

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
NCUC Policy Writing Course Wrap-up
Monday, 12 March 2018 at 12:15 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, welcome back. We have a quorum here. Ozan, we have – for those of you finished your individual comments...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Well don't worry about that. At some point we're going to send them to Ozan. Do you want to send everyone an email so they have your contact and they can send it back to you. Thank you. And if any of you out online have done that we'd appreciate seeing your work as well.

I think we can get started here. I just got some opening comments. Anybody have any thoughts or concerns or questions from what we did yesterday? I thought yesterday was a good session. There were some good exchanges, good collaboration on some writing.

I want to bring up two points that I saw and I mentioned it yesterday, was the – and we'll go through it as – when the others get here. But one was about the uniqueness of the NCUC and how that should be stressed as much as possible when writing your public comment and how you – how NCUC stands apart from the others in the ICANN community.

And the other point was about the – every comment – most of the comments seem to open with, "We appreciate the opportunity," and I was thinking a lot about that and that's almost like going to the voting booth and saying, you know, we appreciate the opportunity to vote. Well it's sort of your right to.

So you can – so when I say to be respectful, yes that's respectful, but also, you know, thanking the volunteers for their work, that's respectful as well so just try to change it up just so that all the comments don't begin that way. But it's still good to do.

We got – we had a – I want to thank Dorothy Gordon and Muriel Alapini, Muriel is in Benin and Dorothy is in Ghana and then of course Renata was on yesterday, all three of them participated throughout the day and I really appreciated their work. I want to read one comment that (Muriel) sent in. She sent in a couple of comments during the writing exercises and also sent a comment about the training program, and I just wanted to read that to you here.

She said, "I am Muriel Alapini, member of the NCUC since 2017. I am a newcomer and a French member. I must admit that the idea of this course is a great idea of the community. This course allowed me to realize that there are themes on which I can express myself and to write – and that to write a comment is not so complicated.

For many members, especially from French and newcomers, this course and another one will be a great opportunity to learn and be more involved. Designing this course around NCUC themes would allow everyone to understand the terms and concepts related to Internet governance and the roles of NCUC as a stakeholder in the ICANN process."

"So I suggest that this course can be done monthly in English and French and outside of ICANN meetings. I would like the rest of the community to provide their suggestions and comments," which of course I hope you guys all will do after this is over. But it struck me in reading her comments – and we didn't discuss this yesterday was how the effect of – I mean, being able to sit down and write if English is not your first language.

And I wonder – and, you know, obviously (Muriel), you know, is more comfortable in French but I'm wondering what kind of – how you folks and you folks have done beautifully writing in English if it's not your – but how you work that out and whether you think in your language and translate or how that works.

And if someone wants to comment on that because I thought your writing yesterday was very good, certainly better than mine. First...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Claudio...

Claudio De Lucena: ...you highlighted a very interesting point and it was a turning point for me because with the languages are structured differently grammatically position elements in different ways...

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Claudio De Lucena: ...use different expressions. And I think that's the first barrier that's tough to break, thinking in your language and then writing in English. It's been a couple of years now, some years since I work with English – use English as a working language.

But it's not been long since I started to make the transition. I try to use expressions that are more common – maybe there is something you want to – a point you want to make, but the way you structure the sentence in your language or in other languages you work is different from the way you structure them in English.

This is something I have just started to pay attention to a couple of years ago. But it's a game changer because then you see that your texts start to be a little bit more clear.

Jim Trengrove: Yes. Yes. Elsa.

Elsa Saade: Yes, for me it's more about being able to translate whatever I write and read in English here to Arabic to the people back home, for instance, with all those technical terms that are there and I would encourage them to come and write themselves, right?

So I think my problem would be the opposite rather translating those English terminologies that are very technical to Arabic so that I would communicate it back home. So for me it's easy to write both in English and Arabic, it's just the technical terms I'd say. Yes.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Ozan, can we put the headline slide up, the first slide with ICANN 61? Yes, thanks. Anyone else have a comment? Olga, go ahead.

Olga Kyrlyiuk: I would say that I don't have the problem of expressing myself and writing in English but it's probably also the same kind of issue as Elsa just mentioned because it's when you need to explain it in Russian or Ukrainian it takes much more words to give like explanation of one word which is in English and also because during the – during my work I normally use English then it's sometimes even difficult to formulate what you mean in your native language because you're just used doing the work to use English. But to write it's not difficult especially if you know the standard phrases from which you start the sentence, how you end the sentence, then it's getting easier with the practice.

Jim Trengrove: Yes, yes. Farrell, do you have comments?

Farrell Folly: Not too difficult but a little bit anyway because to me English is my fourth language...

Jim Trengrove: Oh...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So which language are you translating from to get to English?

Farell Folly: Most of the time I try to translate from French when I'm speaking, but before that I have my own native language and...

Jim Trengrove: Yes.

Farell Folly: ...then French, then German, and then English.

Jim Trengrove: Yes, yes. Okay, well it was interesting because (Muriel) did send in a comment on fellowships and next gen and she kept it short and simple. And I was talking with the head of language services here at ICANN and I asked her about this problem. And she said, my advice is just to keep it as simple as possible, you know, make your point and don't try to, you know, razzle dazzle, you know, and just keep it that way.

Man: Yes, keeping it to the point and making it simple makes it good writing rather than using bulky words or, you know, technically if you need the technical terms you can use technical terms but more progressively whatever content that you are writing if it's put in a simple way clarity you know, structure you're going to have in those features are there then it's really easy I think.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. You know, in the submission that (Muriel) wrote about next gen and fellowship she had – she used the phrase, "I'm a final user." And I thought, oh, she's an end user, that's – you know, and I could see the translation how things like that would happen. But I appreciate her both commenting and sending in the submission.

