| BRENDA BREWER: | Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the NCUC Executive Committee Call, taking place on the 14th of December at 14:00 UTC. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. This call is recorded. Kindly state your name before speaking for the record. And have your microphones, also, on mute when not speaking. And I'm happy to turn the call over to Raphael. |

| RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: | Thank you, Brenda. And thank you, everyone. Welcome to our first statutory NCUC meeting call. And to get quickly into the agenda … So as a first point, I just put a quick round of presentations for Ken, since he recently joined us and probably does not know all of us as of yet. So although we're still missing both Ben and Leah, I suggest that we still go ahead, at least for the people who are there. And I would also maybe invite Brenda and Maryam, also, to quickly present yourselves, given that Ken is relatively new among us. |

So I'll start with myself. My name is Raphael Beauregard-Lacroix. I'm originally from Montreal. I am currently a doctoral student in law, studying data protection. And I've studied and lived in many places. But right now, I am working in Freiburg in Germany, while also working on my dissertation. So yeah. I suppose we probably don't have all the same order. But I would just maybe ask Mili, and then Olga, and then Brenda and Maryam to present. And then, Ken, you can go last as well, so that we get to know you a little bit more. Thank you.

Oh, yes. Of course, Mili. That's fine. It's no problem. So you can type and then maybe Olga you can go, while also Mili will type her little presentation. Thanks.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: Okay. Thanks, Raphael. So my name is Olga and I'm based in Kiev, Ukraine. I have a doctorate degree in international law. And currently, I'm a CEO of NGO called The Influencer Platform. We are focused on the various digital rights and Internet governance issues. And also, I'm a member of the Executive Committee of the South Eastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance. And this would be probably it, in short.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Thanks, Olga. Then maybe Brenda and Maryam as well. Thanks.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Raphael. And welcome, Ken, and everyone. This is Brenda. And I live in the United States, in the Midwest. I am your operations support person. So when you get a calendar invite or a reminder, that comes from me. And together, Maryam and I will be supporting your calls. So I'll let Maryam go ahead. Thank you.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hi, Ken. Welcome. Welcome to NCSG NCUC. My name is Maryam Bakoshi. I live in the United Kingdom. Like Brenda said, I support the NCSG. Primarily, my role is—well actually, NCSG, NCUC, and NPOC. My

role is more of an advisory role. And yeah. So when anything … Apart from the advisory, I also work with the chairs on membership issues, on communications, and the like. Brenda is very good with supporting us on calls and admin. But you would see emails from me when it has to do with the EC. Thank you very much. And again, welcome.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Thanks a lot, Brenda and Maryam. And yeah, Ken. Please go ahead and tell just a quick presentation.

KEN HERMAN: Yes. Great. Thanks to Raphael and hello to everyone. Thanks so much for the brief intros. I really appreciate that. This is Ken Herman. I'm retired from many years working with the United Nations, mostly as the technology coordinator for the UN system, which I'm sure many of you know is a collection of independent and semi-independent institutions. So by background is ICT, more technology. I have a master's degree, many years ago in computer science. And prior to UN, I was the head of ICT for a lot of nonprofits, including starting my career at the UN with the World Food Program as their Chief Information Officer.

As part of the UN system work that I did, I worked very closely with the IGF, attended many WSIS meetings. And it was a lot of through that, that I become more interested in the Internet governance aspect. I don't have a legal background so I warn you that I have to struggle with some of that. But I'm hoping that the work that I've done over the years in the international ICT arena will kind of make up for some of that.

That's good enough for now, hopefully. If there are any questions about what I've done in the past, happy to answer. But I'm happy to be here and I appreciate the welcome message from everybody. Back over to you, Raphael.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Thanks a lot, Ken. And you know that being a lawyer is not something … It is not a prerequisite to be a member of anything at ICANN. There's a lot of lawyers, certainly. And that might be kind of a structural issue or at least a structural component of the work that ICANN does. A lot of lawyers, and then a lot of engineers, and also a lot of people in between. But in any case, that's certainly not an issue at all. And we're glad to always have other perspectives. Otherwise, it can become too lawyerly. So thanks for that.

So now, we're just going to go straight ahead to point two of the agenda. So, as you know, we had this survey that did not get a lot of answers. We got 12 answers in total, which obviously is not a lot, considering the size of our membership. But at the same time, that's just how it is. And we'll make do with what we have.

So I just sent you a Google Doc. I'm going to share it but you all have it in an email that I sent earlier. Oh. Or maybe, Brenda, if you want to share it as well, if possible, instead of going and playing with the settings. Yeah. Thanks. Great.

So for this year's ABR, the survey result, I just summarized them in words because, of course, making averages and stuff like that when you have 12 answers is not really … There's no point in it. Whether we

should do with written or oral advocacy, it was really split. I think it was seven to five, basically, for written, which means that probably we can … Either we make a choice to go with one or the other or we try to cover both.

