do this, 45 minutes maybe?

Well, if you want to leave the things out about the misconceptions, that's fine, too. If you were doing it as a policy comment, for instance. But I'll leave that up to you because there's a lot there. It's a lot to boil down.

And if you want to just take that part out, you can even just say at some other point we'd like to talk to you about the misconceptions that continue here.

So if you each want to grab a - you know, if this group wants to, you know, take your chairs and go around here. Or you can divide up any way you want but - okay. All right. So are we good?

And we have a newcomer here. Hi.

Louise Marie Hurel: Hi. Nice to meet you.

Jim Trengrove: And you are?

Louise Marie Hurel: Louise.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, Louise. Good. I'm glad you made it here. Thank you. Let's go for 30 minutes and then if we need to extend we can do that. But I'll certainly check back.

And for those of you who are at home online watching this, please submit your one pagers, too, if you'd like. I'd like to see what kind of ideas you have and send them to Andrea. We'll do that.

And let's do a time check here. Okay. Let's say it's 10:15 so let's come back at 10:45. So you guys can get up, stretch your legs, gather around and probably appoint a penholder, either one who has had practice doing it or someone who needs the experience of doing it. Okay? All right. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man 1: I think we need to take one photo for the program.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. That's fine.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So how many people do we have right now? Let me have Shree come over here.

((Crosstalk))

Louise Marie Hurel: Sorry for popping in late. I was over at the onboarding meeting.

Jim Trengrove: I completely understand. That's fine.

Louise Marie Hurel: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: That's fine. That's fine. For those wondering at home, a few folks here had to run out and have their photos taken with groups. So we may end up extending but looking forward to your input from home.

END