When I was working with the IANA transition program before I left ICANN three years ago, I did a series of interviews with all the members of the ICG which was sort of the lead organization or body here that was going to

approve. And they were from all over the world. And I was doing interviews with them of course in English and they were answering in English and there was someone from Thailand and someone from Korea and someone from you know, Brazil and all.

And finally I stopped and I said, look, I'm going to ask you the questions in English but you translate – I mean, but you answer in your own language and I'm just going to assume that you're answering me. And we'll subtitle it later on. Because I could see a lot of them were stopping to think and translating as they were speaking. And what happens when you do that, and this – you don't have the same emphasis, you don't have the same passion.

And when they started doing that, wow, they just opened up, their faces lit up, their expressions changed, their hand movements were very expressive. And it makes a big difference. And so instead of putting the onus on them to translate for everyone else we translated for them and that way they're doing a version for their own speaking people and then everyone else is getting the benefit of the subtitles.

Ozan, there's a comment.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you, Jim. Yes, this is Ozan for the record from ICANN Org, managing the remote participation. And we have a comment on the chat box from Renata. She says, "We are so lucky to have such a geographic (unintelligible) it helped a lot but also to clarify all the important structure points helps overcome the language barriers." Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, good. Thank you. Talking about the budget yesterday as we did, and I was thinking about when to comment individually and when to comment as a group. I just talked with Xavier, the director of the budget department here, the head of the budget, and I told him that I was speaking with – and I said, you know, we talked a lot about the budget yesterday and I said, I'm wondering about how effective – well he said, because of the new – of the

transition of the work stream and the new – that NCUC is not part of the empowered group and there's actually veto over the budget, we – the budget department and I guess probably others, they are required to read the comments, well not required but they are – you can veto the budget if a comment was submitted and not addressed and left out, he says so, you know, we read every comment that a constituency offers up.

And I said, okay, I said, you know, we talked about Rafik's comment and I said well what about, you know, the CROP program, which was down on Page 11 of a 14-page document. He said, that doesn't matter. What we'll do is we'll take – we'll go through that, scan that, cut and paste everything and group things together so even if it's on Page 11 it's not being lost, you know, we're still going to be able to do that.

And he said the individual comments we are reading as well. And so but that's something. And I'm sure Renata would weigh in either now or at some point about when to comment individually and when to comment as part of the constituency.

Okay, let's get going here. And we have some lunch back there also. You guys want to –if you guys want to grab a sandwich real quick or if you guys are hungry you want to do that and then before we start into that? Okay, let's just take two minutes to do that and while these guys are eating we'll do the slide presentation.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Who is it you talked with?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Oh, (Daniel) yes, oh yes, I saw him.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: ...a short while ago. Yes, he said he might want to come in and do that. I said we'd give him a waiver.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: ...to do that. So those online we'll be joining you back in a couple of minutes, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Before we – I'm sorry?

Ozan Sahin: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Oh good, you want to read the comments? Sure, thank you.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you, Jim. This is Ozan again. So we have two more comments from remote participants. I'm going to read them out loud. First one is from (Kolu Dawai), "The course was a great initiative. It provided us with the simple steps to follow. We can use our diversity to then reach the initiative. We can translate it in French and Arabic as well. Our friends from the ALAC region can translate it in Spanish as well."

So we have another comment from Renata. "Jim, we have planned conversations with policy committee NCSG who can greatly help us as well on the feature of conducting comments whether individually, on constituency level or stakeholder group level. All in all I'd say this group is inspiration and I hope we interfere more in ICANN comments in the near future. Thank you."

Jim Trengrove: Okay thank you for those two. And that reminds me, I'm already doing some editing of comments. I work – I've been helping with a program called Aim 2 Flourish and its Aim – the Number 2 – Flourish.

And what it is is a program that goes out works with business schools and business professors, more so the business students – school students and the professors around the world and ask them to find radical innovation in business.

And the criteria is that these have to be for profit businesses of any size and the criteria I they have to be doing something that within their regular business practice that pertains to one of the 17 sustainable development goals that the United Nations has set for the year 2030.

And this is a program actually my wife has worked with Aim 2 Flourish, she began it with a Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, and it's about two years old now but for the first year – and what they do the students are go out instead of just sitting in a class room they go out and find radical innovation, they interview the CEOs, they find out about the business, they find – and what happens is these businesses are doing it because they're doing good but they're also doing well by doing good; they're making a profit through their business practices.

I'll give you one example, in Cambodia they – where a quarter of the population is iron deficient, it would be difficult to get the population to take One A Day iron tablets every day. So somebody invented what they call the Lucky Iron Fish and it's a little iron fish and they drop it in the rice pot and every night when they're cooking the rice the iron leaches out of the ingot in the pot and that's how they're getting their iron.

So this story was written up, the students write up their stories, goes to the professors, the professors then send it to a bunch of – second editors, of which I am one, there's a group of about 30 of us, and so we're getting a lot

of writings where English is their second language. And so what I do, and the others do, is help translate those into sort of readable stories and formats. And, you know, some are very good, some take long, but they all get published.