As for which part of ICANN we should focus on, in terms of where the advocacy should be focusing on, it's GNSO PDP, a few answers for the Council. And no one seems to be interested in review teams. But that's fine. At the same time, GNSO PDPs are the which are the closest to us. So that's clear, that it should definitely be focusing on the GNSO and specifically on the PDPs.

We had 10 out of 12 who said that they would be up for some role-playing exercises. So that's good. I guess that's something that we can also suggest incorporating in the training.

As far as the interest in consensus-building methods, or methodologies, or tips and tricks, or whatever, as well as getting into case studies, everyone was interested, 12 out of 12. So I guess that's also something that should be reflected in what we send to Org.

As far as the time, it was kind of split. But there was as substantial, I would say, majority for UTC or UTC+1, a few for India, one for North America, and one for Japan. So mostly, I can presume I would go with UTC or UTC+1 for that.

And yeah. That's totally … If that's something that's already done for the fellows, I presume, if we bring this up in our document, then all when they will review it, and if they see consensus-building exercise, they will probably know what they … They will probably know that this exists and

they may ask whoever's going to lead a training to [retrain] that. But that's certainly something we can flag, and especially if you've experienced and you thought it was a good one. That's good and we're going to keep that in mind.

And then, as for the format, I basically gave two choices, which was that of a more, I called it "interactive" lecture and more like a real workshop. The only difference between these two is how involved the audience is. While interactive lecture is mostly to Q&A and maybe like a more directed question period, while a workshop is really have the audience, or the participants do things, eventually, through break-out rooms and things like that. So it was kind of split 50/50. Now of course, you try to align that with the fact that people are interested in role-playing exercises and it was split 50/50 between the interactive lecture and the workshop. You wonder how you can do an interactive lecture with role-playing exercises. But anyhow, that's the result, still.

Yeah. I think also … I think it's probably more interesting if we do some workshop style, with the breakout rooms and the exercises, especially because this is supposed to be about advocacy, which is a lot about doing things. So we might as well get the audience to practice this kind of doing things. Yeah. That's also my leaning but it's good to know there was—there were people who preferred a more interactive lecture.

And then, there were elements that … So when we were framing the questions for the survey. And I think, Olga, you're the one who commented with more on that. But basically, the fact that the history of civil society at ICANN might as well be included anyway. We don't really need to ask people if they're interested.

That's probably part of what should be discussed—of course, not at length because we don't have hours and hours but just a small—either a refresher for those who already know but, you know, um, also for people who are new and might not know how civil society has been set up at ICANN and the things that they have done. And maybe that's the most important [inaudible] structure. It's more what's been done— what did civil society achieve or not achieve at ICANN? I think that's probably good.

And then, of course, PDP 3.0, especially more if this is going to be about GNSO PDPs. Yeah. PDP 3.0 is probably key in there.

So now we have to draft a document we're going to send to Org. Now, Bruna sent to me this morning … I haven't had the time to share it with you but she sent to me what she sent as NCUC EC Chair regarding the policy writing course that was done a few—well no, not a few years ago. I think that was last year, was it? I don't remember, anyway, when she did that.

So it's about a page and a half. It's not very long. Now, maybe … I think, Maryam, you're our liaison for that. I don't know if you have that document. But otherwise, I could kind of share it with you quickly. And I would just like to confirm that this is what is expected, in terms of output, to what we're going to be sending to Org—like how precise and especially in terms of length.

So what Bruna sent was basically point form, a page and a half. Is that fine? Should it be more or even … Well less, I guess, would be difficult.

But it's more about the level of detail. So if you have [an opinion] on that, that would be good.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hi, Raphael. I sent you a link on the leadership channel. Is that what you're looking for?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Sorry. I'm having breakfast at the same time. No. I don't think so, in the sense that it's really for not the ABR itself but more like what—because we'll have something to send by December 21st, right? And is that … It's more data than I'm thinking of.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. December 31st is basically a framework or a draft, actually, of the ABR for FY 21. So, the ABR that was approved, the one you were just discussing … So we need a draft of what you want from ICANN. All those things you've been talking about, we need that. Yeah.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. But it's more about how long and what kind of details we should go in.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I would go for more details than less.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. As many details as possible, basically.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: As many details as possible. Yeah. So, if you just go … If you look at the request that was sent, that was [inaudible] for it. So just go from that. Yeah.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: [inaudible] as possible. And also, if you could let us know the dates that you're looking at having it, then we can begin to work with NCUC to make sure that we plan around that.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. That's the thing, too, is that I'm … So once there's a document, I'm going to send it around and see with Bruna, and with Raoul at the NCSG and NPOC because—well, especially with Bruna because she also has her own thing to do. And so to make sure there's not—that whatever course or training that results from our ABR is kind of complementary with what NCSG is doing and that there is no—or there's not too much overlap. There might be some. But at least the whole thing is not the same because that would be, really, a duplication. And I think that the point is to avoid that here.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: I'm going to take care of making sure that this is not the case with Bruna.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. Okay. Great. Thanks. And then, just to note as well, that if you could send it to the mailing list as well, the NCUC-discuss list, once you have good draft … That … But yeah. Thanks.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. I'll do that as well so that membership has some time to review. Sorry. So I guess, then, we have to discuss the main points that we want included now, in this document. I've put a few. And then, we have to work backwards, in terms of timeline, from December 31st, including that fact that a lot of us are going to be on Christmas vacation, or that we may want to have Christmas vacation and ICANN vacation as well. But kind of working backwards to make sure that we have the time both draft this document and then send it and circulate it with both Bruna— mostly with Bruna but with Raoul as well—and then on the mailing list, on the general mailing list, and then send it on time. So yeah. It means that we don't have a lot of time left, obviously.

