
MONTREAL – GNSO - NPOC Open Meeting
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Welcome, everyone, [inaudible]. What I'm going to do is ask everyone [inaudible], and tell us one thing about [inaudible], and identify what it is we wanted to accomplish. Two, to build an infrastructure for constituency members to function. And three, [inaudible] community members are interested in, and how we could [inaudible] moving forward, and [inaudible] about that [inaudible] members forward. Engagement has been [inaudible] us It's really crucial that can get more NPOC members [inaudible] calls. We had the last one last month. This way, here, [inaudible]. Okay. [inaudible] recently. Actually, we have a call coordinator. This is also in line with—

RAOUL PLOMMER: Hi. I might actually be ready to consider [inaudible] because we [inaudible]. We need to pay that towards the end of December ... A not-for-profit organization some \$10,000 of ad credit. \$10,000 for advertisement sounds quite good to me. Basically, we could get it if we had a registered organization. We were thinking of making it in Estonia, where you need only two persons for the board. The biggest reason is that they have this e-citizen ... You can get an e-citizenship in Estonia, which is not as much of a citizenship as it is a way to validate yourself or confirm that you are actually who you say you are.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Estonia has the infrastructure to do that. You can just let authorities know that it is really you who are contacting them. You can really be from any country in the world. To apply for the e-citizenship it's about €100 per person. Instead of coming to a country to sign papers and so on, they could really be just using this e-citizenship and registering it at the closest Estonian consulate or embassy.

We haven't started to create the charter for that registered organization. Another thing about Estonia is that their rules need to be really succinct. I've seen a tweet of a picture where there's basically two paragraphs of text, and that is a charter of a registered not-for-profit in Estonia. It's really the kind of lean and light structure that we're looking into creating. Thanks.

[JOAN KERR:]

Great, thank you, Raoul. David and Carlos? Who wants to go first? Maybe David. Did you want to mention what we've done for a few minutes, and then you talk about some of our ... Go forward? You go first?

DAVID CAKE:

Yes, sure. I think the past year we've been investigating ways to ... Thinking a bit about what are useful ways for the NPOC Policy Committee to operate, and what, really, its purpose is. I think we discussed in the meeting that it's probably even a higher priority for us to make sure we're doing valuable work with the NCSG policy world, as well as separate NPOC policy work. We have done quite a lot of policy

work where we don't particularly have a disagreement or a differing position from NCUC. This ends up going out at an NCSG statement and contribution, which we've actually been quite productive this year.

We've also identified several issues that are quite specific to the role of NPOC. We need to concentrate on it and make an effective contribution. That doesn't necessarily mean we're in opposition or in any disagreement at all with the rest of NCSG. It's just that there are issues that specifically relate to the mandate of NPOC. We want to make sure that we are doing a very good job of covering any issue that relates to the mandate of NPOC. We've identified as a future issue at the Policy Committee meeting on Saturday ... An important future issue was the status of INGOs, international nongovernmental organizations, which seem to be emerging as a category of organizations that we need to make sure are integrated into the ICANN system. NPOC is a natural place for issues, for those to be handled as a specific issue.

We've also identified as a long-running issue with ICANN policy processes the role of where ICANN policy treats legal persons, that is organizations, companies, corporations, and other organizations, separately to natural persons, people. We want to make sure that the assumption is not made that all legal persons are commercial entities. It has a lot to do with the way ... We want to make sure that it's understood that many not-for-profit organizations have very different privacy, both needs and legal requirements, than commercial organizations. That's a very important distinction that we need to make sure is maintained, because it's literally an operational concern of not-for-profit. It's a core issue for us, a policy issue that we need.

Those are just a few of the policy issues that we've identified as specifically important for NPOC policy, to keep making sure that we monitor and offer input in. We're still evolving our processes, and how best to do that. It's a particular we'd like to recommend for all ... It's up to Carlos as incoming chair to make sure how we look at NPOC-specific policy meetings and process, but we definitely would like to encourage anyone who is interested in policy to ensure they try and maintain NPOC active participation in the NCSG Policy meetings, which are really quite broad-based, comprehensive meetings. Anything else we should add?

I think that's all we went through at the policy committee, and all the policy processes that we're looking at. The active policy projects of NPOC policy members, we'd just like to mention Martin's involvement in the Rights Protection Measures ongoing working group, and my participation as an alternate in the NCSG.

Are there any other particular policy processes? Sam's participation in the Auction Proceeds Working Group, which actually we didn't discuss specifically, but is very important. I know there are a few others around who were participating. If anyone else is participating actively in a working group, or other policy process, and I haven't mentioned it, please raise your hand.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you, David. We do have one question specifically for David, if we could just ask that before you go, Carlos, if that's okay?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: We've got a question from [Remi] on Zoom chat. It says, "Dave, what are some of the challenges you noticed or identified? Maybe something NPOC ought to advance, some position?"

DAVID CAKE: That's actually quite a good question. The biggest thing has been working out how to balance and cover both the roles of participation. There are separate areas where NPOC has a distinct, separate role to the rest of the NCSG. Also, maintaining its active participation in NCSG. NPOC has contributed lots of NCSG statements this year. It just doesn't seem as NPOC activity. Balancing those roles in particular.