Well they were hoping to get 200 stories the first year; they got 500 stories the first year and there's more than 1000 right now. So what I'm wondering, and I'll just open this idea to Renata, she doesn't have to comment, at another time, is there someone within the NCUC who could be an editor or a couple of people stewardship editors, for instance, who would – who someone like (Muriel) could send their comment to or any of their proposed writing rather than just sending it in and blindly as a comment and have someone edit it for them, and put it into a readable form just so that way they'll be – I would think they would be more comfortable submitting their comment rather than, you know, knowing that there's going to be a step in between to put it in the proper English. So that's just one idea. We could do that.

All right, let's start the presentation here. We're here for the wrap up session. We had a good session yesterday. Hello, Varsha, good to see you. Go to the next slide, Ozan. Who knows what that is? And why is it there? Yes, let's go to the next slide. It's got the tallest elevator in the world. And remember we talked about the elevator test yesterday.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Oh okay, well that's – I think that's the next session.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...human rights.

Jim Trengrove: So we were talking about the elevator test yesterday about being able to make your pitch to tell your story within – and I said, well, you know, if you get on that elevator you'd probably have time but I found out it's only 60 seconds to get to the top. But go to the next slide please if you would.

This is a – I talked about these two books yesterday and I've got them here if you want to look through them. One is Presentation Zen by Garr Reynolds and the others is If You Want to Write by Brenda Ueland.

The book on the right is – was written in 1938 and is still recommended as a resource to creative writing, to good writing. So if at some point if you guys want to look these – I'll pass these around. And the Presentation Zen, because we talked a little bit yesterday about not jazzing up but how to make your presentations more interesting whether it's writing and containing visuals or if you're going to do a presentation how to do it quickly without a lot of – without a lot of text, so if, again, if you want to look at those.

You can go to the next slide, if you want. So in the elevator test, what we were talking about yesterday for – on writing, the same standards, the same – the same guide points I think apply. Ozan, if you go to the next? As we talked about, and we saw yesterday the vast differences in thought process structure, clarity, message delivery and effectiveness, and that's because without a structure there's a tendency to want to be all over the place with your thoughts.

But if you can – if you can gather that in – ahead of your planning, if you could go to the next slide, Ozan, because this is – using this guide for your writing will also help you in your elevator test; it's structuring your thoughts as well as structuring your comments. So I want to go through this quickly again just to kind of ingrain it a little bit to you.

You want to address your comment to a specific group or individual. You want to state the issue and your position on it, explain – and I've mentioned

this to those who arrived late, I talked about this a little bit again, explain why your constituency is uniquely qualified to comment. If you go to the next please.

Describe how your constituents would be affected. And, you know, we certainly saw that in Ayden's comments, if you had a chance to read it, I mean, it was very personal about how he would be affected and how if the programs are cut and how others would be affected. Suggest your alternative. Explain how your position improves the policy. And close with a compelling summary and a call to action.

So, you know, if you go through that – did that – when you guys were doing your individual comments, did any of you kind of use this as a template a little bit to end – yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: And was – anybody want to talk about – and did you sit in front of a laptop first when you were doing it or did you sit – oh you did, okay. You get points deducted Varsha.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Good. Good. Good. Well good.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: I want – Ozan, you put the – this comment that I gave you from Robin Gross online? Okay. I don't know if you can pull it up but I also handed out copies here. And who doesn't have a copy? I'll give you one here. And just take two minutes to read that.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Well this was submitted also during the webinar, excuse me, I apologize for walking in front of you. This was submitted a while – during the webinars. And we used some quotes. Hey, Caleb, how are you? We used some of the quotes to illustrate it but I don't know if you had a chance. But I want you to again, I just – I keep coming back to this because I haven't really found anything else that I think kind of hits – checks all the boxes like this. So I'd like you guys to read this and let me know what you think stands out on this.

Ozan.

Ozan Sahin: Ozan for the record. We have another comment, Jim, thank you, for Dorothy Gordon.

Jim Trengrove: Yes.

Ozan Sahin: She says, "We think better behind the laptop. Also some comments are more general. I'm not sure all comments must refer to the specifics of your community. Could the resource person clarify?"

And we have another comment from Renata...

Jim Trengrove: Okay before we go to – go back to that one. Read that one again if you would?

Ozan Sahin: I'm reading Dorothy Gordon's comment again. "We think better behind the laptop. Also some comments are more general. I'm not sure all comments must refer to the specifics of your community. Could the resource person clarify?"

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Well if you – look, these are just suggestions, these are not must-dos. These were suggestions of a way of visualizing your thoughts by if you get a pad of paper and jotting them down and see how they all connect and kind of

do – almost like a story board of your comment before you write the story. But if you think better, if you've got it together in your head you may want to go right to the laptop. Did you have a comment, Bruna?

Bruna Santos: Just a short one on the public comment, they should – unless you're submitting a comment on your own, they should reflect like the community because we are not allowed to speak for our community ourselves so it's important to note it down. And this is probably mostly why in cases in Ayden's case he submitted a comment on his own...

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Bruna Santos: ...that would reflect his personal opinions and he also helped the Policy Committee submit a comment on the budget. So...

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Bruna Santos: ...when you're like – you have these two different positions, it doesn't pertain to taking to consideration that you're not representing the constituency on your own. So if you want to say something for them you might as well convey with the rest of the group before submitting.

Jim Trengrove: Right. And I know Renata has got a comment but I just wanted to comment here, yes, right, Ayden did submit it but I think it's important as far as the constituency goes that you can also submit examples or comments of specific groups of people or even specific people as an example of someone who might be disadvantaged by a cut in a program, for instance.

So I mean, I understand that an individual comment is going to have a – maybe a personal reflection but that doesn't preclude the constituency from including a group in Southern France or Northern Iceland, or wherever they are in Africa, you know, and bring up examples like that as would illustrate your comment.