But just quickly, these are the three points I identified. Now, I guess if we're to provide details, I don't know if any of you would have, for example, ideas of case studies that would be relevant. And I guess that I could probably go in the document and also just add what we

EN

discussed—the consensus-building exercise. And I've put ICANN fellow—I guess fellowship. Yep.

So do we have …? Anyone has ideas? We'll have a few days to come up with that but not very long. If we are planning with only 14 days from now, if we want to include a few days of ICANN vacation around Christmas. Yeah. So a few days at most. But the timeline is next point. We can just see if there's anything or anyone who has some ideas about—especially case studies. And I know this might require a bit of historical knowledge of what civil society has been doing at ICANN. But yeah.

One that I've—a more recent one, maybe. So Kathy has been involved a lot with SubPro and for a lot of years. And so I'm sure that she might have interesting things to say about whether civil society was efficient, not efficient, successful, not successful in that context. And yeah. I think EPDP might be somewhat recent. I don't know if we need to go—how far we need to go. But I guess I can still [inaudible] as potential. So, SubPro, EPDP, at least the Phase 1, which is concluded, and potentially others. But again, maybe reaching with the membership.

So Ken, "Assuming that workshops of this nature has taken place in the past, is there any evaluation of the effectiveness of these events that could drive ...?" Yeah. So we've never had that specific thing before. So what has been done, there is a policy writing course. And maybe Maryam can correct me but I think that took place two years ago, if I'm not mistaken. And there was something, as well, this summer. But I don't know if that was the result of an ABR or something else.

EN

But there's definitely … If you go on the ICANN Learn—so the e-learning platform from ICANN … Yeah. A policy writing course last year. Yeah. So this course is meant to be on the platform. And the reason we got funding for this one is that this has not been done before, in that format. Otherwise, that would be kind of duplication of—or a wasteful use of resources.

How do we measure effectiveness of that? That's a very good question. And it's not something … Some things are difficult to measure and the impact. We would hope to see it. But at the same time, it's kind of … Yeah. There's only one course of that sort that's been there so far. And this one is meant to build on that.

And so, it might be a bit, I would say, early, although I realize that there's a lot of ways too—the ICANN timeframe, or the type of early that we're talking about—might be a bit strange if we're talking about years. But to see the impact of that … But it's sure that after this, we're going to build on feedback from our members to—or the participants—to improve or refine what we deliver on that.

And of course, that's a good comment to keep in mind for the next round of ABRs, when we're going to be maybe asking for more money to continue this kind of capacity building program. We can think about it in a term that might be easier, as well, to measure the impact. That's definitely something that can be kept in mind when we draft the ABR for the upcoming financial year. Yeah.

Do they become more involved? Yeah. That's the thing. We wish they would. But it's not always the case. And it might be that it's people who

EN

are already involved who sign up as well. And then, they don't necessarily become more involved because they already are involved. So yeah. It's very tricky and this is our evergreen problem here—how to get people more involved and how to measure involvement is very difficult.

So … And I think for format, except if someone has a very strong preference for an interactive lecture, I think that something more hands-on is better, just because otherwise it's going to become one of those more—things where people doze off a little bit or wash their dishes at the same time. And that's not really the point of that. They might as well just listen to things in a much more passive way. So if we're to have something, I would prefer something more involved, in terms of [inaudible]. So, I would definitely go with that.

So I think … Yeah. I see hands. Sorry I've just been rambling on. So, Olga, yes. Please go ahead.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: Thanks, Raphael. I just wanted to comment shortly on the case studies. I am thinking that probably we could name for the participants when happened in the focus areas where NCUC NCSG has been involved, in terms of their thematic tracks. But then, for the practical exercise and for detailed analysis to focus on some—on one thing in specific—because as you said, we will be quite limited in time. And I think it is very important and better to look in more details into one issue than just to keep naming the different ones and to keep jumping between them.