Being a small group, working out what is a really appropriate focus within the policy process can be a bit of a challenge. Definitely, though, we have a lot of capacity-building challenges. I think this meeting in particular, we've begun thinking quite a lot more about how we can fulfill those capacity-building, and outreach and so on, challenges, with cooperation with other groups. We had a session learning about capacity building and outreach with us, ALAC, GAC, and the ICANN Organization, also on Saturday, I think. Looking at what else is being done in other groups, and how we can learn and make a more organized feeling of how we can collaborate, contribute, complement efforts by the other groups, I think is probably a really valuable area for us to think about how we go on. There's a lot of duplication. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Great, thank you, David. Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Yes, thank you. As Dave already mentioned we have these long-running discussions about IGOs and INGOs. The Red Cross solution was to prepare a reserve list. Everybody was very happy, but we hear from the GDD that a reserve list for the Red Cross/Red Crescent organizations in 200 countries amounts to 7,000 IDNs in the implementation phase. I think we should not forget that policy has two phases. The policy development phase and the policy implementation phase. We have a deadline for commencing the implementation of the Red Cross. I doubt somebody will do it.

We have the upcoming IGOs discussion, which falls under our right protection mechanism that Martin follows, because IGOs have a special jurisdiction position. There is not one. Each IGO basically might have a slight difference. We're in the process of making public the charter for this group. The GAC jumped in and went into editing of the charter. I don't know if tomorrow we will have a decision in the council about accepting changes, or accepting the charter and starting the work with the IGOs.

The INGOs are out of the GPS, or radar. Nobody knows where they are. They don't know that we exist. Probably, their only opportunity will be to use the [expos] protection mechanism that everybody else has. They've said this is not fair, we shouldn't take them as a normal

commercial entity, or as an individual. This problem will be around for quite a while.

The good news is that over the last two years we have found interest by many young people, some of them sitting around here, many of them planning to come to the next meeting in Cancún. Joan, I, Martin, and Raoul have been discussing, “What is the best way to involve these young people systematically so that they don’t just come to a meeting and hear a few things, then have to go back to the country?” It may be they are able to participate in the calls between meetings. What kind of incentives can we build on those types of participation?

In any case, the average age is low in NPOC. Lower than NCSG, even though Sam and I are part of the group. We have a lot of young people. We’re thinking very hard about the next year in a way that we can take this great output from the NextGen, the Fellowships, and all the programs that ICANN has, and give these young people the opportunity to participate in lengthy, boring policy processes.

The transition between Dave and I couldn’t have been better. We have been both welcome in the NCSG calls, as part of the family. We heard this morning how good things are being run in the NCUC. We’re part of the family. We hope that this collaboration continues and that we can really leverage our participation both in the council and in the PDPs. The council has taken the philosophy that their task is to manage, not to produce, policy. We have been having strategic sessions about how the council should work, numbered by year. PDP1, PDP2, PDP3.0. They are planning to continue. They have streamlined the operation a lot

based on a project list which everybody should take a look once a month, and creating the roles of liaisons to the PDPs.

That still leaves the search for volunteers for the PDPs with a question mark. Not everybody can do Whois work over six years or longer, like Stephanie here in the back. We hope that this year we will come up with a lot of engagement. We look forward for Cancún. We hope to have six or seven people of NPOC there, and give it a big push forward in the policy area. Myself, I will follow directly the IGO discussion in the PDP once it starts. Thank you very much.

[JOAN KERR:]

Thank you, Carlos. Just a quick update. I just want to say that we have a really comprehensive outreach program, with staff presenting the educational side of it today. If they fit into what we're doing, we're going to be phenomenal. I just want to quickly do a report on the website. Caleb was unable to come. He's online right now. I just want to say that we are working on the website, to integrate [next cloud] and the project management software, and all of that, as Raoul says. I don't want to go over that. We'll update the website to represent the community as a whole, in terms of having member profiles and things like that. That's a quick update on the website. It falls under communications, and we have an actually amazing communication strategy of using cross-pollination of outreaching to our members, as well. Sam, I thought I put you on the list. Do you want to do your quick report for financial?

SAM LANFRANCO:

Yes. This is a quick final report. I'm chair of the Finance Committee. If we have some money, I don't know where it is and where it came from. I assume you're taking good care of it. We do have a bank account, which Joe and I have signing privileges. It has never has a penny in it, so there's nothing to report there. I am now the acting chair of the NCSG Finance Committee, which is a committee of three people. It could only appoint a chair with a 2/3 vote. There are only two members of the committee at the moment, myself and Stephanie. Stephanie, but virtue of her position, is not allowed to be chair.

I'm acting chair in limbo. It's not hard, because we also have no money. NCUC has not been able to figure out who their delegate should be. They fortunately have some money, which they administer off any NCUC, any NCSG books. It's being monitored. They handle that. They've been receiving money, I believe, from either ISOC or [Pierre], I forget which. We don't. We're human resource-rich, financial poor. It makes the accounting really easy. At the moment, I'm also acting, at least for today or this week, on the council. That's temporary.

[JOAN KERR:]

Great, thank you, Sam. That was the exciting second item on the agenda. We're going to the third exciting item, which are the presentations. You've all heard some of the things that we're doing. Hopefully, you're excited, as we are. We're going to find out some research that was done. Here we go. ICANN legitimacy. Geez. This is exciting. I was going to ask, "Is it legitimate?", but you'll tell us. We have

Hortense. I'm going to let you say your name because you will shoot me if I say it wrong, right? Please, go ahead.