Ozan, you have another.

Ozan Sahin: Ozan Sahin for the record. The other comment comes from Renata. Reading the comment now. "I like the VCR MP3 analogy. Sometimes we have to call out technology generational mistakes for what they are, big mistakes. Even Bill Gates said, 'No one would need more than 608 kilobits of memory,' and how absurd this is today yet it takes (unintelligible) in a comment. Thank you."

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Thank you. Well you've all read this now so I'd like to go around and get general comments because again I think this kind of – this isn't five paragraphs but I think it touches what needs to be done to get a comment and it's done pretty succinctly. Claudio.

Claudio De Lucena: If no one else wants to start there is something I need to highlight here. Claudio for the record. For one because I think it's so important and sharing makes me internalize it better. And it's – connects to an exercise we did together, Farrell, me, Olga and Varsha yesterday and I think it's very important. I see here a way in which in three – 2.5 sentences she summarizes the whole important problem when she says, "(Unintelligible) to find a solution acceptable..."

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Stop. What paragraph are we in here?

Claudio De Lucena: Sorry, Paragraph 3, half of the second sentence.

Jim Trengrove: Okay.

Claudio De Lucena: ...after the semicolon. And there is – it's third paragraph, second sentence after the semicolon. "And it failed to – and it failed in its own stated mission by attempting to create substantive rights for trademark claimants

that do not exist in law.” I find this one of the most challenging tasks to summarize the idea so much to a point where it’s clear and objective and short but without taking any of the really relevant elements in.

And there was something I remember we did together yesterday in the exercise. We got three of the paragraphs, which were a little bit full, we didn't have space for the full paragraphs, and we had to extract the core ideas and for me it was an interesting exercise and I think sharing with you today makes me internalize a little bit better.

Jim Trengrove: Good. Anyone else? I mean, I think that, you know, if you go through this there is the introduction, describe the organization, what it does and why it’s important and then the overview of the comment and right there, IP Justice is opposed to all major proposals. Now again, as I said during the webinar, maybe this was an easy one for Robin Gross to write because she just – it was a...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Yes, right. It was an all-out assault. But then gets into the details what you just wrote about, Claudio – spoke about, Claudio, and then gets into the details furthermore, the suggestion, I should say, that ICANN should endeavor to provide a more balanced discussion. A little bit of a criticism, ICANN is an inappropriate forum, and then ending the conclusion with a call to action, which is actually a negative call to action, ICANN must now allow the constant threats. So again and it’s – again all in one page. So I think this is a good – a template for what we’re doing here.

Ozan, could we go back to the slides please? Okay, again, you can go to the next slide. We finished that one. Okay, so again and this is just drilling down a little bit and coming off of what we just looked at with Robin Gross’s comment, a Paragraph 1, identify yourself and state the policy at hand. Recognize the work of volunteers.

Oh that's what I wanted to bring up here. And remember I said you want to be respectful but let's not waste time, okay? So what she does, "Despite its hard work and long hours, which we all recognize and appreciate, the RA team failed its mandate." So right there it is respectful, it does recognize the work yet it gets in...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: It makes a point, yes. Makes a point. And, Ozan if we could – go ahead, Varsha.

Varsha Sewlal: It's Varsha for the record. I just have a little bit of a problem in the introduction, you know, just doing the – trying to name the appropriate sector. I think it's just because I'm so new. And so I think that was a bit of a challenge for me when we drafted our policy statement.

Jim Trengrove: What do you mean?

Varsha Sewlal: When I look at this example it captures the organization so nicely and I failed to do that in mine.

Jim Trengrove: Oh I see. I see, okay, all right, thank you. Again support your objection with reason and evidence, explain why you or your constituency is uniquely qualified to comment on this issue. Next slide. Connect to the people you represent and I think Robin does that several times with her organization, how they will be affected and distinguish your comment from others.

Not sure she does that in any major way here. But again I think that's important. I think the NCUC has – I mean, I was thinking about what the NCUC does and I – was, you know, a couple weeks ago and it's almost like the last line of defense for protecting the Internet and, you know, once

everything else is done you guys are the protecting line so I think that would be important.

Next slide please. Propose the alternative solution with a plan of action. And as in Robin's case even if it's a negative plan of action, don't do something, that's important. And this – I haven't seen a lot but I think this is important because list key indicators of success and present a timeline to monitor success. So I think that you can say if you do – if you do take our suggestion, and go with it, here's what you're going to see. And I think it might, you know, could have the ability of convincing some people, all right, let's give it a chance and see what happens.

Next comment. Again, be compelling in your summation which Robin certainly is here. Express appreciation to the policy makers. And again, urge a call of action on your alternative solution.

So and next slide here. Okay. A couple of quick things I wanted to mention yesterday about Rafik's 14-page submission on the budget, and as opposed to if you had a chance to read Ayden's, and we can't really put both of them up side by side to comment.

You know, there was a lot of sameness to the look of – and this is just a visual thing, if you looked at Rafik's comment a lot of same size paragraphs, all numbered. And I see others kind of numbering them. I wouldn't number things, you know, because I would not number things because there's no – unless you're just referencing paragraphs against – if you say look at Paragraph 19, look at Paragraph 12, but they're not really helping group – I don't think they're helping the reader group ideas together.

And if you start varying the size of the paragraphs, shorter sentences, one sentence, bold sentences, put in quotes, visually it's more attractive and I think it just holds the interest of the reader a little bit longer. It's a small point, but I think it's an effective point.

