

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
NCUC Policy Writing Course Part 4
Sunday, 11 March 2018 at 13:30 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: Okay, 1: 15 are we ready to share our work here? Have you gotten any yet Andrea?

Woman 1: I have a question, (Ron)

Jim Trengrove: Okay.

Woman 1: Okay, I do have a question from Renata, Jim. What if we have different views on a team? For instance, I work on the travel topic, but my belief is that remote participation should be a priority over travel. How does that impact with a group, for instance, who doesn't believe in remote participation?

(Farrel): (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: That's a question from Renata that she's writing about.

(Farrel): (Unintelligible) we're not inputting.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, you're not inputting new information then, okay. Yes.

(Farrel): If it's an argument.

Jim Trengrove: Hold on (unintelligible).

(Farrel): Hello Renata. So however, we (unintelligible) on the issues as (Elia) noted, but if this is an issue, I would rather say the loudest voice in the room, (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Well, you know, remote participation is a good alternative.

(Farrel): Yes, but doesn't make the loudest noise.

Jim Trengrove: No, it doesn't. No, it doesn't. But it is consensus and it shows I will meet you halfway, you know. If I realize that we don't have a lot of money to spend and not everybody can come to the meetings, but we still need some support, but we will agree to increase in cheaper remote participation - or less expensive remote participation as a way to offset, still bringing others, you know, to the meeting.

So it's sort of giving back. You know, meeting them halfway on an issue.

(Farrel): The alternative argument also is the cost (unintelligible) for some participant as well. Take for example, in Africa, it's quite expensive to get good internet connectivity.

Man 2: Yes, that's a point, because most part of the world, you know, that internet connection is not that good, right? So, coming down to a point - because I, myself suffered it when I was attending the IGFN Mexico. So I had to limited participate. And most of the times, the internet was not working. So there is an issue, because it's not a viable solution to it. It can be an option, but it is not...

Jim Trengrove: Although, you could present it as an option and present a viable solution. Present a solution, not necessarily a viable solution, but why don't we invest or, you know - if you can have, again, a call to action or a plan of action of,

well, let's take care of that. It's not going to be done this year, maybe, you know, but, you know, that's an ongoing problem, obviously.

Man 2: Sure, yes.

(Farrel): Alternatively, if you also look at it from the perspective of remote participation, the moderator in most cases usually does not give so much preference to everyone in the remote participation. Just in as you're remote, there's a lot in the room, let's deal with them first. (Unintelligible) we have to think about those of you in the room's participation.

So that argument is a bit flawed.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Farrel): To have some input here and (unintelligible), Claudio. This is a passionate topic, because we do present remote connectivity as an alternative to participation. It does include a lot of people, but the thing is that the weakest bond in this chain is exactly the people who we need to connect next. So there's an issue here that we're not going to solve.

For the sake of the exercise itself, I was just saying that we were not inputting more comments to the ones that were there and that we took the exercise as being identified - and trying to make a one-pager from what those are, right? Because inputting all of the comments would be a different structure from the beginning for us. But I understand (unintelligible) a point.

Man 2: You know, I think completely different set of process where you would probably go to - like, dig into other solutions as well and we are do investigate about whole process and then work towards it (unintelligible) solution. Because right now we are just, like, trying to synthesize this.

Man 3: It was a kind of restructuring of the comment that we had. And, in fact, we ended up identifying that the structure that we're working here as a template was not exactly the structure that was in a very good comment. So, and that was part of our...

((Crosstalk))

Man 3: Now you can see. So part of the exercise for us - because, as we say here, this template that we were introduced to in the webinar and now it's really very helpful. And for a nice, interesting coincidence, this very rich comment does not follow exactly that structure. So part of the exercise was fitting the issue in the new structure. So we went through a different path.

Jim Trengrove: And, Renata, as to the issue itself -- and we're going to do individual comments as a last exercise whether we'll be able to finish today or not -- you know, but that is something that you could address. And I'm just sort of free-thinking here as far as bringing in - if ICANN can't or says that it can't afford to bring as many constituents - volunteers. Maybe looking at sponsorships of - you know, private sponsorships or foundation sponsorships that ICANN can actually get in front of, support, and help the constituency groups go after funding for - outside funding that may get a lot of push back saying, "Are you kidding me? ICANN's got so much money to begin with."

But it's a way of showing, look, we need to - we need this outreach, we need their participation, so we're looking at, you know, all - because it's just going to benefit your people. It's going to benefit your region by bringing these people to the meetings. So...

All right, can we send - are you guys done? All right. Do you want to send your comment to Andrea? And Louise, you done too?