HORTENSE JONGEN: Hortense.

JAN AART SCHOLTE: We'll just keep mine as simple as Jan. I'm Jan Scholte. I'm at the University of Gothenburg, together with Hortense, who has mentioned. We've together been executing this study on legitimacy at ICANN. We have a short presentation of overall initial findings for you.

Several of you have heard this before in a couple of other settings. I recognize a few faces around. I'm wondering whether we can give the presentation. Maybe I would invite people if they want to ask questions as we go along, if you want a clarification or an intervention, maybe we can do that. Those of you who have heard some of the things before, and you want to jump in with a question, you can do that.

We're going to say briefly something. Maryam, why does it do this every time? It was fine until ... We still have the pointer, that's a good thing. Alright. Now, the pointer's fine. Do you want to get me going with it? Okay, thanks. We're going to tell you a little bit about the study, which again, to remind you, is academic and independent. We've not been commissioned by anyone. It's funded by the Swedish Research Council.

We're going to tell you something about how ICANN's legitimacy looks from the outside. People outside the ICANN sphere who are interested

in Internet governance, but not working in ICANN, and general elites around the world. After that, we're going to tell you something about how ICANN's legitimacy looks from the inside. That means the community, the different stakeholders, the staff, the board. Then, we're going to finish by saying a few things about what we found out civil society participants are particularly concerned about, and ICANN.

We'll just leave it there for a minute. The take-home messages, again, are four base main headline things that we're going to tell you today. Take it back? Yes, thanks. The first take-home is that average legitimacy beliefs for ICANN are neither high enough that you would want to be complacent, they're not sky high, but they're also not low enough that you'd want to be alarmed. It's moving along at the moderate-plus level. Not high, but not low either. You might say the overall verdict is room for improvement, also. Then, the second main message is that legitimacy beliefs towards ICANN generally correlate with closeness to the regime.

The highest legitimacy beliefs we find with the staff. Well, you can imagine there are organizations with low morale, not mentioning any governments around the world at this moment, where the civil service might not be feeling very great about the government, and so on. I think it wouldn't always be that way.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I have to take the opportunity and ask. As you said, it's independent, but we're being led by a former Swedish civil servant.

JAN AART SCHOLTE:

Göran is actually a graduate of the University of Gothenburg, but another faculty than ours. I don't think he put in a word with the Swedish Research Council, but maybe things work in mysterious ways. No, in seriousness. What you can say there is the legitimacy is quite secure on the inside, and more wobbly on the outside. The further you get away from ICANN, the less legitimacy you find. By the time you get to the general public, no one even knows that you exist. You can't have legitimacy if people don't know you.

Third point is that several exceptions aside, there are some exceptions, but broadly speaking, the legitimacy is pretty steady across stakeholder groups, across regions, and across social categories. You were saying earlier, Carlos, about young people, and so on. If you think, or you've had the impression, that younger generations feel marginalized, or would not feel so happy about ICANN, or whatever, or is you thought that governments might feel marginalized or whatever, that doesn't come out, here. In fact, in the case of governments, you'll see, governments actually give ICANN higher legitimacy ratings than almost any other stakeholder group, which might be counter to what you had anticipated.

[JOAN KERR:]

I just want to say that this could be bad for civil society, having government legitimize ICANN.

JAN AART SCHOLTE:

Well, I will let you take your interpretations in whatever way you wish. We're just giving you the data. No, that's to say there isn't really an Achilles heel anywhere, There's not like you can go through the community as say, "Ah, here's the place it's really dissatisfied, and it's ready to bring the regime down." At the same time, you can't go across the ICANN eco-sphere and say, "Here's a place that's really ready to take ICANN forward in legitimacy drives." It's not like anyone is way out in front, and it's not like anyone is ready to be really unhappy. Take that as you wish.

Last thing to say on the overall message is we're giving you descriptive detail. Please, we are not giving you statistical significance, and we're not telling you explanatory accounts. We can do that later. From what you see here, don't jump to huge conclusions, because we're showing you patterns of data, and that's all.

Legitimacy, the concept, just for you to say, a number of you who took the survey ... Again, it was on conditions of anonymity, so I can't thank you in person, but I can kind of look and wink at you, and say thank you. Again, without your participation we couldn't have gone any way with this. A number of you asked us in the interview, "What do you mean by legitimacy?" We answered, "We're not telling you. We wanted you to make of it what you did." Academically, what we think legitimacy is is the belief that the governor has the right to govern, has the right to rule, and does that rule in an appropriate manner. That's the academic definition. If you want to make it more simple, you say, "ICANN has the right to rule in your view."

Again, these are legitimacy perceptions and legitimacy beliefs. We are not making our own judgments as researchers about whether ICANN is legitimate. We're asking you whether you think ... We might have our own ideas, but that's not the point of the study.

Now, we go to the next slide. Legitimacy. We thought it was important because we want to do the study. Thankfully, when we asked you if you thought it was important, you said yes. Go ahead.

[JOAN KERR:]

I think it fits, here. What was the inspiration for the study in the first place?