Okay, how did we do with our individual comments here? I got – did we all send them in? Okay, who has sent them or who still needs to send them in? Yes, I got – yes, have you all sent them in? Great. Okay good. All right, you're all in.

And the group comments, we didn't get to the group comments yesterday on the review of the first public comment from the 2009 letter. Do we have those? We have the group one. How about your group here? Okay, all right, did you send it? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...yes, Olga and (unintelligible)...

Jim Trengrove: Okay. All right.

Claudio De Lucena: That was the second one, wasn't it?

Jim Trengrove: Yes, that was the second one, right. Right.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Remember the first one we didn't...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Okay all right. If you can send that? Okay, do you guys want to talk a little bit about your – putting your comment together yesterday on sort of the process of putting it together? Well the one from yesterday, the – not your individual comment, the group comments on the...

Claudio De Lucena: First or second?

Jim Trengrove: ...the first one on the one that we thought was fairly scathing in – because I know we had some online responses well that I thought boiled them down kind of well – boiled them down to – streamlined so that you could read it and took out a lot of the what we thought was sort of inflammatory language. Go ahead, Claudio.

Claudio De Lucena: Yes, there was this point I have already highlighted, it was an interesting exercise for us because then we had the problem of space, the issue of space so we had to fit it in a one-page, at least that was the idea. And this was an interesting exercise that we – to comply, let's say, or to follow the template and the flex room that we had.

We tried to extract the general ideas of each paragraph and then build another language that would be less harsh, if you may, then it was, then what it was.

We also – the issue of the tone kept coming back every time and there were parts where we just left the original language because we – in the measure in the balance gauge it seemed right at that point. But we then readdressed and redesigned a couple of other expressions and some other points. I don't know if Olga has something to add?

Jim Trengrove: Olga.

Olga Kyrlyuk: Just a few more points. I would say that it was quite easy to agree on the key ideas we wanted to reflect in the comment and but then when it came to beautification of the language then it was a bit like everyone has his own approach and then for example like I believe that we can delete this part of the sentence and like somebody out of (unintelligible) that we can delete the other part of the sentence.

But at the end it's all about consensus whether we had to write about that but still but I believe there were no like clashes inside the team more or less we were on the same page so it was quite smoothly. And it was probably the example how easy it could be to work in the team because normally it's like a lot of conflicting views but in our case it was quite easy and quite interesting exercise especially of making it fit into one page because probably that would make sense to have a bit longer but then we also wanted to have that one page so we were thinking what else to cut, so yes.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, if we haven't shared it we will. Ozan, did you share the Group 1, if you could, the Group 1 comments that I sent to you? Okay. Anyone else talk about their process without looking at the comment right now? But I know you guys over here were working, over here and just give a little bit of description about how trying to boil down the inflammatory language were you able to do it in a way that you still made the point?

Elsa Saade: Elsa for the record. Yes, we actually – as you mentioned yesterday it was quite easy for us to just like highlight the most important issues and put them together in a much short and organized way. And whatever information was left we added it as a supporting document. If that answers your question. So we left everything there, it's just the matter of how we organized it.

And the way we kind of put the highlights on was that each and every one of us took a certain paragraph or a certain part of the statement and we just highlighted the most important points and put them together. We trusted each other enough to know that each and every one of us knows what she's doing, what she was doing back then. So yes, I don't know if that answers your question...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: No, I think it does yes. Okay. Go ahead.

Elsa Saade: We just sent the document if you'd like to review it. We sent it to Ozan and hopefully he'll share it with you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay and it's one page?

Elsa Saade: It's two pages.

Jim Trengrove: Oh okay.

Elsa Saade: We had the supporting document at the end which makes it three but like it's two pages basically.

Jim Trengrove: Yes, yes. Who had a chance to be the pen holder yesterday? Farell? Caleb were you...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Okay, okay. And you guys did as well? Well Farell, so this – was this your first time as the pen holder in the – yes. What did you think about the experience though?

Farell Folly: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Yes. Just yesterday in general if it applies.

Farell Folly: Well yesterday (unintelligible)...

Jim Trengrove: Oh put your microphone on.

Farell Folly: Farrell Folly for the record. I was saying that for yesterday the experience was quite easy because I have the contributors right beside me and they can just give ideas as long as I was writing. But usually for public comments it's like you start drafting something, you send email to people who will take one

week or two week to reply and sometimes they write comment that you cannot actually understand or know which points they are getting to.

But here when you have collaborators right beside you it's quite easy because you can discuss and understand and it goes faster. So I think when it's time to write a public comment be good to have a meeting or physical or webinar to quickly draft something instead of working offline and waiting for people to reply afterwards, it take more time to do that. So this is a bit different I can tell about being a pen holder when you have people around you and offline or...

Jim Trengrove: What about having people online with you in real time?

Farell Folly: This also is good because you can just have a chat room and you can share comments...

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Farell Folly: ...and explain exactly what you mean so that the pen holder can incorporate the comment directly.

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Farell Folly: But if it's not interactive it's become annoying because you write something and then somebody else would write a comment, you get them to understand what is say and thereafter somebody add another thing that will conflict with the previous one and you have to understand everybody's view and try to summarize them and be sure that you get to have taken into account everyone's perspective.

But if it's interactive quickly all of us will get to one idea and agree on consensus. But if it's offline like – when I say offline it's not physical, if it's online but you have a chat room it's easy because you can put...