Louise Marie Hurel: We're almost done (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Okay, well we're going to share it first, okay?

Louise Marie Hurel: Okay, yes, we'll share then.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, and (Farrel)?

(Farrel): Yes, we are done.

Jim Trengrove: You're done? All right.

Woman 2: Jim, I sent - I have Maryam send out the remote participation ones to everybody.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, good.

Woman 2: Everybody has those for those for those that are on remote participation.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. And what we want to do is - so Claudio, you're still working, right?

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Oh, okay, all right. Do you guys want to look at their work? Okay. And so even though everybody will have it, if you can review their work and you want to review their work, okay? I know, and then I'll get a - no, I'm going to be too tough. And then you can send yours to (Shriva) and Claudio for review.

Yes, Andrea should mail - will email them all to everyone.

Andrea Glandon: Yes, Maryam is sending out...

Jim Trengrove: Okay, Maryam.

Andrea Glandon: Yes, Maryam is sending them out, so everybody should have received the remote participation ones.

Jim Trengrove: Hello, Maryam.

Andrea Glandon: And then as soon as I receive yours, I'll send those out to everybody as well.

Jim Trengrove: And then the remote participation ones, we want to review also. We'll probably be able to do those - because we want to look at all the work - all the completed work and hopefully be able to review that tomorrow on the wrap up along with some other comments. You good? You sent it?

Okay, send it to Andrea. Do you have her email? Okay, and each group, let me know when you have the work of your colleagues. And why don't you take, you know, 10 minutes to read them, make some notes and you can each comment. You don't have to comment as a group. You can take your turns commenting.

Andrea Glandon: Renata did just have a comment. Thanks, great to know the materials are being sent to remote participants, too.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, it's 1:25 here at ICANN 61, so in five minutes we'll start the discussion. So everybody takes a look at the other person's work, okay?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So do you each have a comment now that you're reviewing?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Do you have it? Oh, okay. They're going to review Farrell's group. Yes, finish up. I mean, do it if you can, but I don't want you not to sign off.

Oh, and Andrea? Send me everybody's work from today too, thank you.

Andrea Glandon: Do you want me to (unintelligible)?

Jim Trengrove: I'm going to talk about it yet today, but I think if people want to take coffee they should (unintelligible). How many do you have?

Andrea Glandon: Yes, I have everybody here. These three groups and then - yes, and then I have three...

Jim Trengrove: Okay, so they're reviewing it. Okay, good, so all the work is in and we're reviewing them.

Andrea Glandon: Dorothy, this is Andrea. The class does end at 3 pm San Juan time. So that is in an hour and 30 minutes.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Okay, well, let's do this. Caleb and Shree, Claudio, you want to start off and...

Claudio Lucena: Yes, the...

Jim Trengrove: How long is the comments from...

Claudio Lucena: It's a one-pager.

Jim Trengrove: It is one page.

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Do you want to read it?

Claudio Lucena: Sure.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, so begin.

Claudio Lucena: The outreach team says, "The non-commercial stakeholder's group welcomes the opportunity to comment on ICANN's draft operating plan and budget for fiscal year 2019 and would like to express concern about cuts in outreach activities that we believe deserve further consideration by ICANN." The NCSG represents the interests of non-commercial domain name registrants and end users and the formulation of domain name system policy with the generic name supporting organization.

Following the release of the draft FY19 operating plan and budget and five-year operating plan update, we acknowledge the internet of ICANN to make cuts on the budget. However, we are deeply concerned by narrowing opportunities of the empowered communities to engage effective in policy discussions. Indeed, we do not support stabilization nor the cuts in funding or different activities that impact directly our outreach plan.

Outreach events remain unique opportunities to attract new comers, raise awareness, make the voice of NCSG heard in policy development with ICANN. To be more specific, number one, we do not support the stabilization in funding for constituency support travel and aggregate for uniform travel policy with equal application to all within ICANN.

Two, a multi-lingual internet supports ubiquitous access. We therefore support ICANN in its efforts to focus translation and interpretation resources based on need. Three, we strongly oppose ICANN's proposal to reduce the additional budgetary requests envelope by 2/3 in FY19. This budgetary envelope was developed through a bottom-up process and has developed into a major way to engage communities.

We believe the above to be critical to the sustainability of NCSG mandate. Although we acknowledge the need for budget cuts, we propose that the development of a strategic intervention to investigate superfluous and replicate costs in many activities, like the expenditure incurred by the GSN, GSC team.

We thank you again for giving us the opportunity to comment on this draft budget in an open and transparent manner. We would kindly ask you to take now into consideration the impact of making cuts to our outreach activities and review your budget plan accordingly. This is critical to ensure diverse, inclusive, and continuous participation from the internet community.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, any comments?