JAN AART SCHOLTE:

Well, from our point of view? ICANN has interest because they want to know about themselves. That's the community, the board, the staff, etc. I think that's why we found a good response on the side of ICANN in all of its parts. I think people are interested to know what people think about this. In more academic terms, there are two sides. One is ICANN-specific. The IANA transition was, if you like, a big legitimization exercise. ICANN had some severe legitimacy problems with the view of the US as a single overseer of the global Internet infrastructure. Three years after the IANA transition, what's it looking like? That's one kind of motivation.

There's another motivation which is multi-stakeholder global governance is, although you might think when you're working in the

Internet sphere that it's really unique here, actually it's part of a general trend in global governing of the last 25 years that more and more multi-stakeholder arrangements are coming forward. ICANN is, if you like, one of the oldest, one of the most developed, one of the largest, one of the most important. Also, it spends a lot of time thinking about legitimacy and legitimizing itself.

We thought ICANN is a really good place to look at legitimacy in multi-stakeholder global governance, that might tell us something about the future of global governance. Are we moving away from multi-lateralism to multi-stakeholderism, or is this just a fluke that happens in a few places? There are some bigger questions behind it. That's a rather long answer.

You think that legitimacy is important. 80% of you said it was extremely important. Most of the other 20% said it's quite important. This is distributed across ... The blue line is the weighted average of the ICANN sphere. The orange is the board. The grey is the staff. The yellow is the community. The dark blue on the right is the informed outsiders, people involved in internet governance but not active in ICANN.

People said legitimacy is important because it means ICANN gets resources, it secures its mandate, people participate. ICANN holds its own against other institutions. For all of these reasons, legitimacy is important. If you do the next slide? We talked with quite a few people. No, go back a couple. Next one back. There we go. We talked to everyone on the board between 2015 and 2018. Nobody to have confidentiality for, there, because they all participated.

We talked to the community, 305 people. We talked to ICANN staff. We gained a huge response rate there of 132. We should say the figures that we show you here are weighted. You might look at that and say, “Oh, the board and the staff are going to have far too much weight in the results.” We’ve actually made it proportionate to participation in ICANN meetings. Community votes, if you like, are counting four times as much as staff votes in the actual numbers that we’ve calculated.

Then, we talked to outsiders. As I say, some people were involved in Internet governance, but not involved in ICANN. Then, we talked to 860 general elites around the world. We went to six countries in six very different world regions: Russia, Germany, USA, South Africa, Phillipines, Brazil. We talked with 120 or so elites spread across media, academe, business, politicians, and government, and asked them about ICANN. Then, we didn’t do a public opinion survey because we just thought it probably wasn’t worthwhile spending tens of thousands of dollars to find out that nobody knows about you. Next one? Slide? There we go.

This is what came out of the general elites. We asked those 860 people around the world what they thought about a range of global governance institutions. Here, you can see, if you like, both positive and negative, or optimistic and pessimistic, how you want to read it. Red ... Oh, come on. Please give me ... No. You see? The moment I need it, it doesn't go. I was going to point to that red bar, but you can see the red bar for yourself. That’s ICANN. ICANN is coming in with an average confidence score of 1.7 on a scale of 0-3.

Amongst 14 global governance institutions it's coming in fifth. It's ranking up close with the United Nations, it's just 0.1 below the United Nations. It's ahead of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, the Security Council, the groups of 20. It's ranking quite solidly, you could say. That looks pretty optimistic.

Also, note that the green bar is national government. The elites are giving their national government, in fact, a lower confidence score than ICANN. Also, if you look, you've got ICANN ahead of the Forest Stewardship Council, ahead of the Kimberley Process, and, well, not surprisingly, ahead of FIFA. It does have ICANN ranked as the highest amongst, if you like, the new forms of global governance, the non-intergovernmental organization guys of global governance. All of that, you could say, is pretty good news on the ICANN legitimacy side. Okay.

You flip it around. Then you can say, "Well, 1.7 on a scale of 0-3 is just above half." It's not that high. You could also point it that way. And, you could say, "Well, in fact, legitimacy for governance institutions in general, national, regional, global, is not very high." It's like nobody's got very much faith in any governing institutions, if you want to look at it that way. It's cup half empty or cup half full, depending on how you want to look at it.

The other thing to say which this doesn't show, that red line hides the fact that 49.7% of the work elites didn't know about ICANN. After 20 years of ICANN being around, half of world elites don't know that it's there. Now, you can say that that's a good thing or a bad thing, depending on your perspective. This legitimacy of 1.7 is premised on

half of people not actually knowing this organization. Then, if you add the public, who don't generally know about ICANN, the legitimacy belief for ICANN is actually on a fairly narrow base. It's the people in Internet governance and then general world elites, to some extent. Next one.

Confidence in various Internet governance institutions. Here, we're comparing confidence for ICANN, legitimacy for ICANN, with a number of other institutions in global Internet governance. Here, again, you can distinguish between the weighted average is the light blue, on the left. Then, you've got the board in the orange, the staff in the grey, and the community in the yellow.

Here, you can broadly see that if you add it all up ICANN comes in the middle with the regional Internet registries and the IETF getting overall higher scores, and the IGF, the national government, and the ITU getting lower scores for confidence. ICANN is falling in between, here. You could read this and say the more the state is involved, the lower the confidence. You could read it that way. Or, you could read it the other way, and say the more the non-state is involved, the higher the confidence. Whichever way you want to go. That's kind of interesting, here.