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Farell Folly: ...an idea, discuss and come with one conclusion. But if you have to edit a document separately and within a timeline that is not very short it difficult to coordinate comment and reflect individually what each individual has said or understand and make difference between each comment and come with consensus that the commenter will agree or not agree upon.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. You know, it – go ahead, Ozan.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you, Jim. Ozan for the record. I just wanted to note that I pulled up the document as I just mentioned and we have a comment from Renata in the chat box.

Jim Trengrove: Okay.

Ozan Sahin: So she says, “The topic I chose was name collisions, a real technical topic which I hope to understand a bit more on an upcoming informational session. The difficult task today a technical comment perhaps is that you're always unsure whether there's something else you need to cover. But I guess that line is the limit so sent what I had first in mind. DotHome is not necessarily a home.”

Jim Trengrove: You know, I read that, I like that comment. The dotHome is not necessarily – yes, and let me just say for those who submitted comments and even all the individual comments, I am going to look at all the comments and send you my thoughts rather than – I know you guys have other things to do but I will have some time to be able to review all your individual comments, look at them and respond.

And if you want – if we can – and I do want you to share with the group here because we've become pretty familiar with ourselves and I don't think we

should have any hesitancy to do that so I'd like to be able to do that if that's okay, share your comment – share the comments and share my comments on them, if I could.

Caleb, did you have a comment?

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: I think my own experience from being a partial pen holder is the - say for Claudio's help who actually covered for me in between is that first it was in our own document and it was easy to actually extract information from someone else's understanding. And I think I like the style Claudio used yesterday which really did make our work very fast.

He did use keywords to actually search for terms within the document and so those keywords were some of the things that helped us look out for information within that document and then we quickly say okay, this is where we can find travel because we were writing on travel, this is where travel was mentioned.

((Crosstalk))

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: ...entire sentence, look at how we can redraft and do stuff around it. And I think it was a very, very good style of looking out for information and quickly working very fast.

Jim Trengrove: And as you were planning your comment and part of what we talked about was research, that would help in your research whether you have the comment already prepared for you like this or you're doing a Google search or document search and you put in the keywords and find out all, you know, if you've got a 50-page document you can find quickly where those elements are, it's the same principle.

Farell, you had to say about online and offline and being interactive, or having a process which is sort of open and timely. So I remember (Louise) several

times yesterday being a little shaken by the time limits, you know, you've got five minutes, you got four minutes, you got three minutes. But, you know, you should think of the idea of – and maybe just do this as a pilot or a test as an idea of doing online chats or a Zoom or a Skype room and instead of doing I'm going to send you an email, respond when you can, schedule a time, we're going to talk about the comment.

And, you know, maybe you already do that, I'm sure Renata, with policy development is doing that as well. But, you know, getting a group of people who want to participate, we'll be doing this at, you know, 1600 UTC and, you know, please participate and we'll do it for an hour and probably get a lot done during that time. Caleb, oh you're – oh you had your mic open there. Okay.

Varsha, you wrote your comments – your individual comments about dotAmazon, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Yes, now did you – and you did this because this is part of your work or part of your interest or...?

Varsha Sewlal: Varsha here. I did it part – because it's part of my interest. My day job has nothing to do with this.

Jim Trengrove: Okay good.

Varsha Sewlal: I'm in insolvency and liquidation so...

Jim Trengrove: Okay all right. And how did it help you arrange your comments knowing, I mean, having the passion for it? Did it make it easier for you to write? And part of our survey asked how are you on being able to comment on

something that you've got an interest in? And how are you on being able to deliver a comment on something that you're just reading up on?

Varsha Sewlal: Thank you. I think it's easier when it's something you're interested in but it doesn't derogate from the fact that you can still prepare a comment if you have to. I mean, it's often that I would have to do an opinion on something that doesn't particularly interest me but I'd have to research it anyway. And being a doctoral student you know, research is like something you have to do sometimes it's not always the most interesting material and some portions of it can be dry. But you go ahead.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. We did do the survey and as I said we had 18 responses and what I'm going to do is first compile the data, the results, kind of fashion it into a report and share it with Renata first and then, you know, she may want to send it out to all the members as well. And so if there's anyone – I think everyone here has done the survey? Did everyone – so if there's anyone online who hasn't done the survey there's still time to do that, submit your ideas.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Shree?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: I'm sorry. I'll put...

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: The one with the (unintelligible) right?

Jim Trengrove: The national – no we sent out the survey on writing on how familiar you are with writing, how comfortable. Okay. So if you don't we can get it to you and be able to do that. Okay. All right, well good. I think that's it. I'm trying to see does anybody else have comments or ideas or thoughts as we move ahead? This is your chance to...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Yes. Why don't we go around and if people are going to do this why don't we just go around in circle and force everybody to have...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: But we'll start since you – since I started over here with you on your comment, Bruna, do you want to have any general comments as we finish here?

Bruna Santos: General comments on the course...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: On anything that you've learned, anything that you're concerned about that you want to try that you still have a problem with.

Bruna Santos: Yes, yes of course. You started this session mentioning the part of the language and this often strikes me as a problem as well. Although, I mean, I guess I have reached some level of like some level of advanced English or something like this, I still come across lack of – I forgot the name of it in English – you see – vocabulary, sorry.

Jim Trengrove: Yes.

Bruna Santos: So often like vocabulary, lack of vocabulary comes across as a problem for me. And it's not – it might seem sometimes that we are not well articulated or not able to do some stuff due to the lack of vocabulary but also I tend to structure all my positions in English just so I don't get lost in the translation, so this is also an important thing.

