

**ICANN Costa Rica Meeting
Joint ccNSO /GNSO Council meeting - TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 12th March 2012 at 12:30 local time**

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

Lesley Cowley: Good afternoon everybody and welcome to the GNSO and ccNSO Council lunch. Welcome to the new faces we have in the room. We have worked up an agenda between us today covering such interesting aspects as the ccNSO financial working group and strategy, an operations plan working group. I think you're going to update us on your Whois reports and some of the implications of that from the GNSO.

We're going to tell you about the study group on the use of names for countries and territories. I hope we can have a joint discussion around the joint working group on the security and stability analysis.

And then if we still have time we can fill that with some discussion around some of our recent joint letters and perhaps the cross-community working group procedures. So that's our challenge for today to get through that little lot.

But to start with we had the update from the financial working group and the strategic and operational plan working group. And whilst Byron is swallowing let me just say you'll recall that we've talked about money and we've talked

about ccNSO inputs into the strategic and operational plan of ICANN on a number of occasions.

And I don't know if any of the GNSO community members were able to make input into the recent strategic and operational plan financial framework discussion but certainly the ccNSO were able to do that and we will be sharing some of the thoughts and some of the comments that we made on that one with you.

But to start Byron and a number of others have been very busy in the financial working group and we thought we'd just bring you up to date with progress there.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Lesley. The finance working group has been looking at several different elements; a contribution model, so what type of model would be most appropriate to be acceptable to the broad and diverse group of CCs in terms of their different structures.

And we're also looking at the - what ICANN claims are the expenses associated with supporting the CCs and getting a sense of their financial systems, what they can produce and their ability to appropriately allocate those expenses.

And then we're also examining CC contributions into the ICANN process so there's the - just the checks that we write in terms of making voluntary contribution fees. But there are also significant other contributions into the ICANN process both cash and hard resources as well as others so we're examining that with the goal of putting them all together and updating the contribution model and contributions.

We continue to wait on ICANN to provide their data but we have been - we've recently done a survey in - an internal survey for the CCs looking at all of their contributions. It was distributed amongst all the ccNSO members -

there's just shy of 130 of us now - and beyond. And we had quite a good turnout or feedback; 55 responded to quite a lengthy and robust survey. So it was a - what we would consider a solid response rate.

And we literally have just received the feedback from the research company and we're in the process right now of just digesting it and teasing out the core themes that the data has exposed. So we've literally just been in receipt of that and we'll be doing that over the coming short while.

So really this is just more of a process than a schedule update. And in fairly short order we should be able to be sharing, you know, what are the key themes that arose from the survey.

Should I keep talking, Lesley, while you finish? So anyway...

Lesley Cowley: I just knew that was going to happen. Okay so before we invite questions or comments maybe if we also update you on the work of the strategic and operational plan working group and we can cover those two areas together. Roelof.

Roelof Meijer: Yes, thank you, Lesley. Probably as you all know the (ESOP) working group provides input and commands the strategic and operational planning process of ICANN so we provide comments on both the strategic plan and the operational plan and the framework of the letter. We did so quite recently on the fiscal year 2013 operating plan framework.

I would refer you to our comments quite elaborate I think. And I will just give an overview of the main conclusions we drew from the framework. First of all we started with a compliment this time because we saw a significant improvement with - if we compared it to the previous year, the fiscal year '12 operating plan.

In two senses, firstly that there was a much clearer link between the priorities for 2013 and strategic plan for 2013 to '15; and secondly there is now a paragraph which is called I think main assumptions and that provides a clear insight into the foundation of the plan for 2013.

Sorry. I have to - this is better? Yes? Yes, okay.

Then of course we had our concerns, quite a few of them. I'll just give you the most important ones. We feel that ICANN seriously has to professionalize internally. And for instance in the areas of financial management costs are running out of control; there are no timely and correct financial reports. Staff retention - especially senior staff retention is very low.

Recruitment is very slow. And there are quite a few others. And we all I think experience it every now and then ICANN has a problem with adhering to its own deadlines and there are quite a few other examples of that. There is no mention whatsoever of activities in professionalizing the organization in the present framework so that's fine.

Secondly the focus of the plan we think is lacking there now 37 strategic projects for 2013; that's 10 more than we had in 2012. And even in 2012 ICANN has not been able to address all those projects. So they end ('10) without having finished the ones that they should have finished in 2012. I think that it's - on one hand it's good of course, there's a lot of ambition but it's lacking a certain sense of reality I think.