The other thing is to look at those dark blue lines on the right, and you'll notice that those dark blue lines tend to be lower than the ICANN insiders. The ICANN insiders are generally having higher confidence in the Internet governance regimes than the informed outsiders. The same trend of less-state-higher-confidence actually holds for those people, as well.

This is the picture of ICANN within the wider global governance. Now, we can start dissecting ICANN inside, and for that, I go to Hortense. Hand over.

HORTENSE JONGEN:

Thank you. What we can see here is a breakdown of responses to the question, “How much confidence do you have in the current workings of ICANN overall?” Again, we can read this both as “the glass is half empty” or “it is half full.” On the positive side, when we look at all the insiders combined, the board, the staff, and the community, which is the light blue bar, we can see that more than half of them indicate that they have high or very high confidence in ICANN. At the same time, looking at it from the “glass is half empty” perspective, when we look specifically at the ICANN community we can see that about half of them indicate to have moderate, low, or very low confidence in ICANN. This share is even higher amongst the informed outsiders.

What we did next is we converted these responses into numerical scores. A response of very low confidence, we gave it a score of 1. A response of very high confidence, we gave it a score of 5. Based on these numbers, we could calculate a mean average. Yes. Go to the next slide?

We could calculate the means. Then, we can see that ICANN staff overall has the highest confidence in ICANN. They report a mean score of 4.11, which means that they have between high and very high confidence in ICANN, though leaning more towards high. Then, the ICANN Board, they indicated that they have an average of high confidence in ICANN

overall. Then, the ICANN community, they have between moderate and high confidence in ICANN overall. Then, we again show the total of the insiders. The board, the staff, and the community combined.

We show the general elites at an average of 3.27. Again, more towards the mid-point. We show the informed outsiders. They report a score of 3.18, which means that it's more towards moderate confidence. Again, this shows that the closer you are at the heart of the ICANN regime, the higher the confidence. Amongst ICANN staff, confidence in ICANN overall is the highest. Next slide, please.

What we show here is a breakdown of confidence in ICANN for different stakeholder groups. We asked questions about confidence in ICANN overall, in the ICANN Board, in the multi-stakeholder community, and in ICANN staff. We found rather little variation across stakeholder groups, with a few exceptions.

First of all, academia. They indicate that they have the highest confidence in ICANN overall. Although, this mean average is based on rather a small number of responses. Then, this is followed by government, who report to have 3.58 confidence, between moderate and high, but already leaning more towards high confidence in ICANN. Then, we see when we look at confidence in the multi-stakeholder community that the business/other stakeholder group, the grey bar, they report the lowest confidence in the multi-stakeholder community.

We also find that if we look at confidence in ICANN staff that the government stakeholder group report the highest confidence in ICANN

staff. Not only of all the stakeholder groups, but they also have more confidence in ICANN staff than in the community, in the board, and in ICANN overall. For civil society specifically, this is indicated with the yellow bar. It falls more or less in line with the other stakeholder groups. Next?

Here, we show a breakdown of confidence in ICANN according to region. First, we can show the average of 3.54. Then, we can see that respondents from Russia and Central Asia, they generally report the lowest confidence in ICANN. An average of 3.05 indicates that it's really close to moderate confidence only. Although, I should say again, this is based on a relatively small number of responses.

Then, respondents from East, South, and South-East Asia. They report the highest confidence in ICANN. A mean average of 3.83. This really indicates this is leaning more towards high confidence. There's a difference of 0.80 between Russia and Central Asia on the one hand, and Asia on the other hand.

Now, what is also interesting is that we cannot really speak of a global north/south divide, here. If anything, respondents from Latin American and the Caribbean, from Sub-Saharan Africa and from Asia, they report a slightly higher confidence in ICANN compared to, for example, respondents from Europe and North America.

Then, we looked at differences between social groups. Again, I would like to underline we did not look into causal relationships. We did not look into statistically significant differences. These are just patterns. We

found almost no variation between men and women in how much confidence they have in ICANN. We also found only little variation by age group, and very little variation when it comes to English language skills. Although, interestingly, native English speakers, they report the lowest confidence in ICANN, followed by people with medium-to-no English language skills. Actually, people with non-native strong English skills, they report the highest confidence.

Finally, we found that respondents who self-identify as white report the lowest confidence in ICANN, and Hispanics the highest confidence in ICANN. Again, this doesn't say anything about causal relationships. These are just the patterns.

Now, we will present some data about civil society constituencies specifically. We asked the question, “In principle, regardless of whether ICANN achieves the matter in practice, how far do you find it important that ICANN achieves 15 specific aims?” This data gives some insight into what ICANN should be doing according to respondents.

First, we show you the four aims that were commonly considered the most important by the civil society constituencies. These are transparency, accountability, to give all stakeholders the opportunity to participate in policy-making, and to take decisions on the best available knowledge and expertise.

Then, the four aims that were commonly considered the least important for ICANN, amongst the civil society constituencies, are to promote a fair distribution of cost and benefits of the DNI, to promote

human rights in ICANN operations, promote competition in the DNI, and to promote democratic values in wider society. Now, it is very interesting ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: DNI is DNS?

HORTENSE JONGEN: Domain Name Industry. What is very interesting about the data for civil society specifically is that even when it comes to the four aims that got the lowest scores, these scores are still quite high. They're actually higher than many of the other stakeholder groups. When it comes to promoting democratic values in wider society, a score of 3.65 still indicates that it's between moderately and quite important. Promoting fair distribution of costs and benefits of the DNI is even above four. Specifically when it comes to aims of promoting democracy, promoting human rights, we can see that this is ranked as much more important amongst civil society constituencies than amongst several of the other stakeholder groups. Go on, please.