But with regard to the whole course, I have to state this, and I stated it at the LAC session as well, this is such a good opportunity and I wish the rest of our constituency was able to do it. And we keep on doing it for the meetings because we need more volunteers and we need more people diving into policy processes so being able to be here and listen to your knowledge and share it with all of us is a good opportunity and I appreciate it very much. So thank you, Jim.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, I did want to make this – but thank you, I appreciate that. But go ahead, Elsa.

Elsa Saade: All right, so first of all thank you, Jim, for being super open to any question and I think that was key in this course, the fact that there was no intimidation to ask any kind of question because normally in any kind of policy development fear – there's always people who know much more than you do so you're afraid to ask questions, but I didn't feel it here and I felt that this was key in our – in developing that course forward so that was something I wanted to highlight.

And the second thing was more of a question, and it was more about what the future is in terms of follow up with us as participants to this course. And if someone else would like to also take this course how would they be able to take it? Is it going to be an ICANN Learn thing and then for more hands on exercises they do it in an ICANN meeting, for instance or like what is your vision for the future of this policy course generally? And, yes, I think that's it for me.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, well let me just say that I have – I talked to several people this week from other constituencies and they were also interested and said, gee, we'd like to do that too so I know that has to do with budget requests and this preparation for this course was unique; it's the first time I had done a course like this. And so all the, you know, the research and planning was original.

But now this sort of template has kind of been set. But I'll just leave that, you know, up others to decide.

We did webinars as well. You know, if there's face to face that's fine, if there's webinars that's fine. The cameras were here yesterday and I don't – and I'm not sure I explained why the cameras were here yesterday. This is going to be an ICANN Learn video. I'm glad you – I'm glad you brought this up. So you guys – so unless – and I'm not sure I need you to sign waivers...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: ...but I'm not going to make you look bad. Ozan, you had a comment.

Ozan Sahin: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Ozan Sahin: (Unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: Okay there you go. That's perfect. Good idea.

Ozan Sahin: This is Ozan for the record. We have another comment in the chat box from Dorothy Gordon. And she says, "Very useful and enjoyable but next time I think we should all work online as that is how we work in the real life. I suggest all new members do a policy writing course as they join. Please send book references. Thank you."

Jim Trengrove: Good. That's a good suggestion.

Claudio De Lucena: Jim, I would say not exactly the contrary but I think the way you build up this course with previous seminars or previous webinars leading to a face to face meeting was super cool. And this worked nice.

Jim Trengrove: Oh that's good.

Claudio De Lucena: True, we work distance and we have to find a way to work this remotely because that's our reality, but it makes a difference at least for me it made a difference to be able to prepare a little bit in advance and then, yes, in a couple of days meet and then we go to hands on, it worked really nice. And I have to say if this is an idea that you're structuring not only ICANN but other Internet governance spaces are going to very interested in the experience too.

Elsa Saade: Jim, may I ask...

Jim Trengrove: Go ahead, Elsa.

Elsa Saade: I think what Dorothy is just saying here is important because most of the work that's done in – most of the work is done in between meetings but also that work being done virtually is also being signed upon in a face to face meeting, so I completely agree with you, Claudio. And honestly this course inspired us through what you just said, Jim, to make – maybe make a supporting group for people who might not know about this and maybe translate issues for them to be able to be more engaged as well. So I just also wanted to add this. Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Olga.

Olga Kyrliuk: I think this is a very important initiative because you need some kind of starting point when you just come into the constituency and you want to get involved but you don't really know what's the proper format of writing that and what the proper way of expressing your ideas. So I think this is something which should be made on a permanent basis and thank you a lot for guiding us through this process and showing us the nuances how to write a public comment and both as a member of the team and the individual comment.

And at this point I think this is very important that you will also kind of committed to send us the individual feedback on our individual comments because this is very important to get this personalized feedback at least one time feedback but then that will show where we are wrong and what we are doing correctly so at the end we will know how better to structure our comments.

And I also think that probably we can make out of this five points template that you provided us so use this as a template probably disseminate that through the list for maybe people who are just starting to write their comments so that they at least know what is the structure. But also yes, I think that at some point there should be on site groups of newcomers gathered and they should get this firsthand experience how to do that because this is a really valuable. And yes, this is good to share and this is good that we have now this online opportunities but at the end it's always good to have this personal contact with people and to share and to see what the – what they think you do right or wrong.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Farell.

Farell Folly: I just want to emphasize on the last points you said, that was my comment. As a member of Policy Committee the most problem we used to encounter is like what (unintelligible) to use when writing a public comment. That's the first question. And secondly, when you are to evaluate or to comment on somebody else comment you don't know what the styling and you have put this here but the person choose to put the argument other and it's really difficult to compare comment and to follow a streamline but actually say this course will give us like a template, a guideline that, a commonly guide template accepted that we can use now onwards to write public comment.

And my intention I already discussed with the Policy Committee chair is to take this, make it more like what we want like okay if you want to make a public comment those are the five paragraphs you can follow. Within those

five paragraphs how many ideas you want to comment on, first idea is how many rationale, how many examples and so on. And it will guide people who start writing public comments and I think this is very good because it will not be like somebody else come and try to enforce a way to do something but it's after we follow writing policy (unintelligible) we all commonly agreed that this is a method that is working and can help us write a public comment from now onwards.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Shree.

Shreedeeep Rayamajhi: Policy – I strongly believe that policy writing is something very complicated in terms of, you know, you're getting all the – all the – doing all the research as well as getting all the comments. And you are there, and if things are not clear to you, if you are not clear, if you don't have the clarity then it's a very chaotic thing. So you know, like highlighting those things about how to be clear, those things are very important. Those are the basics, so when the basics are clear then you – it reaches a certain point. And it further helps you to, you know, create a process. So it's all about putting all the spices and cooking it but you need to know when what to do, right?