EN

Because if we take, for example … And I think both SubPro and the EPDP would be very good examples. Maybe EPDP a bit more complicated for people who did not really deal with that issue closely. But if we take just one of them, that would give us an opportunity to look into more details and probably to give to participants more understanding of how to move with one specific issue, let's say from the very beginning to the very end of this PDP process. And maybe even to take from SubPro some few or one bigger thing to discuss in specific because I think that could help to understand the details better than if we just keep it very wide in scope.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes. Thank you. I think, Olga, that's true, that I think going into the details is probably better. And so that having more than one, given that this training isn't going to be lasting for hours and hours. But yeah. Definitely, I think that's a good point. Yep. Mili, yep. You can go.

MILI SEMLANI: Thanks, Raphael. I hope I'm audible. And I finally got to a quieter place.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Oh, good. Yes.

MILI SEMLANI: So I agree with Olga on this particular point. And also, just what we were discussing on the chat when Ken mentioned effectiveness, I was thinking we could also add a little bit of a pre-preparation or pre-

assessment kind of a thing to this webinar, workshop, or whatever we choose to have. And this is, again, something I've seen at the Fellowship and that's been improved over a period of time—even the IGF Fellowship for that matter.

They will get their candidates who sign up for the Fellowship, even before they're selected to do a preparatory course, maybe spanning over a month. It could just be like going through the civil society—I mean understanding the role of civil society in ICANN. If you prepare some material and then people take that time, for the first month, to go through it and then sign up. I mean sign up for the workshop but when they do sign up, they have to use this material. Once they do and then they come to the workshop, it just helps them to be a little more primed about what we [inaudible].

And then, we also shape the workshop in a way that it specifically leads then to some kind of an objective of participation at NCUC. So for example, if we do SubPro, we should align the topics in such a way that there are opportunities for them to participate right after or at least a few weeks or months after the workshop, so that this knowledge and experience or skill that they gain in the workshop can be almost directly used right after that. It's not forgotten and then after six months, they have to refresh themselves again—something like that.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes. Thank you. That's a very good point as well. And that's something that I've seen done too, and definitely, we can do that. And I'm even thinking maybe the more historical part might be addressed there as

well—if not entirely, at least in part so that we don't have to do too much of it during the live training. Olga, is this a new hand or an old one?

OLGA KYRYLIUK: Yes. It's a new one.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. Go ahead.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: It just crossed my mind that again, following this discussion of whether people become more active once they complete such courses, I'm thinking … I know we can't force people to participate or to be more active. But what if we ask the participants of this specific webinar, or whatever we call it, to sign up afterwards for any of the public comments, for example—at least, if not as a super-active member, penholder, but at least to participate, to contribute, even with the smallest input, so that they, in practice, see how this works.

And maybe afterwards, that would help us to have new people as active members for the public comments. Because if we don't ask for any commitment, I'm indeed afraid that this can be the case as always. People just participate and then they, again, ask for some skills-building exercises. But then, we don't get nothing in return.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes. That's very true. And that might be a point. I don't know if all of you were at the policy committee call that just took place before. But one of the issues with having people volunteer for public comments might be breaking the ice, in the sense that it's possible—and that's totally hypothetical—that the most difficult public comment to get involved in is the first one. And once you've done one, then you get a bit more confident and you feel that you can do it.

And in that sense, maybe a bit of targeted nudging, post-training, might be a good thing to really encourage, especially the ones who are newcomers, to really get involved in one with a bit more handholding. And in that sense, it might allow them to gain that confidence if—again, and it's the hypothesis--if self-confidence is one element that prevents people from engaging with the with the engaging with the [inaudible]. A lot of this is hypothetical, but we have to try things, I guess, to figure out.

Mili, is that an old hand or is that a new one? I would presume it's an old one, in that case.

And I see also that Ben agreed with Olga for the hands-on thing. And yeah. I think that's really a preferable format, in that sense. All right. Thanks.

So yes, in the sense it's an old hand. That's what I interpret. So I think now we could probably go, except if someone else has more to say in terms of content. So I'm going to take care putting these bullet points into something more of a text.

And now we can probably go to point two of the agenda—or not point two but subpoint number two, which was the timeline. So, the timeline for that … Let's say that we go back from the 31st and now we're, today, the 14th. So if I give … Let's say that I come up with the draft in 48 hours. That brings us to the 16th, Wednesday. And then, give us or you 24 hours to just review, as well. So let's say by Thursday, close of business, we'll have something that we internally kind of agree on.

And then, I would share it with Bruna and with Raoul—try to get some feedback from them by, let's say, Monday the 21st. And then we could put it on the list and give … That would go over Christmas a little bit. But then, give until maybe Monday the 28th for list feedback. And then, this gives us two more days to finalize whatever needs to be finalized and maybe having a little bit of buffer, if we cannot hold the previous deadlines. Yeah. And then, that would get submitted by the 31st, as agreed.