Claudio Lucena: Yes, I think...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: You've all been friendly so far, so this is...

Claudio Lucena: Well, they're using it against me, because I started the draft with them. That's the thing. Still, it's an - as I said, it's an interesting exercise, because we're looking at the - in the course, we're looking at a structure which, really, a template of sequence of (unintelligible), if I may. It helps us draft comments.

And we were looking at a very well-drafted comment that yet did not follow exactly that structure. So it seemed to me that, in the comment we're looking at as a template for this exercise, the objections, the reasons, and the alternatives were placed together. And we see that, as you said, it's not a wrong way to put it. It works and the proof it works is that we, in the first reading, thought it was a very well-drafted comment. So it works like that.

However, I think the way we are looking at this from the same place works better. You just introduce, highlight the issues, try to find reasons, -- they're pretty much there -- try to find evidence, they're not always there. In the comments there are usually the reasons you can find it. It's not all the time we can connect to evidence. At times, they aren't here.

And then you leave an alternative or a more concrete suggestion to a point afterwards. And I think it works from the perspective of secondary minds of others, it works well.

Jim Trengrove: And there seems to be a call to action at the end even if it's...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Lucena: And if possible, at some point in (unintelligible) this is actually budget issues. It's a budget issue. I think it's better to sometimes use metrics. Metrics might probably be a very good thing to justify a case. Like for example, if you are trying to say reasons why this should not be this...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Lucena: Yes, these are possible metrics that could help do that probing and infographic (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Okay, but in a streamlined version as you're proposing. Well, again, (unintelligible). (Sharif), did you have anything to...

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: I think it is more like rationalizing the new format is, like, that we have been working on is more rationalizing the process of finding a proper solution and laying it out in policy so that it can be more well-integrated. Because if a policy is vague or everything is there, it cannot be identified and there are chances that it can wrongly integrated, right?

And if it is, like, sequenced in, you know, more appropriate way, then it's more in a process and more rationalized and people can get it.

Jim Trengrove: I see, okay. A rebuttal from this side? Have anything to say or just...

Woman 3: No, no (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Yes, no, I thought it was very good. I mean, I really - no. I really liked it. I thought it was good.

Woman 3: (Unintelligible) we tried to be as succinct as possible without losing the central thread of what we wanted to communicate. And we didn't use any figures. However, I mean, to - maybe that would have - I think that would have given us a little more oomph or some more evidence-based information in our summary.

Jim Trengrove: But understanding it - and I made a comment before about a lot of budget numbers. Whether you have million-dollar figures, or you've got percentages and maybe choose one or the other. I think percentages usually are more effective, because you can show - yes, Claudio.

Claudio Lucena: Before we got shot in our analysis, I would like to say that we were working within a timeframe and a size frame and that was the reason why we didn't go further into this. But...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So with that caveat...

Louise Marie Hurel: Okay, should we just read through also? Hi, Louise here. Should we just read through it?

Jim Trengrove: Yes, you want to read it? Yes.

Louise Marie Hurel: Okay, let me put my glasses on.

Jim Trengrove: This is the submission from (Sharif), Caleb, and Claudio.

Louise Marie Hurel: Oh, I don't have it here.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, no. Did you review their work or...?

Louise Marie Hurel: No, no, no. It's not in my email. I didn't receive that, I'm sorry. I really didn't.

Jim Trengrove: Did you review anybody's work yet?

Woman: No, we were working on the...

Louise Marie Hurel: I'm sorry. I'm really sorry about that.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, so here's what you guys can do. Why don't you - Andrea, do they have (Claudio's) work?

Andrea Glandon: Yes, we have some on our emails.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, just take a look at it real quick and then we'll go to this group here.

Louise Marie Hurel: Can you send it to me? I don't have it.

Jim Trengrove: And do you have Louise and...

Andrea Glandon: I'll send it directly to you also.

Louise Marie Hurel: Okay.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, do you guys have - have you reviewed their work there? Oh, so do you want to read it for us?

((Crosstalk))

Andrea Glandon: Did you receive it?

Louise Marie Hurel: Oh, it's right here.

Jim Trengrove: And this will be the submission from (Ilsa), Louise, and (Bruna).

Woman 4: Statement of the international user's constituency on the community regional outreach program within the draft FY19 operating plan and budget and 5-year operating plan update. The international user's constituency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the FY19 budget request and would like to offer some insight and suggestions, specifically with regard to the community regional outreach program.