Thirdly there is a proposed increase in staff, quite significant, at the end of 2013. ICANN should come about 195 full time equivalents. At the end of 2012 they are probably going to be at 159. And as I said retention is low; recruitment is slow and we are really worried if ICANN is going to be able to get up to that number.

And if they can't they will have a problem with not only those strategic projects but also for instance with all those processes that the new gTLD process needs.

The financial position at the end of the year 2013 was also something that concerns us because the present framework shows a deficit of about \$6.3 million US which is about 8% of the total budget which means that again ICANN will not be able to convert money into its strategic fund. In the strategic plan it says that it has to put money into the fund to get it up to one year of operational costs.

Last year and I think also this year it probably - well as it is reported now also in 2013 ICANN will not be able to do that. So those are our main concerns. And for the rest I would refer you to our (unintelligible). And of course I will take questions.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Roelof. Thank you, Byron. Open the floor to questions and comments from the community.

Stephane van Gelder: And perhaps I can begin by saying welcome to the ccNSO from the GNSO. This is Stephane van Gelder; I Chair the GNSO. And thanking you for that report. I just wanted to ask how you have interacted with ICANN on those findings because they are quite critical of ICANN.

And I know you've been working at this for a while. And this - have been dissatisfied or sharing that level of dissatisfaction for a while. But I'm not sure that - I mean, my question, I guess, is is the message getting through do you think?

Roelof Meijer: Our impression is that, yes, the message is getting through; probably not on all counts but if we look at the comments we filed on the 2012 operating plan in the end quite a lot of those comments were taken into account.

And the way we interact is especially during meetings like this we have several sessions with them. And after we file our comments we always ask them to come back in writing to us and explain to us which comments were taken into account and which were not and for which reason they were not. And I expect that we will get that answered this time, yes.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you.

Lesley Cowley: Stephane, if I can just add to that. Yes, we have been quite critical but I would hope that we've been constructively critical. And certainly there's a number of CC managers who've obviously got quite a lot of experience in this area and are highly engaged in the strategic plan and all things financial and are certainly very willing and able to offer to share their experience and skills and those offers have been well received by ICANN to be fair.

There is also about to kick off the new strategic planning process. And just the other day the (SOP) group were I think able to act as guinea pigs for an experiment in terms of engaging with the community at an early stage on what the priorities should be and where the efforts should most usefully be directed.

And we very much have said back on that session and encouraged greater interaction with the community at the early stages of the strategic plan in order to hopefully in the end have something that we are all comfortable with rather than pushing back at something when its produced.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Lesley. I have Wolf and then (unintelligible).

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, thank you. Stephane, Wolf Knobon speaking from the ISP Constituency - the GNSO. I am really surprised to hear what you were saying about the situation of the - of ICANN - how ICANN has organized its financial - its financial management here.

And I really - I wonder how we from the GNSO could be affected by that taking into consideration that every time being we have provided input for the budget for the next year budget, we have been asked for that. And our budget - so talking from our - point of the constituency point of view is the requirements are really I would guess really low compared the level of budget you are talking about is really like in finance.

So I wonder how this will work and how it will affect ourselves in the future if ICANN is not able to manage their overall budget in that sense or the big portions of that and how we will be affected in that way. So I would like really to see that also our - the GNSO's problems or the stakeholder group problems we have with that could be communicated to the - to ICANN itself.

I know we will have from our stakeholder group we will have a meeting tomorrow together with the ICANN CFO as well so you'll bring up this point as well and we'll hear what was going on with regards to our budget, yes. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Wolf. (Unintelligible). Did you have a question?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stephane van Gelder: Okay well we'll go to Jonathan then.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Stephane. It's Jonathan Robinson, Registries representative on the GNSO. I would say to the ccNSO congratulations on a structured and methodical approach once again. It's very nice to see someone picking up this kind of structured critique. And I think it is, as Lesley said, a constructive criticism of what's going on. And all of us have some concerns about some of these - the issues that you raised.

The biggest single thing that's about to hit ICANN self evidently is the new gTLD program. And of course that has massive operational and financial

impact. They don't see to have sensitized the budget at all or the financial planning around various models. Is this something you've either come across or raised with them or discussed with them at all? I guess it's really for Roelof but I mean, possibly the financial working group.

Roelof Meijer: The answer to that question is yes we raised that in our comments that we see no different scenarios being addressed in the operational plan. The thing of course that by the time the operational plan will be finalized and approved by the Board that will be after we know how many implications there will have been. So there's also a bit of a time conflict there. But it would have been better in our opinion that there had been a few scenarios (flagged) into financial projections. Yes.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks.