And maybe—just checking with Maryam. Do you believe that this is a reasonable deadline, since you always kindly provide the project management advice here?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. I think it is. Yeah.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. Thanks. So, I think … At least from my side, it seems reasonable as well. So let's do it that way. So as far as this one is concerned, I'll be back to you guys with something Wednesday. I'm going to try to make it

Wednesday relatively early here, North American time, so that for people in Europe … And also Mili, you're in India, if I'm not mistaken. Then, it's going to come out a little bit later for you so that you also have a good time. So I'm going to try to aim for something in the morning here, North American time, on Wednesday. So that's, I think, for that.

Maybe just quickly go back to the agenda, Brenda, if you can, just so that I—just to make sure that we're not skipping on anything. I can actually go back here, as well, on my own since I posted it. Yeah, timeline, next steps. Okay. No. That's fine.

So I think we can go to ABR for Financial Year 2022. So yeah. You can actually … Sorry for that. I should have just pulled up the agenda on my own. You can go back to the document—the Google Doc. Yes. Thanks. And you can scroll down. Okay. All right.

So ABRs for the financial year 2022. So submission deadline, 29th of January 2021. And we've had deadline problems in the previous years. So we're really going to try to aim to submit things on time this time. So we had a short call with ICANN Org last week about that. But it was just a presentation call. And I went over the documents and just kind of took interesting bits out—that is, the ones we find interesting for us.

So the granting of any resource to support the presentation of panels, workshops at the IGF will be contingent upon the proposal panel's relevancy to the ICANN mission selection for the panel for inclusion in the IGF. So this is something that has been done before, if I'm not mistaken, or at least there's been NCUC booths, panels, workshops,

open forums, or whatever the format is, by NCUC, or maybe even NCSG or NPOC at the IGF. That's something that is a possibility. But if we want to go that way, we need to abide by that.

And I think, what I got at least from the call, is that the more tailored and the more precise we make it, and the more details we give on how this is related to ICANN's mission and to our constituency's mission specifically as well, is really going to help to facilitate the evaluation task and then also to get it approved [inaudible].

And then, as far as travel support, as you know, we're requesting travel support as an ABR, basically. And maybe just … Actually, I'm going to go back a little bit, and maybe for Ken, since you're new. So ABRs are basically Additional Budget Requests. And this is something that every year, ICANN has a given amount of a few hundred thousand USD that they basically distribute to the community, as you know, upon request, for specific projects usually. And of course, these projects need to be in the mission of ICANN and in the mission of the community group that requests it. But these are things that are not based—are not part of the base budget and often are pilot projects or new things that certain constituencies want to try to further their engagement.

And so it can be a lot of things. But one of the few things that it cannot be is, basically, travel support to ICANN public meetings—so the last two points—and a stipend of travel support for outside speakers as well So these are, by definition, out-of-bounds.

But otherwise, we can … Like what we're doing now—the thing that we worked on—capacity-building courses that will be part of the ICANN e-

learning platform, that's one thing that can be done. We can ask for travel or sponsorship for certain events. But then, it needs to be tailored—and that's the second point.

As well as, also from one of the documents that was distributed last week … So a travel or sponsorship request will only be granted for ICANN-hosted or ICANN-sponsored events unless it's consistent with the ICANN regional strategy, involves Internet governance—yes, thank you, Maryam, for doing—Internet governance, or DNS or PIC, or is otherwise coordinated with Org.

So now, obviously, if we think of the upcoming financial year, so July 2021 to July 2022, we can think that we're going to have some sort of—that may be large-scale or even smaller-scale events—but that in-person events are going to start resuming. But we don't know, actually. So of course, asking for funding for in-person events, at this point, would be highly hypothetical—even what events, right, and whether the event would even take place, even if it's scheduled. That's something we need to keep in mind, if that's the path we decide to go to—or go on, rather.

So yeah. That's just for information purpose right now. I think in terms of next steps for that would be to reach out to the list as a preliminary matter. Bruna's going to do it on her site for NCSG. And we can do it specifically for NCUC as well. But obviously, the whole process of requesting is going to be coordinated with NCSG, and potentially with NPOC as well, so that we don't make overlapping requests because then, of course, it's going to be a big issue when it comes to evaluating

these requests [inaudible] if NCSG, and NCUC, and NPOC make requests that overlap. So we have to make sure of that.

But we can still conduct our own inquiry, specifically for the purpose of our constituency and then we can liaise the NCSG and NPOC to see what they have come up with and what we can collectively come up with as well.

So of course, if you have ideas, what I'm going to do today is send an email to the general mailing list. So feel free to reply to that email as well, or to that thread on the general mailing list because at this point, I don't think it's necessarily worthwhile to have a discussion among ourselves. But it's really to try to gauge what's the membership interest? Where does it lie? Yeah. But I thought that these few points were important for us as well. And I'm going to stress them, also, in my email so that the discussion is [inaudible] or that people don't start asking for more travel support because that's, unfortunately, not the way that it would go. Yeah.