(Unintelligible) is concerned that CROP is not mentioned in the FY19 operating plan. This comment focuses on two important considerations. First, it seeks to highlight the importance of the program for ensuring non-commercial representation and strengthening the opportunities for our members. Second, we seek to provide greater insight as to how these cuts directly impact the work of the NCUC and the consequences that this might have in our governance.

The NCUC has upheld its commitment to diversity since its inception. Given the importance of highlighting multiple context relations and non-commercial interests around the world, when it comes to topics with a universal nature such as the ones discussed at ICANN. Given its diversity, NCUC has always shed the light on issues that would have been normally overshadowed by commercial interests. That's helping ICANN uphold its own commitment to the multi-stakeholder model.

The work of the non-commercial user's constituency consists of ensuring that non-commercial interests are (unintelligible) in the policy making processes with regards to GNS and genetic (unintelligible). Therefore, we work with delicate issues such as privacy and freedom of expression that are important to end users all over the world. We acknowledge that not enough voices would be able to be present in this debate without opportunities such as CROP and the work developed by both ICANN and its communities towards outreach and further inclusion of (unintelligible).

CROP has been a key element and avenue for us to better advertise our work and achieve more granular in the internet governance related events and regional communities all over the world. As highlighted in the CROP page, in its various pilot phases, the CROP (unintelligible) studied growth in community interest and do this for eligible communities. The fact that both ICANN's community and organization are international makes it more important that we listen to the different points of view around the world when building democratic policies for the GNS.

Therefore, our constituency (unintelligible) very important resource at regional debates and events around the subjects we advocate for and also for drafting out new members to the ICANN community. Our executive committee has been instituted with a representative for the following regions: (unintelligible) and Epic. And we developed our annual strategy based on the input brought to us by some of the outreaches we get to promote in such places thanks to the CROP program.

The cut being proposed has significant impacts in taking (unintelligible) and it is unacceptable. This is problematic in terms of process and transparency, because being unaware that CROP was being cut, the community was unable to submit additional budgetary requests for these (unintelligible) activities as they had expected them to continue to be funded through the core budget as had been the case in FY18.

We would look forward to hearing more about how the financial team has considered the impacts of the cuts being proposed on non-commercial interests and we hope that this brief comment provides greater insight as to the importance of CROP, not only in promoting the aforementioned steady growth, but most importantly, capacity building efforts. We would also welcome a continuous conversation with an NCC and the finance committee.

Do you want to comment?

Jim Trengrove: Let them have it, (Farrel).

Andrea Glandon: Okay, the policy committee person is commenting.

(Farrel): No, I think that...

Jim Trengrove: If you were a new comer, had no idea what the CROP program was, came in, heard that there's this controversy about the CROP program and you read this. Would you have a good feeling?

((Crosstalk))

(Farrel): Careful, I will go and read about CROP shortcoming. That's what I would do. So I don't think that they have to define in detail what CROP is, because strictly speaking, they just have one page and we know that having one page, you have to jump directly into what you want to point out. And I think they did it pretty well here in document.

And I think, for the structure and for the (unintelligible), I think everything inside and I don't have very much comment on this. It's more than one page, but it was to be more than one, because they have to develop the idea and that's good for me.

Jim Trengrove: (Olga), do you have any thoughts?

Olga Kyrlyiuk: No, it's good. Explains all the details of the - what CROP is and why it's needed, but it also depends on from which perspective you are looking. Because from the perspective of the new comer, then probably you need all these details. If we are addressing the people who are taking this financial decisions, then probably we could make that a bit shorter, because they know what the problem is, but just like to highlight why it's so important and it's there. I believe it's just probably - in some places it's a repetition of what is there, but maybe because of the importance of the issue, it's worth that.

Jim Trengrove: Louise.

Louise Marie Hurel: Louise.

Jim Trengrove: the pen holder.

Louise Marie Hurel: So, thank you for the comments. I think the idea of the statement of the letter - of the input overall was - what we thought was actually that it was a little bit repetitive in certain moments and in - we definitely acknowledge that. Because it is also about, like, reinstating and building on what we were talking previous. So just adding layers and layers to our argument. So that was part of it even though we couldn't work so much on that due to time constraints.

But still, I think one of the things that we wanted to do to actually stress is the two-fold kind of argument that it - why it is important for us, what we have done with it, and we want to understand why it was cut. So, and we also tried to bring what was on the website about CROP, you know. So this is publicly available information about CROP that says that it is successful. The history is good. So what are the claims here for cutting CROP?

Even though we didn't have time to, like, go to, like, percentages or bringing the numbers to it. But I think that was kind of like the rational that led us to develop this comment. So, yes, do you want to add something?

Jim Trengrove: Ilsa?