Here, we present the findings on how ICANN is perceived to perform when it comes to achieving these aims in practice. ICANN amongst civil society constituencies is perceived to be most successful when it comes to promoting technical stability, technical security, to give all stakeholders the opportunity to participate in policy-making, and to promote competition in the DNI. Then, ICANN is perceived to do least well when it comes to taking decisions in a timely way, to promote a fair

distribution of cost and benefits of the DNI, promote human rights in the DNS, and to promote democratic values in wider society. These scores are actually quite low. They fall between two and three. A score of two means that ICANN only does this to a limited extent, and a score of three means that it's a moderate extent.

In this regard, in some respects, civil society ... We can interpret these findings, when we combine it with the previous question, that civil society has quite high expectations of what ICANN should be doing, but that not all of these expectations are met. Next slide, please. Thank you.

In this presentation, we've only shown you descriptive patterns. We couldn't go into causal explanations, but we will do that during the next months. We will do more advanced analyses and then drawing on these explanatory analyses we could start thinking about possible reforms, in order to increase legitimacy beliefs in ICANN even further. If you're interested in this, we would be very happy to report on these results at ICANN67 in Cancún. Thank you very much.

[JOAN KERR:]

Great, thank you. Very interesting, especially in the civil society. I guess if anyone's interested in reporting on issues for Cancún, they can contact, too. Is that okay? We're pressed for time, and you're going to be in the NCSG meeting. If it's okay with everyone, we can ask some questions there. That might be helpful. Is that good? We do have one question online, if that's okay?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: This is a question from [inaudible]. He says, “Was there a kind of doubt over ICANN legitimacy that gave birth to the study?”

JAN AART SCHOLTE: No. It was a curiosity. People have traditionally thought about legitimacy in relation to the nation-state. When you talk about legitimacy governing, you normally think about the nation-state. You think about the national government. In today’s world, more and more governing is being done by global bodies. Researchers and thinkers are thinking about, “Okay, how does legitimacy move from the nation-state to regional and global bodies?” It’s academic and political curiosity. There’s no particular agenda to do ICANN up or down.

[JOAN KERR:] That’s a great question, thank you. We have to just move quickly to the next item, if that’s okay? Martin’s not here. Shall we just get back to the [beginning]? Adam or Brian, we now have you on our agenda. Which of you would like to start? Okay, great. Thank you so much.

ADAM PEAKE: Good afternoon, everyone. Could we have the agenda? We’ll see where we are, here. The idea is we would like to offer, and we’ve discussed this before, a series of webinars to talk about operational concerns. I hope Patrick Jones will pop in in a minute. I know that you’ve met Patrick before because we discussed this in Marrakech. The idea is that we would take, with your guidance, a set of topics matching with your

mission, so that staff can help design a set of webinars that would be presented for NPOC and the wider ICANN community as an NPOC activity, using those webinars to, of course, help your members come up to speed on this set of issues.

Also, using the resulting documents and knowledge to create a set of summary presentations, so that you could use these in your own outreach. That would be the idea. My colleague here, Brian Gutterman from GDD, can run through some of the issues that you have. How would you like to progress this from now, Joan?

JOAN KERR:

Sure, we can talk about that. We have identified the issues, the platform ... Well, we have Carlos. He's looking at me in a weird way. We have identified the issues that we would like to address on our membership calls, but they're on sub-sets of that, if you know what I mean. Do you want me to tell you what those are, or do you want ...? When we were speaking in Marrakech, the ones that you had mentioned were very interesting. Why don't we start with those?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN:

Sure. Thanks, Joan. Maybe it would be better to go to the next slide, in terms of the topics. Part of our work at the ICANN Org Registrant Program is to create educational materials for registrants. Our audience is everyday registrants. Not folks with large portfolios or investors, but everyday registrants. Some of the things we have written about through a registrant lens we think might be useful to you. We

spoke a little bit in Kobe on the sidelines, six months ago. I mentioned some of these materials to you. They are available on the ICANN Org website, icann.org/registrants. Since we last spoke, we're also developing an ICANN Learn course. That can be complementary, something you can offer to your membership and to others who might be interested. That's a good thing.

We are happy to collaborate with Adam and other staff who are thinking about what kind of webinars would be useful. Some of the topics that we could cover, for example, are here. I think it's important to listen to what your priorities are, and the topics that your group is really interested in receiving webinars on. We can take that back and look for subject matter expertise that might not be here. We can think more about how to work best together.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Patrick is here. You introduced yourself before, but your quick introduction, here. The idea is that this is more the technical, operational concerns around domain names inter-security, or DNSSEC, or whatever it would be you think that the NGOs would benefit from in terms of information.

PATRICK JONES:

Hi. Global Stakeholder Engagement team. I did speak briefly to the group in Marrakech. At that meeting, I also did a session. It was open. You may have attended. It was with At-Large, but also GAC members were there. I, outside of ICANN meetings, do a number of DNS eco-

system security talks. This tends to be for not only ccTLDs, but ISPs, academic institutions, and others. That content is also something that might be of interest this week.