So do we have anything on that? I see Olga is probably a new hand. And Mili, I'm not sure. But yeah. Olga, you can go.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: I'm thinking that when you will be sending this email, maybe also to incorporate into it the link to Google Doc, for example, to make it a dedicated Google Doc where we will collect the ideas. And then, we can develop those ideas when we will be writing the descriptions for them and so on. And also, I had a question. Do we know what are the funding limits for how much money we can be asking for these ABRs?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: I don't know. Maybe, Maryam, you would know. But I think, if I remember reading correctly, the whole ABR [envelope is $300,000.] Now, of course, it's not going to go to one constituency or one stakeholder group, even. So I don't know what's a reasonable amount to ask for. And I'm not even sure that quantification is necessary. Or maybe it depends on the type of ABR. But year. Maryam, if you know anything about that, feel free to chime in. But I don't remember seeing numbers in the presentation, at least.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. Hi, Raphael. Thanks. No. You can't really ask for a dollar amount. So you can ask for what you want and then a dollar amount will be attributed to that, based on your request. Does that help?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. I think that was my feeling as well, is that there's no need to quantify it. If we ask for what we want, and then it's going to be evaluated, basically, as … Of course, if we ask for something that, even without a dollar amount, which is obviously—goes way, way beyond what could be attributed to us—I suppose it's going to be flagged during the evaluation process.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: Okay. That's good. Just because I didn't know what is exactly the procedure here. But thank you.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. And also, there's no need for quantification, in that sense. And Mili, again, I'm sure if it's a new hand. Or maybe it is—

MILI SEMLANI: Yeah. Raphael I just want to make … Thanks. So, one is about collecting community input. I was thinking instead of throwing open the question to them, asking them what they would like, if it is better for us, maybe as EC, jointly with NCSG EC and the others, to come up with a list of four, or five, or six, whatever ideas. And then, just do a poll with the entire mailing list saying, "Were looking at seven, eight ideas. What do you prefer?" And if you have other suggestions, like another box there for them to just add other ideas they might have, just to make it a little more responsive and quicker.

And this is another idea that I'm just throwing out in the open now. I've been hearing this conversation since last year, where we've been talking about putting together onboarding kit or something like that. So I do realize that at the NCUC-NCSG level, we lack a lot of resources that help our newcomers get more acquainted with what we do, how it works, also just the role of civil society and stuff like that.

So I was thinking if we could use the ABR to develop these resources, like toolkits. So it could be the onboarding kit. It could be an ICANN Learn course specifically for people interested in the NCUC-NCSG space and how they could participate, what's the history, what should be their orientation like, and stuff like that. And for this, we could seek professional help to develop this material because we do understand

that when we've tried to do the onboarding kit on own, the double volunteer timing, plus the other public comments and stuff going on the side, it's not been so easy. So I was hoping we could use the ABR budget to do this a bit.

And I know for sure, on the At-Large side … I don't know how they worked out this but they have developed a lot of these resources, which are available on ICANN Learn as well. And they continue to do a lot of these capacity building webinars with some professional help. So if we could look at something like that.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Sure. Thank you. I think, as well, that funneling input is good. It prevents it going all over the place. Now, the thing is that ... Yeah. And what I'm going to do, is I'm going to reach out quickly to Bruna and ask her what she thinks about that. Because my only thing in that is that if it requires us to coordinate with the NCSG EC, eventually, and us, and maybe even NPOC, that we would use a lot of that time to coordinate. And then, we would end up being kind of late in getting input because, of course, once we have the input we actually need to draft the ABRs, which is the part that probably takes a bit more effort from us at least …

So I agree with the principle. I'm not just sure, in terms of time, whether it's realistic to put the coordination part ahead. But even if we can't, the general idea of funneling input, it might be a good idea, in that sense, before sending the email. So what I'm going to do, in terms of action point, I'm just going to reach quickly to Bruna right now and hopefully get an answer today or tomorrow on that, and I'll be back to you. So

EN

either if she thinks that it's doable to coordinate, to actually try to put that coordination into action.

Or if it's not feasible, then I would say probably we develop—we come up with a few ideas. And you already had one, I think, Mili. And I think it's an interesting one as well. So, we develop a few ideas and then we try to gauge the support for those ideas that we might have. And then, leaving it open for people add their own input, as well, into the conversation. So yeah. I guess that's the thing.

Now, the only issue with the Google Form, though, is that people cannot … It's not a contributive exercise, in the sense that you don't really see … Let's say someone has an idea. You won't really see what the person put in the form, while in the email thread, people can see and they can plus-one each other or whatever. Yeah. I don't know. I'm a bit … I think to just do both, in that sense. And there are things that email thread can capture and things that the Google Form cannot.

But let me see first what Bruna is planning to do, quickly, and I'll be back on-list with that by tomorrow. So I'm going to note that for myself as well.