(Ilsa): Yes, (Ilsa). There was also a conversation about whether we make concessions or not and that's took quite a while. That's why it took us a while to write down what we want exactly. So whether we actually call for, yes, let's make concessions. We'll take two out of five. Or, no, we don't want to take two out of five. We really want this diversity to sustain.

So we eventually made that decision that no, we don't want to make any kind of consensus. We just want it all. So this also was kind of in the buildup of our writing. That's why we focused mostly on diversity and on what NCUC does

Jim Trengrove: Okay, Louise?

Louise Marie Hurel: Yes, sorry. Just a final comment. Louise, here. Is one of the things that we really wanted to work on, but we didn't have lots of time to do that, was actually to bring a strong argument as to, like, the impact of CROP, not only in terms of diversity, but, like, what it actually means for us within NCUC. And I think just making it - just framing it in a certain way so that the comment can send the message that there's going to be a really huge impact for non-commercial user's expression and for their capacity building. So how do we do that?

So I think that was one of the things that we didn't have much time to work on, like, more deeply. But it's definitely one of the key aspects to it, yes.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, good, good. Have you had time to look at their work yet? You want to read theirs? Okay.

Louise Marie Hurel: Okay, Louise reading...

Jim Trengrove: They're going to read your comments here.

Louise Marie Hurel: Policy statement of the SIG within the non-commercial stakeholders group on the draft FY19 operating plan and budget and five-year operating plan update. The NCSG represents the interests of non-commercial domain name registrants and end users in the formulation of domain name system policy within the generic name supporting organization. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the ICANN's draft operating plan and budget for fiscal year 2019 and we would like to provide structured feedback and suggested refinements concerning travel expenses that we believe deserve a further consideration by ICANN.

We respectfully do not support the stabilization in funding for constituency supported travel. The project cost budgeted for each supported traveler for FY19 makes it seem that ICANN has not sought to make the necessary improvements to the travel guidelines to ensure supported travelers arrive at each ICANN public meeting able to work productively for day one. We ask that ICANN review global engagement activities to ensure that they are all closely aligned with ICANN's mission and cut any and all that are not.

The constituency how - the GSC uses their funds (unintelligible). We believe statute of low-cost should be reduced. As a civil society, we believe it is extremely important for the ICANN multi-stakeholder model that we have good representation at ICANN meetings and that our members are responsible with the funds they utilize for travel.

Many of our members are putting many hours of work each week purely as volunteers and they have no organization to top-up travel expenses. We are proud to have individual and organizational members in over 160 countries and as a network of academics and internet end users and civil society

actors, we represent a broad cross-section of the global internet community. Failing to improve the allocation of travel resources might hinder non-commercial participation in ICANN processes as civil society members will not arrive at the meetings in the same conditions as other participants and it will certainly have a negative impact on our engagement and participation in ICANN's public meetings and policy development processes.

Our understanding is that a common travel policy for all ICANN funded travelers. We also believe that internal controls should be put in place to manage staff trouble spending, how the projects are approved, how their targets are set, and how the community is consulted with regards to those activities. We should finally appreciate the ability to compare our spending on travel to that of ICANN the organization since better data on these costs would also help us understand the impact of our own usage of staff time.

We thank ICANN for this opportunity to share our perspectives on the issue of travel expenses. We trust you will find our recommendations helpful and we look forward to seeing those improvements advanced in FY19 budget. Yes, okay.

So we'll comment. So first...

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: Take it easy.

Louise Marie Hurel: Yes, so (unintelligible) I think editing would be a good recommendation. I think there's a lot of value on all of the points raised, but perhaps rephrasing some of the key point here might be interesting, especially in terms of making the message clearer. One thing that struck me a lot...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Louise Marie Hurel: One thing that struck me a lot is - especially is one of the - on the third - on the first paragraph after the three points, when you say, "Failing to

improve, blah, blah, blah," and then you go, will certainly have a negative impact on our engagement and participation in ICANN's public meetings and policy development processes. Okay, maybe just focus on how, like, just going deeper into the consequences, because just saying public meetings and policy development -- I know this is kind of like a very (unintelligible) kind of comment, but I'm just -- it would be nice to see more specifically what are the impacts aside from just not having the conditions of arriving in a certain way. But what would be the tangible consequences of that maybe.

Because policy development processes is so broad and can mean, like, in which ways you're talking about - actually, what about remote participation? You know, I think that is probably a counter-argument that would arise from that. So I think - and strategizing how to say it, you might just try to feel - like, try to include how - why is it important, aside from remote participation, you know, to have this? Why is this so crucial aside from we having not that much resources and being outnumbered from, like, other constituencies that have the funds to do so.