Woman: I just wanted to ask if the 37 projects included the 27 recommendations that the board agreed to implement in the coming year?

Roelof Meijer: Well that's a difficult one. I wouldn't be able to answer that one. At least I know that of the 37 there are not 27 projects that are a single - each of them are a single recommendation.

Woman: Okay.

Stephane van Gelder: Any further questions on this - or comments? So, Lesley, do you want to move onto the second topic?

Lesley Cowley: So let me just add to close that, you know, the ccNSO are more than willing to work with constituents for the GNSO if that would help to share, you know, the approach, etcetera. It's not a small task to pay attention to the strategic plan and have that translate into money and so forth.

And I know we've already had a conversation with the BC constituency about how they will be engaged. And obviously those skills will be relevant to making input.

Okay so moving on we had an item from the GNSO on the agenda and that was the gTLD Whois report. And I'm told that you're especially interested in the possible conflicts between new geo gTLDs with strict data protection laws and Whois requirements.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. Marika - well perhaps I can ask Marika to just say a few words about the work that we're doing on thick Whois and what's going on there as an introduction to that topic.

And then perhaps it would be useful as well to - in order to frame this discussion to - for me to tell you a little bit about the discussion that we had yesterday with the Whois review team where we kind of approached the question of how to make sure that if there's work on Whois in the G space it can also be useful for the CC space. So - and one of their answers, for example, and obviously Emily is no stranger to the - to your crowd - was that they've already done a lot of work with the - the CCs have input a lot of their experience into the Whois Review Team's work so that was interesting today.

But let me first of all let Marika just take you through the work that we're doing on the thick Whois.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Hello everyone. For those of you that don't know me I'm Marika Konings; I'm part of the policy staff supporting the GNSO Council. So one of the topics that currently are active on the discussion in the GNSO Council is on a PDP that has been started on thick Whois.

This is an issue that came out of the discussions that were held in the context of the review of the transfer policy that is in place because in the context of those discussions it was clear that there would be a lot of benefit to having a thick Whois; it would solve a lot of issues.

But at the same time the group that looked at that also realized that there are potential other implications of requiring thick Whois for all gTLDs. So what they did is actually recommended - they recommended the start of a policy development process in which the first phase is the request of an issue report.

So the staff prepared an issue report and it was tasked to basically look at thick Whois but look at potential pros and cons of requiring a thick Whois for all gTLDs.

So what we did in the issue report we basically outlined a number of elements that we think should be considered should a PDP move forward things such as, you know, a consistent response, enhanced ability, enhanced accessibility, cost implications, a privacy and data protection issue, a data escrow and also impact on existing Whois requirements which all should be considered in further detail should a PDP move forward.

So staff has submitted this final issue report to the council. The staff recommendation there is to move forward with the PDP as it's considered within scope of the GNSO as well as ICANN noting that from our perspective we think it would be a beneficial discussion to look at the pros and cons so that an informed decision can be taken on whether or not to require a thick Whois for all gTLDs.

So this report is now in front of the GNSO Council for a decision. The council is expected to vote on it coming Wednesday. So based on the outcome of the vote a PDP would either move forward or not. And that's where things stand on that issue.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much, Marika. Any questions on that? Yes please.

Vika Mpisane: Vika Mpisane, ccNSO Council. Just a quick one so that we have assembled the basics. If there's a thick Whois there must be a thin Whois; what's the difference if you could help us understand?

Marika Konings: So you're basically asking what the current situation is. Yes. So...

Vika Mpisane: Sorry it's pretty much to clarify what a thick Whois as opposed to a thin Whois.

Marika Konings: Apologies for that I thought that was clear. So basically in the thick registry the data of the registrant is held both at the registrar as well as the registry level while in the thin Whois there's only limited data that's provided to the registry.

So currently in the gTLD environment I think it's dotCom, dotNet, dotJobs, dotName? No, I think...

Stephane van Gelder: Com, Net, Jobs and that's it.

Marika Konings: I think that's it so there are three gTLD registries so still operate under a thin model. And of course the biggest of that is dotCom. So if there would be a change of course and it would, you know, be a huge task and might have, you know, bigger implications as it affects a lot of registrants and also registrars.

Stephane van Gelder: And perhaps I just add for your information that the new gTLD program requires new gTLD applicants to - successful applicants to use a Whois that is thick. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I'm not - I think that goes to actually the point I was going to make is that the GNSO Council may not move forward with that PDP. There's still some discussion so I can't predict whether it will or won't. But a number of us on the Council do not feel it should go forward because it really only affects the TLDs that are supported by one registry operator and that's VeriSign who does Com, Net and they do the backend for dotJobs.