We tend to cover new and emerging security challenges and threats that we're seeing that are happening in the eco-system, as well as some of the new technologies, such as the connection between the DNS and Internet of Things. There's a lot of work that's happening around new identifier technology. Helping explain those to your community might be something you would be interested in.

JOAN KERR:

Right. Does anybody have any questions, first of all, before I ...? No? Okay. We want to do a lot of educating our members. That's one approach. There's the in-reach. The outreach is to particularly youth. It's going to be a significant program because not only do we want to educate them, we want to engage them in the PDP process from a youth point of view. We're going to certify them and work with them as a ... I'm going to use this term, but it's not what the term is going to be, because we're working on a really sexy term because we're so boring at operational concerns.

It's like an internship. If they're working in a particular issue in their university or educational entity, that they could come on board and help us with our work. That's a specific approach that we're going to be having for youth. It would span the spectrum from all of our platforms so that we bring in more people to participate with us. It's the in-reach,

the outreach, and a particular youth outreach. Carlos, do you want to say something? I can always tell when he wants to say something?

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: That’s why you’re the chair. Thank you very much. Of course, we’re interested more in the lower part of the list. Particularly, as Joan said, since we want to see the profits from the Fellowship Program and the NextGen Program, the policy impacting registrants. When I think about policies impacting registrants, I think a little bit more than just the list of the GNSO Council. We have on the table the discussion of the price in the contracts of .org, for example. The elephant in the room, of course, when we think about this constituency, is why the people prefer to set all the eggs in Facebook, and not in a domain name. I know that goes well beyond probably the scope of ICANN.

The fact is, with the young people that we get and the geographic areas that we get, and when we look forward ... What we are talking about here is for companies, for each country, for developed markets, somehow. Of course, what we need for the Global South, and so on, is secure digital identity. Domain names should be a path. We should be able to investigate those things. Everybody would yell, and said, “Well, we’re not here paying you.” I mean the contracted party house would be saying, “We’re not paying for that.”

Every time we discuss about expanding the market and subsequent procedures, we’re in the front of the wall why this works so well in US and in Europe, but it doesn’t work so well in the Global South. I think if

we combine the lower part with the young people, we should always discuss why it's better to have a domain name than just living under the domain name of Facebook, Twitter, or something like that. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

This is also something we mentioned previously. Would that also include a session discussing how the policy development process works in ICANN? The development of that? I'm looking across the room at Emily, who does a very magnificent presentation on those sorts of topics.

I think, collectively, we can certainly cover all of those bases. It's really how you'd like us to do it. Perhaps we could put together a further outline, and put it to you? You also mention the member meetings. I was wondering, I think this was something we mentioned before, whether you wanted to structure it around your member meetings, or to have it as something that would be ...? I'm trying to think of the right word. A stand-alone NPOC product where you say, "There's going to be, on Thursday-the-something of December, a webinar on X. January-the-something, there will be an X webinar on Y, so that you have a program coming through," rather than matching it just to your membership meetings, which is somewhat internal. You can actually use it for your outreach and education of others around the issues that you're concerned with.

JOAN KERR:

No, actually want to do both. We want our members engaged. One of the reasons they're not engaged is because they sometimes don't understand becoming a member, and what's next. We want to move them to the "what's next," and have them participate. We have a broader mandate to outreach. One of those would be every three months, or twice a year, having a major webinar on the introduction to ICANN and NPOC, and how it works. That's the sort of vision I think we have. We have a question from Sam?

SAM LANFRANCO:

It's partially a question, but it's partly a statement. We talked about in-reach and outreach. One of the things that I, working elsewhere in various institutes, would call other-reach, here. Other-reach is if there are huge constituencies out there, especially in the NGO community, for whom ... Our focus, our mission, is very small. The Digital Empowerment Foundation in India, for example, works with massive numbers of people. India is a good case of point, here.

The latest 100 million people who have come online in India through the efforts of one of the brothers of the Reliance company, are basically using phones that do not use text. They're audio and they're visual, and they're being used by people who basically are illiterate. These people who are illiterate are not stupid, and they are using that domain to do their work, to build their businesses. Here, we'd say, "Oh, they're on social media. We have to drag them back into the webspace and get them a domain name." That's not going to happen.

What do we do about that? That other-reach, elsewhere, some of us are looking at, is, “How do we partner with the people who are worried about the bigger issues in the Internet eco-system?”, where we come in and work with them, and help position what we’re doing inside what they’re doing, instead of standing outside yelling, “You should have a domain name! You should worry about domain names!” There are things like what Kyle’s mentioned, an ID. A digital ID that actually works. There are all so issues around that, but there are also needs for that.

There are initiatives taking place in Canada. I know that here, between our government and our banking system and so forth, there are all kinds of ingenious things taking on there. We have to figure out, especially within NPOC, how we work in that other-reach with them. They’re working on their challenges in the internet. They have a whole list of, “We think somebody should do something about that.” It’s not in our domain in terms of our remit inside ICANN. It’s related. We have to be at those parties, as well. ICANN can’t be there, directly. It can be there as a stakeholder. We need to think beyond this little box.

Basically, what I’m hearing here is saying, “We need an outreach to turn those outreach people into in-reach people, and get them on the PDP Working Groups. That’s a very difficult task if you’re talking about 100 million Indians who can neither read nor write.