So this structural - aside from this structural kind of power dynamics that has - ICANN had internally. So these would be my perceptions of that I would really - I think the points are very strong and they kind of - they are straight forward in terms of structure. So this and this and that, like, the three points, is a really good way of just making it clear, but I would just recommend these things. You know, maybe just go a bit further on addressing the impacts and trying to make your argument so strong as in the way that the remote participation element of it won't be an easy counter argument, you know.
Thanks.

Jim Trengrove: All good?

Claudio Lucena: Sure, no, yes, apart from the last-minute editing that (Kellen) tried. And for the sake of consistency for all of the whole document, but that's absolutely true. We tried to follow the template and the steps, and we probably found a

way to point out, but we didn't go deep enough and that's absolutely true. And I would like to maybe share with you here also as a doubt, there's something even more abstract in the document itself that we avoided.

It's here in paragraph 19. Paragraph says - and we avoided this. We didn't put in the document. But says, "It's very hard to understand from the budget how much ICANN spends on travel - on staff travel and then the expression. But we suspect it is a sizable figure." So this is a strong point on a budget issue and that is - it seemed even more abstract when you suspect something happens. I'm not a native English speaker, so I don't know if the very suspect has the same connotation as it does in the other ones, but this is one of the...

Jim Trengrove: Yes, it's incriminating (unintelligible). Or you could say, you know, we don't have the figures. Why is that? You know, I think you can legitimately ask that question. Why can't we get answers to that?

Claudio Lucena: Yes, it does call for answers to those questions here, but...

Jim Trengrove: Okay, good. I may have made a mistake by putting be respectful up on top of the four points, because everybody starts out with we welcome the opportunity. And it would be nice to do that in a way of saying thank you, but, hey, we got - but we got problems here. And I thought of that at the beginning of yours here and I'm just going to throw this out. The NCUC represents the interests of non-commercial domain name registrants and end users in the formulation of domain name system policy within the generic name supporting organization.

What makes us unique is that we're the only constituency that isn't here to make a buck, you know? And therefore, you know, and right away - and therefore, we can't support the cuts that are going to the only constituency that isn't here to make money or - just a way of getting it right in there at the top.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Yes, and that's why - that's if you go back to the presentation of - be unique. Let them know why your constituency is different, why you stand out, why you are - why you have the expertise, why you are uniquely qualified to comment on this program. So that's just one idea. I mean, I'm not saying that you need to get away from being respectful and welcome the opportunity. You can even do it as a, we welcome the opportunity, but, you know, if you wanted to do it that way. So that's just one comment there.

Okay, good, and we had others that came in as well and we're going to look at these and comment tomorrow. I hope you all get a chance. And I'd like to leave - even though we're going to have one more assignment, I doubt we're going to be able to finish it today. So we can at least give it some thought. No, no, no, we're not going to head - no, this is the - oh, but, I do want you to read Ayden's comments.

One of the comments on the budget also was from Ayden and it was very good as well. And I had originally thought that we would have time to get to that with Rafik's, but Rafik's was so thorough that there was enough to work with there. But I did want to mention one - the last page of Ayden's comment was - and what I like also is he personalized it. He personalized his comment very nicely on how he - on he or others like him would be affected by the cuts.

And in his conclusion is very strong. As you move forward, I ask you to look inward, provide the community, reevaluate - so those are all action words. We haven't gotten into word choices yet. And one thing that we can share tomorrow is, ICANN has come out with a style guide on writing. Not so much for policy structure, but just general writing. So it'd be good to share with you, so you can look through there and get some ideas. But action words like that

certainly are helpful. And again his - and the personal touch that he put into it I thought was very good.

So any comments online at all, Andrea? Okay, it is now after 2 o'clock. So the last assignment -- and you will not be forced to work with anyone other than yourselves -- is to come up with an issue, whether it's an issue that is current, upcoming, or you wish that could be revisited or that is just a passion for you. We prefer it be something with a passion, so you can really put yourselves into it. And again, if you could do it in one page, because it's harder to do it in one page, as you know, to try to limit yourself and also limiting the time, as you're talking about.

You know, if you're at home and you get a request for a comment on something, you say, "Oh, no, how am I gonna do this. Well, jeez, I got 20 minutes. I can do this, you know." You know, by yourself, you should be able to. So once you go through the practice of reading, synthesizing information quickly, and writing it quickly, it doesn't become as much of a burden as, you know, oh, my God, I've got to, you know, how am I going to get this done?