So from our perspective because there's so much work going on within the Council, with the GNSO community and since, as Stephane said, it is a requirement for thick Whois for all new gTLDs going forward to spend a lot of resources we really with respect to one operator to us just doesn't make sense.

And, you know, maybe that could be a private negotiation between that one operator and ICANN to - whether they want to move to a thick Whois or not.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Jeff. Any further comments? So perhaps I can then continue the discussion - thanks, very much, Marika, for that - with a more general discussion of the work that the Whois Review Team has told us that they're doing.

And I think it's useful in the light of our cross conversations with the ccNSO to have just a general discussion on that. We were very impressed with the work that the Whois Review Team has done. We had a list of questions for them. They came and saw us yesterday. We - our list was long enough that we didn't have time to go through all the answers. But they have provided answers to all the questions.

And we also had a meeting with the Board yesterday. And their Whois was by one Board member called a museum piece. So we're very much talking about something that is central to both our lives I think as G and ccNSO - GNSO and ccNSO members.

And it's something that we're very interested in hearing your feedback on especially in the light, as I mentioned earlier on, of this question of is work that's ongoing within the ICANN community on Whois specifically on the G space something that can either be useful or certainly taken notice of by the CC space. And I'm sure you've given that some thought so I don't know if.

Lesley Cowley: To be frank we've not given it a great deal of support because, as you know, HUC will set its own policy. We will of course in due course be looking at the Whois work and no doubt providing some ccNSO comment if we feel that's appropriate. But generally we each chart our own course and try to develop and follow the best practice as well.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I was just interested in learning whether your group has given some consideration to the fact that particularly law enforcement agencies might increase pressure for ccTLD operators in the light of the ongoing discussions surrounding the RAA.

Lesley Cowley: Yes in fact we have a broader session and schedule for the ccNSO later this week where we're looking at regulatory and legislative developments and sharing some of the developments in particular countries but also I suspect leading into a more general discussion about developments globally. So you're right, there definitely is an element of that discussion.

And that is open for everybody. I'm sure it's bound to clash with lots of things on your schedules too. But if there is sufficient interest then maybe that's something that there might be some sort of cross community sessions on in Prague perhaps.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you, Lesley. Any further questions or comments on the Whois? Okay so perhaps we can move onto the third item.

Lesley Cowley: So the third item was the ccNSO study group on the use of names for countries and territories. And we have an update from Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Paul Schindler. I'm the General Manager of International and Government Affairs at AUDA. And for the purposes of this discussion the Chair of the Country and Territory Names Study Group.

I thought I'd put up a couple of slides for a few reasons; first of all this is the first time we've spoken about it at length in this forum so it won't take too long. Also I'm a visual person. And, C, I suspect I use PowerPoint much like a drunk uses a lamppost; more for support than illumination. Comedy aside - I'll be here all week.

This group was originally established by the ccNSO Council back in December 2010. And the length of time that's passed between now and then it shouldn't be read as a great deal of work having been undertaken without briefing the community it just has taken a while to get ourselves moving.

And it grew out of an acknowledgement that more study and more collective understanding is required regarding how country and territory names are used in the ICANN environment.

It came up as an issue during the IDN CCPDP. Working Group One specifically looked at the issue of country and territory names. And it was appropriately deemed to be out of scope.

So the Council convened our little working group. And basically the intent is to provide both the Council and the broader community about an overview of the issues related with the use of country and territory names.

More specifically that means a three-stage process. Number one, we look at the current and proposed policy and procedural landscape. What are the

policies that we've used over time in all communities across the constituencies and how have country and territory names come up in those? For the ccTLDs that's pretty self evident in the good old ISO list.

And it comes up in new gTLDs and that's what's intensified a lot of discussion in this space. But of course it was also in the IDN process. So all of that has been brought together and catalogued. We're not releasing it yet because it's a little body of work that we've put aside and it will then be incorporated as an element of our draft reporting.

We're now at the big second stage of the process. And this is where the fear and loathing often comes in generally from a place of not knowing what this group is doing. And that is to look at the different representations of country and territory names.

So we take as a basis ISO 3166-1A2 and then expand beyond that to look at how countries and territories see themselves represented, how it's used in a range of fora. And that would include outside of the ICANN community.