JOAN KERR:

I think that’s what you’re asking, is for us to identify what we want, and that you will respond, too. Am I correct? It’s up to us to identify that

issue and deal with it, and say, “Okay, this is what we’ve found. What can we do?” Is that what I'm understanding? Yes. Okay. Point well taken. Great. Is there anything else you would like to say? If I'm understanding, the next step is for us to send you ... Identify what we need. You’re going to get together. Our next meeting is in December. Is December even on the radar for a webinar, depending on what it is?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

It depends on the date. It depends on the time. Brian’s in LA, Patrick’s in D.C., I'm in Amsterdam. Or not, depending on where the travel takes us. Possibly, a bit early. We can see. We’ll let you know.

JOAN KERR:

Maybe in the new year, we can start with the first meeting in January. That would give you some time at least talk. Does that sound fair? The next step would be to send something in. Got it, thank you. Great, guys. That’s really wonderful. I'm really excited. We have Mr. Martin to give us an update on our GNSO Council. Thanks, Martin. You have five minutes.

MARTIN PABLO SILVA VALENT: I have less.

JOAN KERR:

Okay.

MARTIN PABLO SILVA VALENT: I'll just talk for literally 30 seconds to answer a business call. It literally was my time up. I joined ICANN for the legitimacy question six years ago. I'm a lawyer, so that was my driver, not the DNS configurations of servers and resolutions. I'm very interested to continue hearing about the work. I'm also very optimistic towards the new approach NPOC is having. I was a previous part of the ExCom. I'm very happy. Congratulations for the things that you are doing. I think that the work is almost over, and you're really in a place to start working on harder PDPs. My presentation today was actually thought towards a more newcomers session. NPOC tends to be that. We always have a lot of newcomers. It's not the case today.

I won't do the presentation. It was mainly an explanation of what the GNSO Council is, as a way to really put a framework towards what the GNSO is, and what the PDP, the policy development process, is, and what is working. I'll read off the agenda an example of how the [council] agenda is, and how it works. I was trying to show the insights of the management of the PDPs, mainly. It definitely goes towards legitimacy, because it's the process that we all agreed on, and produce regulation that we are then going to be binding. I was going to end with RPMs, which I've presented several times in NPOC. Today, we have a very relevant event, and I think that could be my most important update towards the PDP update to NPOC.

We have a new process coming along. I wouldn't say from scratch. It's on the contrary. The IGO's mechanisms of right protections has been debated since the beginnings of all ICANN. There was a lot of water under the bridge way before I came in. Most people don't even

remember the whole discussion. It has been so wide, and so stretched over ICANN from GAC. NPOC itself was created at some point to address this issue. It's not from scratch.

We do have the opportunity to oversee and participate in a process that is beginning. That's the fact that one of the recommendations from the working group, that was dealing with the RPMs of IGOs, wasn't approved by the council. It was decided that the recommendation that wasn't approved was messing with the RPMs. We decided to send that specific recommendation to the RPM, the Rights Protection Mechanism Group that does the trade protection mechanisms, to have a new work track, a new charter to address specifically that issue.

That's my invitation to NPOC, to really make a voice in that group. I will echo the words of some, as well. I really respect [subpoena], and [he's] absolutely true towards how we are going to engage new NGOs. There's a lot of hard-learned truth in that statement. We've been trying to do that for a long time in the previous ages of NPOC. I literally only have two minutes, so I'm not going to go into the weeds of any specific topics. Mainly, as a councilor I'm a non-commercial stakeholder. I'm not specific for NPOC, but because of my relationship with NPOC, and since I'm a member of NPOC, I have a special relationship to this constituency. I am more than happy to work and be a point of contact and guidance in this specific area of specific policy work. Congratulations, and let's work together.

JOAN KERR:

Well, I have to say thank you, Martin. We've heard such amazing stories about your hard work and dedication to the RPM process. We will take you up on that to get more involved, since you were such an inspiration. Anyway, I think that's it, if there are no other questions? One more minute. If I say we're done, we're going to be under time? Okay, we're done. Thank you. Thank you, everyone. Great job.

ADAM PEAKE:

Oh, any other business? I almost forgot. You remember the Internet governance forum in Berlin? 25th-29th December, I think. ICANN has a booth and various things. November. Did I say December? November, anyway. Yes, because I'm not going there between Christmas and New Year. I'm going to go and see my mom. Anyway, November. We have a booth and we would like your documents that you would like put on a website that links through a QR code to the booth. I know Maryam can make sure I have the right ones, but whatever you think would be the appropriate way to represent the NPOC.

I would also like you to ask your members who will be at the IGF. There will be a technical reception on the Tuesday evening. I would like to know who will be there, so that we can make sure you're invited. The numbers will be limited, and it's embarrassing to turn away people you know. It's actually very embarrassing because we did it last year. Then, just any generally activities. If any of your members are running sessions and you'd like to share that information, then we'll try and do that. Not necessarily about the DNS, just whatever your particular interests are. Then, we'll try and make sure that people know about

that. There will be an ICANN booth, and you're very welcome to come along and hang out, tell people about NPOC, and so on. Thank you. I can send a note to the list about that.

JOAN KERR:

Yes. No, that's great. I won't be there, but I know that Raoul ... You're not there this year? Oh! Okay. I will send you any information, then. Thank you. With that, we can come to a close? Yes? The real close? Yes, thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]