Okay. Was there anything else on that? Mili, I suppose that's your ever up hand. It's probably still there. Can we keep the form responses open? Yeah. That's a good question. I think it's possible that people can see the answers. But I'm not sure though. I think they can go back and edit their answers. But I don't know if we can make the answers visible to everyone. I'm going to have a look at that. And Mili, if you have an answer … I haven't actually worked a lot with Google Forms before. But

if someone knows the answer, please just say it. Because if anything, we might even try to use another tool that allows the answers to be seen.

MILI SEMLANI: In Google Forms as well … Sorry to cut in. In Google Forms, as well, once we generate shorter responses in an Excel or whatever—like a spreadsheet and then we make that spreadsheet an open access to the whole mailing list. So it's just a link that anybody who has the link can watch it. So whoever's interested can go look at the responses. And maybe we have another column there for [vote, or] I don't know, something like that.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: No. that's good. Yeah.

MILI SEMLANI: We can stick with the tools. I'm sure there are lot of other interactive tools to get us—like do the voting and submission of answers. There are others that I know, Mentimeter and things like that. I can help explore those.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. Sure. Then I'll note that as an action point for you.

MILI SEMLANI: Thanks.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: But what you say is true. As long as the spreadsheet has been generated, then we can just share that, basically. And it's possible, I suppose, to pre-generate it, even though there's no answers in it yet, and then share that link, and then as the answers come in, it's going to be visible to everyone who has the link.

MILI SEMLANI: Yeah. That'll be the easiest, I think.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. Yeah. But if you want to have a look to other things that might be readily useable without them being too complicated or too arcane, please have a look and you can come back to us with that. Because we're not bound to Google Forms, in that sense. All right. Good.

So I think that's … if there's nothing else for FY 22, then we can just go to AOB. So if anyone has any AOB … Otherwise, I'll give you all back 10 minutes of our morning, evening, afternoon, whichever. All right.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: I guess I have a quick question.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes. Go ahead.

EN

OLGA KYRYLIUK: I was thinking, are we supposed to have any email addresses at NCUC.org or we just keep using our personal emails and that's it? How it usually works?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: No. I think you keep your personal email. Now, the thing is that … And that's something that I had to do for myself. There's a lot of NCUC mailing lists that have been unused for years. And one of those, or some of those, are the original mailing lists. So I need to get into that, and really make a list, and look at who are members of those lists and everything. So that's why it was not on the agenda for today because I haven't had time to deal with it. But that's going to be on the agenda for the January meeting, so that we'll just decide which ones we should keep and which ones we should get rid of.

But as a general matter, no. You just keep using your own email. There's a chair email but that's the … And that just, it's basically a redirect email to my personal email. It's not an email account that I have access to it. It's a label, basically. So that's all.

Eventually, if we want to, it's possible to create more of those. But there's just—

OLGA KYRYLIUK: I also was thinking about these regional mailing lists. They are operational and I can use them, right, for example for sending some relevant information to European—

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. They are. The thing is that, again, it's … I'm not sure they have been used a lot. Maybe the African one has been used because there's been a bit more activity in the last years, like a regional kind of thing. But yeah. They are operational. And it's just that I don't remember exactly how they are populated. It might be an automated thing. I'm not even sure. And I remember have the discussion a few months or a few weeks back. But I will need to go back in. So yeah. You can certainly try using them. I cannot guarantee any result. But yeah. They are there and you can see.

OLGA KYRYLIUK: And would it be possible, at some point, to see who are the people on those lists? Or this information—

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes. It's there, as I said. It's just that I need to get into it and to make sure that I understand how they work because I think these regional ones might be automatically created, based on membership addresses for example, and things like that. But yeah. I just have to make sure of that before I can give you an answer.

But yes. That's definitely something that … It's information that I want to regroup and make available somewhere so that we have access to it more readily because there's a lot of those and some of those mailing lists date from the foundation of NCUC, years ago. And they've just been sitting there with all kinds of people in them. Some of them are still part of NCUC. Some of them are long-gone and things like that.

EN

So yeah. There's a lot of clean-up that needs to be done there. And I'm going to be doing that in the coming months. And so next time we can discuss that a bit more.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raphael, can I jump in the queue, please?

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yes. Go ahead.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So, I have an answer regarding the regional mailing lists. So I manage those, together with the regional reps. And I don't know if you're on them as well, Raphael. So basically, the way it used to work was it was an automatic process when we had the old database. And based on your region, you would be pushed into that mailing list. Now, when we changed into CiviCRM and then GDPR came into force, we stopped the automated process, or at least my manually adding people to the list had to stop.

So what I advise … What I did before now was send the list name to the EC reps and ask them to push that into the discuss list and ask people to sign up. So maybe we want to do that again. Once that exercise is concluded, then you might want to start using the EC list.