And I know here that this is because we're a study group and it's part of our responsibility, indeed we're not doing our job properly if we're not expansive in our study, in our research. And I'll talk more about the form that that will take shortly. But I wanted to make that point clear now.

And then what we do is we map the two together. We take the range of country and territory names we have, we match that up against the policy frameworks and we see are there any gaps? Are there any inconsistencies? Are there any not necessarily failings but do we see any problems.

And then from that point we can provide some commentary on that. And again it's to observe and to provide an overview; it is not to take decisions or to make advice or recommendations on that.

I'll flag there that of course we're now starting the process that we've got our own act together of engaging relevant stakeholders and ultimately reporting to the Council.

This is my favorite slide. This is what we don't do. This is not about identifying what's a ccTLD and what is not. Nor is it about - and this was more relevant when started (unintelligible) people were unsure a few months ago with the new gTLD process still looming and some months away was it about intervening in the first round? Well obviously not and the timeframes have made that clear. It's about developing some input in advance of subsequent rounds.

It's also not about judging previous policy approaches. It's about just mapping them. And then also it's not about making recommendations for additional protections to country and territory names. We go into a more exhaustive list, expansive list for the purposes of our survey work.

But it is made clear throughout it that no inference should be drawn regarding the questions that are asked or the representations that are identified.

And it's also not about developing a definitive recommendation for how country and territory names should be treated within ICANN in the future.

This is where we're up to. We've done a quick policy overview. We're working on a topology or a survey which UNESCO will assist us with. And we - I'll get into that subsequently. We'll then start discussing issues.

These are the things we've all talked about at the bar about what will happen with this country name and this country name and it may well become a ccTLD under one process and a gTLD under the other. That's all very well and good. There needs to be an intelligent in-depth discussion about those.

There will be a status report which will build upon what I'm saying here but will also go out to the community shortly so that people can see in greater detail the detail of our work.

And then beyond that we'd hoped to achieve some further survey with to go back to UNESCO members; did we get it right the first time? If we got it wrong can we improve the process so that we get better input?

And then some final sort of consultation and briefing around Toronto with the report aiming for about the end of 2012. That is simply based on the best guestimate of in a perfect world everything goes smoothly with new gTLDs and you'd launch round two the following year.

The survey itself is a tool. This is the research gathering method that we're using. It - we have a lot of data already. We all know about various documents, lists, authoritative sources that have been used for country and territory names. But we'd be failing in our remit if we didn't actually go ahead and ask as many questions as possible to see what has been missed.

So it is expansive. And again clearly caveats so no inferences should be drawn about what we ask and whether that's going to lead to any sort of future protections. It's also about testing the process.

And just to be clear if anybody is to respond to the survey they would be asked to provide citations or where that - they use that country and where that country that uses that name in international fora or where it's an international statute, etcetera, rather than simply, you know, just random examples.

The survey back in September 2011 through the auspices of Janis Karklins the UNESCO agreed to assist with the survey. They've been very flexible and accommodating in how this will be done. Yes it necessarily limits the initial

consultation to member states of UNESCO but having their participation and their expertise they know about this stuff a lot more than we do.

It provides a certain (unintelligible) work and will also help with quality control. It is an important first step. It is at least not an only. It will go out to about 20-25 member states and will be communicated by a UNESCO - their relevant newsletter; those that are interested in country indicators as they call them with others being welcome to participate. No one will be excluded.

The questions are formulated by the study group. And states will be selected with geographic and linguistic diversity in mind. And this is the point at which once that's finalized it will also be made available as an attachment to the issues or the status report for a document that will go out to the community because we're acutely aware that there are many within the community who have the expertise, the contacts back in their home countries where they or someone they know could certainly help fill out the survey and gather more information not just through UNESCO.

I've summarized what was about 10 slides and a lengthy discussion here about two hours ago about what the survey would contain. Very briefly - and I realize that having just short headings leads to more questions; it doesn't have all the explanatory material underneath it.

But we basically start with the simple stuff. What is your ISO alpha two code and what is your alpha three code? Alpha threes have been asked about - and this may be contentious for many simply because it is involved - it is used in some ICANN processes; it is the number one criteria for identifying country names in the Applicant Guidebook, for example.

But it will also lead to responses that will help us validate what we all already know. There is a certain gTLD which - a rather large one - that shares a three-letter country code with Comoros.

And that's the way it is as part of our final reporting and actually aids our work to be able to say well it is - it just is. It exists that way and that coexistence has been like that for a while. Again it's made very clear - no inference should be drawn that a clash there would suggest that someone has exclusive rights over that.