So the last exercise, as I was just saying, is that I would like you all just to write an individual public comment. And we'll talk tomorrow, also, about when to comment individually, when to comment within the constituency itself, because it's important, because you want the constituency to be strong, but, you know, I mean, I covered politics for a long time and in a lot of ways, you're like the Democratic party. You're all over the place. You've got so many different interests that it's hard to come through a consensus on things. So wonder if you have to work extra hard to get - because you say you have your issue and you're like-minded, but what about the other issues that, you know, is there, like, an NCUC platform that you - even though it may not be your main issue, that you still support and you understand, but you're working hard on this one particular issue.

So, you know, for the remainder of the time here -- and I think it's a chance to get going -- is to sit quietly, think about it, jot down some ideas on the things that you want to talk about and I'll leave it open to you. Try to keep it to a page or so and if you finish today and you can circulate it today, that's great. If it's tomorrow when we meet, we'll do that quickly and that's the first thing that we'll do, and we'll go through the other comments as well.

Anybody have any questions, Andrea?

Andrea Glandon: Dorothy just has a question on the chat. Was Ayden's comments circulated? And did our presenter say he things a 14-page comment is a good idea?

Jim Trengrove: I didn't say it was a good idea. I said it was well-written. Again, it's - back to what we were talking about earlier about an executive summary. But more so than Rafik did, Ayden really poured his heart out into his comments. I mean, it was a lot of passion involved in what he had to say to the point where there was probably no holding him back. But, if anybody who reads it, they're going to get it, but are they going to read it? So that's, you know, it's - so Dorothy, it's a good question. But if you can do it in a shorter amount of time, you know, Dorothy, if you want to look at it and boil it down to one page, let me know. We can do that.

So for now, we're going to just ask you guys just to go ahead and think about what you'd like to write about. And I want to thank everyone who's had to come in and out of the room all day, because of other obligations and sticking with this. But we'll be here for another 50 minutes or so. And what we're going to do is - tomorrow, again, we're going to review things and then we're going to - again, we're going to go over some points about being a member of the constituency and what that means and go from there.

Okay, great, great. So, all right, Renata will be calling in at 2: 45 which is great. And for the others who have hung in there and participated, really appreciate that. Louise?

Louise Marie Hurel: Hi, Louise here. I don't know if this is cheating on the process, but I am - so I'm working on - already on a comment right now and I was wondering if I could just work on top of that? It's the public comment on cascade roll-over. So it's already underway and I think it's, like, double - it's just helping in the process.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, sure.

Louise Marie Hurel: Yes? Okay.

Jim Trengrove: I mean, if you're working on something, you don't have to come up with something different. You guys all have ideas on things you would want to - you don't have to share them, but you have an idea to do that? So why don't you just sit here for a few minutes and just think of it, you know, unless you need to run. If you can sit here and then just kind of clear your head before you get back out into the crowds and it'll help you get a head start on what we're going to review for tomorrow.

Woman: Jim, I just wanted to - I was thinking of doing a comment on (unintelligible). Will that be...

Jim Trengrove: (Unintelligible).

Woman: No, no, did not. No, just that I'll utilize the same...

Jim Trengrove: Yes, in structure the same - yes. The same information?

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: (Unintelligible) but if it has to go over into two, that's fine. Again, the challenge is if you can - well, that's...

Louise Marie Hurel: That's really interesting, because normally, I would think that a good comment would be a very long comment. So, yes, I don't know. And it seems like, you know, sometimes those comments are pretty short sometimes.

Jim Trengrove: Yes, well, yes. I mean, you want to be able to tick all the boxes, as I said, but, you know, you don't want to leave important information out.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I don't know she was using - probably (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: But it's something that...

Woman: Does it have to be something in ICANN?

Jim Trengrove: Well, yes, I think so.

Woman: Just asking.

Man: (Unintelligible) baseball teams.

Claudio Lucena: Is it supposed to be at your individual level or are we supposed to...

Jim Trengrove: This is your individual level.

Claudio Lucena: Individual, okay (unintelligible).

Woman: I was going to suggest...

Jim Trengrove: No, you're not going to finish it today, but I wanted (unintelligible) you have time to work on it today. If you want you can (unintelligible). We'll review it during the (unintelligible).

Olga Kyryliuk: (Unintelligible) or not?

Jim Trengrove: What's that?

Olga Kyryliuk: Tomorrow we will all have something (unintelligible) or not?

Jim Trengrove: I'd like to have it finished before you get here.

Olga Kyryliuk: Today, now?

Jim Trengrove: No, before you come tomorrow. Each comment ready.

((Crosstalk))

Louise Marie Hurel: A comment on the (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Is that what it is? There's a (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think it's (unintelligible) downtown, isn't it?

Louise Marie Hurel: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Who said that? That can be fake news.