But again, you can start using the regional lists now because it is functional. Like Raphael was saying, Africa is quite … They use that quite a lot. And I think Europe as well. And I think I've seen a few from AP as

well. So yes, use the regional lists. They're really good for speaking to people in your region and getting them engaged in things within ICANN and particularly NCUC. But the first step is I will send the list name to you. And then, you can encourage … Raphael, you can do that. Encourage people to sign up.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. Definitely. That was the thing I wasn't sure about, with the whole automation. But yeah. So basically, right now, I guess that it's all the new members, for example, would not be on any regional list. I don't know when that would be but maybe members from the last two years or something, or the last year and half will not be on … Yeah. They will not be on the regional lists, while the older members would have automatically been included on the regional lists. And then, there is the issue of people moving around, obviously.

So yeah. That's definitely something that can be done. So let me see how we could proceed with that. So Maryam, you were saying that you would send the registration link to each of the regional reps so that they can, themselves, post on the general list and encourage signing up, right? Okay.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah. You can do either. It's either you post it or the regional reps do that. But it's probably better for the regional reps to do that or off the back of the ones you post, they say something. I don't know. It depends on how you all agree to move forward with it.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: No. I think I would leave it up to you, EC members, as regional representatives as well, to decide if that's something—if that's a tool you want to use. Then, in which case, please go ahead and put it out on the mailing list and encourage people to sign up for them. But yeah. You don't have to either, if you don't feel like that's something that you would use or whichever. So in that case, I would leave it up to you guys to decide what you want to do with that.

KEN HERMAN: This is Ken, if I may.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Yeah. Go ahead. Go ahead, Ken.

KEN HERMAN: Great. So now I'm somewhat confused. Sorry. Maryam, thanks so much. You actually provided me with a list that I requested a couple of weeks ago and I appreciated that. So now, just once again, we are obliged to take some action now, I order to comply with privacy requirements. So you want us to send a message to the list and ask individuals to confirm their participation in the list? And those that do not reply, then we remove them? Is that the process that you're recommending? Help me understand.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: No, no, no. So what we're saying now is to send … Because there are people who have not joined the list, who are either, for instance, in Europe region, right. And they might want to join the list. So it is you sending to the list and saying, "Guys, we have this regional for Europe, LAC, North America, whatever it is. Please feel free to join. Information regarding the regions and stuff will be sent here." So we're not taking off anyone off the list except they ask to do that. But it's just to get people to join the list.

KEN HERMAN: I understand—to join the individual, regional lists.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yeah.

KEN HERMAN: So you want to send a message to the main list and say—introduce ourselves—that kind of thing—

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes.

KEN HERMAN: - and ask them to join within our region? Okay. That's fine. That, I was planning to do anyway. I don't see any reason not to use this particular tool because that's the one that is. And after I'm long-gone from this

part of the world, then at least it carries on with the North American activities. Okay. Great. Thanks.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: So given that it might be interest, at least for many of them, from you, I think just to avoid duplicative emails, I think it might be best to just have a single one where we list those. And then, you guys can keep track of whoever replies. Or I can even direct members as then, "Well, if you want to be part of that list, please refer to the regional EC representative and then you can be added." And keeping you, Maryam, and NCUC, in that sense, so that people can get added to the mailing list. I think that would just prevent having five different threads suddenly pop up on the mailing list for very similar things.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Raphael, they can actually add themselves. So the point is for them to add themselves to the list.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Oh, the link? Okay. All right. Yeah.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: So you just need to make it clear that they can actually add themselves by just—

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. Good.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Be added, subscribed to the list. Yeah.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Okay. That's fine. Noted. So I'll make sure to write that here as well, in the email. So then I'll take care of that. But then, after that, it's up to you guys to use that list the way you see fit. Or if it becomes a general regional mailing list … I don't even know. I don't think I'm part of any, actually. I think I joined after this was done so I'm probably not part of anything. But yeah. That would be a good opportunity, even for me, to join some of those—or at least Europe and North America.

Okay. I'll take care of that email. Then, I'll also … This, I'll do today. I'll circulate it with you, just so you have a quick look and if there's anything. Otherwise, I'll post it by tomorrow morning on the general list. Action point, email for regional lists. Okay. That's good. So I'll do that. And it's great if they can add themselves and there is much less administrative stuff to deal with. Okay. Good. Thanks for that AOB. I'm glad it turned out to be a productive one.

So is there anything else? Now we're just on time. No. I'll take that as a no. All right. So good. Thanks a lot everyone. So we're going to be doing … Our next call, if I'm not mistaken, is going to be on the 11th of January. Yeah. That's true, Olga, as well. Yeah. You can actually go and look up who is on that list, too.

Yeah. So great. And yeah. So see you again 11th of January, same time. And have a nice week and have a very nice holidays for all of you. Enjoy.

It's certainly going to be very different from the previous years but at the same time, I think all of us can spare ourselves privileged to live the way that we do, with access to Internet and a lot of conveniences, despite that fact that we have to reduce our contact with our families. So yes. I guess we can stop the recording now. And nice holidays to everyone. See you in January.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]