Other common abbreviations and acronyms - I mean, that sort of thing is thrown in because BRB is Barbados in the ISO list but they will be running under BAR at the Olympics. People will be much more interested in dotBAR than they would be in dotBRB. So - and again that is to assess what is; that may well happen. That's an eventuality that may arise and that's why we're asking the questions.

And then more traditional things like their long form names, short form name. And then an attempt to go branching out mentioning their name in the six UN languages so that respondents get the idea that this is a borderless sort of industry that we're in and there are other representations of your country name other than those that you use yourself.

And then out into even broader; could you describe all the other countries that are participating the survey in your language. And yes we have had really extensive discussions about official language, designated language, language used for administrative - pardon me - administrative purposes, etcetera. So that's a summary. It's not as raw as that.

And then beyond that other commonly used and local names - this is again to pick up examples such as Holland which may not be picked up under some of the other categories. Minority and indigenous languages because culturally it's vital that we do that - written, thank you, Cheryl - minority and indigenous languages.

And then the tactual question at the end, other representations, which I would be very hesitant to put up as question number one because who knows what

responses you would get. But at the end survey respondents would generally be expected to be thinking in the right way to hopefully expand their thinking and be able to come up with other ideas that haven't been captured.

So what's important is what we do with that. And as I said that is basically to take the policies that exist, look at where things are going, take all the country name representations that we've been given. And if for instance we've come up against a quirky clash, which no one has thought of before, which is unlikely, we can look into it further and populate that with more country and territory names using particular examples.

The briefing of other constituencies will increase. We have cross constituency participation, the GNSO, the ALAC and the GAC are all there; everyone is participating on the group now. And their input is very welcome.

And then the status report will be the formalization of that engagement and consultation with the community. We will have a look at the new gTLD responses when they come in just simply because it's great to have the actual rather than theoretical in front of you. It may come to nothing but it might be an interesting exercise to look at it.

And then see what the survey delivers, possibly go out again and then keep discussing issues working towards the usual process of draft report consultation and a final report towards the end of the year.

Sorry that was a bit long but I thought it was worth doing the first time.

Stephane van Gelder: Oh that was very interesting. Thank you very much for that presentation.

Let me open it up to questions. Perhaps I can introduce one myself. It may not be directly linked to what you're doing but we've been - this weekend - in a situation where - well first of all as you know in past GNSO ccNSO conversations we've mentioned the - we've asked about your view of geo

names, i.e. names that may be geographic but behave in a generic manner as it were.

And during, once again, our conversations with the Board yesterday the Board asked us, the GNSO, about what our feeling was of the impact of the new gTLD program would be on our own structure and the ICANN structure in general.

I don't know if you've had conversations with the Board on that yet but I'd be - in the light of what you've just described and I think it's interesting to have a look at those points together.

Lesley Cowley: We've not yet had that conversation but it's on the list for our meeting tomorrow.

Paul Szyndler: And indeed it would be a logical outcome of the work of this group to help inform those sort of deliberations because we'll look at it in some depth and we'll see what we come out. And that which applies to country and territory names may well logically apply to broader geographic names. The same rules or the same observations may well apply more broadly.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes because in the same that we will be called upon to see registries and registrars mix to some extent or other constituents become, you know, have a different function in our ecosystem you may also see that as well as ccTLD operators become gTLD operators.

Paul Szyndler: As Cheryl correctly just whispered in my ear often happens. It's something we've seen and we're considering with regards to IDNs in our particular community. So, yes, it's definitely on our list for discussion but we're at the preliminary stages of that process.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you. John.

John Berard: If I can get just a little more information to help me see things better. Back on Slide 3 you have three items. I love the symmetry of that by the way. I wonder if you can - as you say to yourself each of them out loud what is the example of each that you are thinking to yourself?

So when you say we're going to look at the current and proposed landscape what are you thinking? And then when you say look at the different representations of countries and territories what are you thinking?

Paul Szyndler: I will attempt to channel the collective thinking of the group rather than my own perspectives and reflect on some of the extensive discussions we've already had. But number one was fairly clear. The examples are, as I mentioned earlier, the rules around delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs and the ISO list and RFC 1591, etcetera, etcetera.

The reason it was proposed, I mean, it is current and as we're trying to see things above - I mean, we're also including, obviously, what was at the time a draft Applicant Guidebook when we started our work. And anything that has intersected with country and territory names in the ICANN process over the last years.

It's not - that work is fairly comprehensive now but we've just set it aside while we do step two and we'll come back to it. But it is that - it is IDN ccTLDs, it's almost everything.