Woman: That is. Caleb told me that. He said, (unintelligible). I don't know what that means but...

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Um, I have them here, correct.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So, Claudio, what is your doctorate in?

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible) issues from accountability (unintelligible) work too. I found some notes I had about this (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: No, your doctorate?

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Lucena: I'm working with AI and law enforcement.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, really?

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible) AI and law enforcement.

Jim Trengrove: In Brazil or in...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Portugal?

Claudio Lucena: Portugal, yes. It's sponsored by the public (unintelligible) university.

Jim Trengrove: So are you based now in Portugal?

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible) they sent me to Georgetown for six months.

Jim Trengrove: Really?

Claudio Lucena: That and I'm from Brazil to Portugal (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: That's great. I love Portugal. Where in Portugal?

Claudio Lucena: Lisbon. Yes, (unintelligible) based two years last year. And then after we left Georgetown for the research visit. And now we're back to Brazil and coming back and forth.

Jim Trengrove: I love Lisboa (unintelligible).

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Lucena: But then there was a bathing issue (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Which at Georgetown is a problem, because there's no metro.

Claudio Lucena: Yes, no, but Georgetown law.

Jim Trengrove: Oh, Georgetown law.

Claudio Lucena: I wasn't - yes, I wasn't in the Union space or jurisdiction. Yes, that's good.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Claudio Lucena: Georgetown law is very small. Georgetown University in the neighborhood in Georgetown is enormous with the hospital and everything.

Woman: Really?

Claudio Lucena: Georgetown law is a much smaller.

Jim Trengrove: Watch the movie the Exorcist.

Woman: I've watched it.

Jim Trengrove: Then you've seen Georgetown. (Unintelligible) is where the priest goes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman 3: Which area did you visit?

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible).

Woman 3: Oh, that's amazing. I'd love to meet her (unintelligible). It's like a hobby.

Claudio Lucena: Is it?

Woman 3: Yes.

Claudio Lucena: That's interesting.

Woman 3: So you know (unintelligible) the placement of furniture and the direction of flow and elevation of your home and all of those things are considered either auspicious or (unintelligible). Feng Sui is a Chinese and Japanese philosophy and then (unintelligible) is Indian philosophy. But it's so close (unintelligible) that a lot of homes are designed in that way.

((Crosstalk))

Woman 3: Yes, because it's not part of the culture, right?

Claudio Lucena: (Unintelligible) but actual knowledge or practices are not.

Woman 3: It's very difficult to find an architect that is a Feng Shui practitioner, because if you think about it, architects (unintelligible) and if the home design is not (unintelligible) then you have to do all these remedies. But if the home is designed from the get go (unintelligible). But not everybody is going to say I want house that is designed...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: What is he talking about (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Andrea, did you say Renata's calling in?

Andrea Glandon: Yes, I can dial up her now.

Jim Trengrove: Okay.

Andrea Glandon: Renata, this is Andrea. I'm having the operator call out to you now.

((Crosstalk))

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hello?

Jim Trengrove: Hello?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: (Unintelligible), Renata.

Jim Trengrove: Is that Renata? Hello Renata.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: (Unintelligible) oh, hello.

Andrea Glandon: Renata, are you able to hear us?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Yes, perfectly.

Andrea Glandon: Okay, great. Renata, if you want to go ahead and talk, you can go ahead and start now.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hello? I'm Renata here. I'm hearing some echo, but I can hear you well. I just wanted to thank everyone for doing the course, doing the exercises, showing a lot of good humor and really (unintelligible). Thank you Jim and thank you to the staff who have put this together and supported today. And in our next activities, our wrap up and (unintelligible).

So thank you very much everyone.

Jim Trengrove: Thank you, Renata, this is Jim. It was - for my part, it was a real pleasure. Your members here were just fabulous. They were so much - they were fun, they were collaborative. They played along. They played well with others for the most part. And the staff here was great too. So it worked out well. Yes, you've got some real talent in your constituency here. So you ought to be happy about that.

And so tomorrow we'll do the wrap up. We're going to go through the completed comments. The staff has - I mean, the participants here have one final individual comment that they're going to work on and that we'll have to review tomorrow to submit. And we'll look at the ones that also submitted online. So that will be interesting to see.

And then, you know, we'll discuss NCUC and moving ahead - sort of the challenges and I think there's a lot of bright spots in the future for them.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Great, fantastic. So thank you very much, Jim and everyone.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, you have a great day. And thank you everyone who participated online, too. I'm glad they hung in there. It was a long day, so...

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Okay, buh-bye.

Jim Trengrove: All right, thank you everybody.

END