So this course has completely given us the clarity about what to do, how to put it and where to go. So it's more important to know that because as I said, policy is always – it always has a research point, you know, you always do that in terms of what the problem is, or what the challenges are or you do a lot of investigation also. So in those terms clarity is a must and I think it gives us a great breakthrough. Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Caleb.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Okay, so I think how we're speaking from the point of fellowship this time around and just a suggestion that probably for coaches or second time fellowship anyone who happens to get the fellowship before the second time, as part of the (unintelligible) for the process of beginning to engage

within the community, I think it's good that probably the fellowship coordinator is informed that they could probably add this as part of (unintelligible) for coaches and second timers because this is good.

Yes, the newcomers might really not find this very interesting but the point of being a second or third time participant as a fellow I think it's actually a good thing that they kind of enforce it if it's possible or make it compulsory that you at least pass through this policy writing public comment thing. I think it's going to be a good way of beginning to engage and communicate within...

Jim Trengrove: So you're saying not when you first arrive, when you've got everything else going on, throw you into a writing course, but once you – once you've had the ICANN experience wash over you over a couple of meetings...

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Yes.

Jim Trengrove: ...over a couple of meetings or so then you can start to...

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Yes, when you start...

((Crosstalk))

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: ...understanding the acronyms, which is very, very confusing.

Jim Trengrove: Right.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: Yes. And you understand everything that has to do with ICANN so over a period of time you've probably joined a constituency, and having joined a constituency you are just on a listening mode, not on the talking mode.

Jim Trengrove: Yes.

Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele: But now you need to start participating and start contributing to that constituency so for you to start that and part of the curriculum that should be part of coaches or maybe folks that are coming in next for the second time the policy call should be part of it.

Jim Trengrove: Okay. Good.

Claudio De Lucena: I have a question.

Jim Trengrove: Yes.

Claudio De Lucena: I know you're starting the experience now from scratch but it's just a curiosity, is there anything planned for the future as a follow up or as another...

Jim Trengrove: I'm just – well I'm going to work on the ICANN Learn video now, I'm going to be putting that together and work with the ICANN Learn people. But I think – I'm sure that I'll be talking, you know, I talked to David Olive who's on the – head – the Policy Director and so we'll see, you know, we'll see. You know, and again these – let's talk about the five points or the five paragraphs whatever, again, these are just organizational points just to help you – whether you're getting on an elevator and you want to organize your thoughts because you're going to be speaking with Göran going up to the top floor, or whether you're sitting down writing it just helps you organize your thought.

You know, it's not brain surgery, you know, and that's a comment I used to use with my daughter a lot until she became a neuroscientist and so I can't use that with her anymore because she says I know that that is. But it just helps you – it just helps you gather your thoughts. It's just a tool to help do that so that's it.

Okay, I think we've – I think we've just about wrapped up time here. We have some certificates to hand out here for the participants to thank you for

participating in the webinars and the two day sessions here. And what I'm going to do here is I'm going to start with Varsha and I'm going to read this here just so we have it.

It says, "Certificate of Attendance. This certificate is awarded to Varsha Sewlal..."

Varsha Sewlal: Sewlal.

Jim Trengrove: "...Sewlal for attending the Writing for Policy and Public Comment Training, February March 2018." ICANN NCUC, signed by Renata, Chair of the NCUC and by David Olive, Senior Vice President Policy Development Support, ICANN. And, Varsha, let me just say a quick personal note about you, one thing that I did before I met – I knew who the participants were going to be, so I did a little research on all of you and you guys are all fascinating and that's one of the thrills that I enjoyed coming here because I learned so much every time I meet someone new and talk with them. And so I knew about your legal work and your work down in South Africa. There are several things. Some of you have to work on your bios though, if you don't have an ICANN wiki up profile you need to do that. So I want to present this to you and congratulate and...

Varsha Sewlal: Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: And...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Wait. Wait. This is the time where we (unintelligible).

Jim Trengrove: All right.

Varsha Sewlal: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Then if we don't have a photograph.

Varsha Sewlal: You know these photographs are going to get me in trouble, do you know that?

((Crosstalk))

Varsha Sewlal: Thank you so much.

Man: We had to check which one is good or better but I think this should (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Claudio.

Varsha Sewlal: Thank you. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Varsha Sewlal: Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: And let me just say also that you all have my email or if you don't get my email because I want to stay in touch with all of you so that if you have a writing comment or a suggestion or something you want to share or something you want to look at, feel free to send that to me. Varsha, I need you back up here.

Varsha Sewlal: Oh my God, what did I do now?

Jim Trengrove: Well because you're going to present yours – the next one.

Varsha Sewlal: Oh, what an honor.

Jim Trengrove: Okay, here you go.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: Here you go.

Varsha Sewlal: With great pleasure...

Jim Trengrove: Well you don't have to read the whole thing.

Varsha Sewlal: No but I have your...

((Crosstalk))

Varsha Sewlal: ...the check for the moment.

Jim Trengrove: You don't need to do exactly what (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jim Trengrove: So much about...

((Crosstalk))

Varsha Sewlal: Okay. Okay, with great pleasure I will – the certificate is awarded to Claudio (unintelligible), well done Claudio. And thank you for being an amazing teammate. Thank you.

Claudio De Lucena: Thank you very much.

Jim Trengrove: You may want to step up here.

END