And that will be part of our draft report so that will all be open for commentary to see whether collectively we missed something. So it's everything that's had countries and territories involved.

The different representations starts with necessarily, as I said, the ISO list because that's where we ccTLDs come from so that's the first question. And it is a simple one because we know the answers for every respondent that

comes back; we already know the answer to that. But we ease them into the process.

Where it becomes more possibly contentious and where we are being cautious to explain the - we're just trying to see anything that may, according to a government or an authoritative agency, or it may be an independent authority within a country, that they would see as a legitimate and documented and proven representation of themselves.

And now the purpose of that is we wouldn't then map that together and say okay under current new gTLD policy this would be eligible to be a new gTLD. But looking at this more extensive list of what countries have come back no it wouldn't. That it would just simply be a mapping of it to observe that that's what it is.

For example if we go into the next round of the new gTLDs and the Applicant Guidebook is revised and country name are included in there the sorts - and the early warning government process is left in there the sorts of things that might come out of left field from governments where they suddenly believe that they assert their right to something that they say is now a representation of a country and territory name.

I said this morning we'll know the problem when we get to it. We'll hear it when there's an objection. But if we're doing our work properly we might be able to identify that now and just see that there might be something coming up. So that's the sort of examples I had for one and two.

And then, as I said, three is far more open-ended. There are particular examples due to the characters used that countries could well go through the IDN process as an IDN be a ccTLD and then end up as a gTLD in that process late down the track.

And the statement from the group will be well that's - for instance that's what is not - it's outside the mandates though them digging deeper into is that a problem or what - God forbid, what do we do to fix it and that's not the intention at all. It's just to develop that shared common understanding of where we're at.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much. That's a great discussion. Anybody else want to ask questions or make comments? Okay back to you.

Lesley Cowley: I seem to have become the keeper of the list. Okay so the next item on the joint agenda was the Joint Security and Stability Analysis Working Group updates. But I don't think we have either of the two people we were expecting to speak to that item in the room. So we can save time and update each other on that either separately or at our next engagement.

So the item following that was one suggested by the GNSO which was a conversation about the experience with the recent letter to the Board - the joint letter on IDNs - on the IDN single character issue. And I think you were going to speak to that?

Stephane van Gelder: Actually Edmon was going to speak to it and he's just left. So I apologize.

Lesley Cowley: We're having an unfortunate effect on people.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: I don't know if Ching, you want to...

Ching Chiao: I think as a council - the GNSO Council we have worked around or with the ccNSO the revised letter which we also looked into that. And we will - we appreciate the effort. And - but other than that probably (unintelligible) to get Edmon for his further thoughts as the co-chair so.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much, Ching. So that conversation will remain short I'm afraid.

Lesley Cowley: Perhaps take that a bit more broadly rather than that specific one. I wonder if this comes into the principles for cross community working groups or also what do we learn - if I talk long enough somebody will come in.

((Crosstalk))

Lesley Cowley: What timing. But actually there's also a how can we learn from that experience that if we do need to produce a joint letter how might we do that a bit more easily because it might not necessarily come as a result of a cross community working group. And maybe we can do some thinking on that particularly.

Stephane van Gelder: So, Edmon, do you want to say a few words about the work going on with IDNs as a joint project for the ccNSO and the GNSO?

Edmon Chung: Sure. Thank you, Stephane, and apologies for skipping out for a couple minutes just at the right time.

But so I guess Lesley has mentioned and the recent experience with the JIG letter that was originally drafted by the JIG on a number of issues focused on the single character IDN TLDs.

It went through an interesting process, I guess, which is I think would like to get some feedback from both groups on, you know, how to - what the learning is as Lesley has mentioned.

Just a quick review of it, I mean, quick look back at it. Basically the two - well the JIG created a final report on the issue which was approved by the two councils and was forwarded to the Board. The Board made a resolution after

that. And the JIG was looking at responding to that action and through that drafted a letter which went to, again, back to the two councils for approval.

The GNSO approved the - the GNSO Council approved the letter as-is. The ccNSO took a look at it and felt that it, you know, it wanted to refine it and did so - made the changes, approved it. And I guess then the GNSO took it back and considered and approved the version that was refined by the ccNSO. So that's sort of a - I guess in a nut shell what happened.

Personally I think that - at least the end result of having a joint letter - a synchronized joint letter is something - is a goal that the JIG is - I mean, is happy to see that; that was the end result. I think it should be important - personally I think it's important that if we have a joint working group and sort of an output in a way that comes out it's probably best to have a synchronized set of actions from the two - from the chartering councils or the chartering organizations. So that's sort of my thoughts. I guess we - open to other thoughts.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Edmon. I mean, my perspective on that as Chair we're getting quite organized in the ccNSO and we have a work plan and we know what we're doing and so on.

And I guess it would be easier if a joint letter is being envisaged that we try to coordinate in terms of dates, etcetera. I'm very much aware that sometimes we're - we come back with further iterations that it then needs to wait another meeting or meetings of both councils in order to get a final signoff which I'm sure must add a lot of frustrating delay to the people that would like the letter issued.

So maybe we could - with hindsight - plan a bit more in advance so as to kind of streamline that process.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, thanks. If I can add to that first of all to thank Edmon for that presentation; secondly to say that on that specific letter working through it, you know, as just been said the ccNSO - the GNSO approved something from the JIG, the ccNSO wanted to redraft. I think there was excellent collaboration between our two SOs to get to that end result.

And I'm very heartened to hear that members of the working group feel that that was a good result and did move things forward. I think there was excellent collaboration all around. And it's something that in our meetings for the past year I think we've all expressed a desire to see - and to build upon. So I just wanted to say that I thought that was very good.

Do we have any questions on that topic? Yes, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes, just adding to that a little bit terms of learning - okay - in terms of learning I think as Lesley said I think these joint working groups probably in the future would need to budget a little bit more time for results coming from the - after its recommendations are given back to the respective chartering organizations.

So I guess one of the things is that perhaps in the future we'll try to present the letter probably at a particular meeting and allow for discussions and then come back, you know, and share notes between the two and then, you know, I guess sort of target for the second meeting of these before it is being, you know, voted for or approved. So that probably, you know, is a learning that would make the process perhaps even more smoother.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much. So if there's nothing further on this I think the ccNSO wants to talk about cross community working groups.

Lesley Cowley: Only very briefly. So we have received some draft principles for cross community working groups which apparently are going to be known as

CWGs. And we will be considering those and considering how they will work of the Council and no doubt will let you have some inputs in due course.

Stephane van Gelder: Jonathan, do you want to say a few words on that?

Jonathan Robinson: Sure, Stephane, thanks. It's Jonathan Robinson. I was the chair of that working group within the GNSO. I suppose there's a couple of things we'd love - it's rather the GNSO's concern in many ways we've done what we intended to do. It was to chew the issue over and kick it around within the GNSO.

We were very sensitive to the fact that that may be perceived as the GNSO deciding how CWGs should work within the broader ICANN community. And there was not way in which that was intended to be the case.

It's great that you've got them. We did try and make our sessions and the calls and so on as open as possible so that others could participate but it was essentially a GNSO working group to see - to work on our position on that.

But it's great that you're got the principles now and it's clear to us at least that this is now something that the broader community - or at least perhaps I should say to me - I shouldn't speak for others on this - at a personal level it's clear to me it seems that this has got to be out in the wider community and developed because it's very useful it seems to have some broad principles to work to which is why we thought to look at this in any event in the first place.

I don't know if there's any other comments but that's the sort of two-cents worth on the CWGs work to be done.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Jonathan. Any comments? Can I pass it back to you?

Lesley Cowley: Thank you. Okay so the final item on our list, which we've just added in because we noticed we have a little bit of time is the issue of capacity. And to

share with you the ccNSO has been doing quite a bit of work getting to grips with our work, looking at the number of working groups we have running, we have a multipage project plan that builds in resources and builds in timelines.

And we also have an amazing Technicolor mind map of our work on one page that enables you for the first time I think really to get a proper overall picture as to our work. And Bart has been wondering in trying to get that all in one place.

But as a result of that we've kind of come to the view, as if we didn't know it already, that the ccNSO is probably at capacity and have started to have a conversation with other groups in the community as to whether this is a shared issue or whether this is just us knowing full well that it probably isn't just us.

And talking really about what we might do about that situation whether it's in terms of prioritization of work or whether we might be able to get more resource or whether we might be able to work smarter, etcetera.

And we will be doing some work on prioritization and on how we can get people more engaged and maybe breaking up big tasks into smaller tasks which use more people, maybe some of the new CCs that you've heard getting involved in the work of the ccNSO.

And it's also a topic that we've started to talk about as a group of SO and AC chairs. So we just really wanted to advise you of that and see if there's any similar thinking in the GNSO.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you, Lesley. Does anyone want to provide a GNSO view on that or personal comments? Joy and then Alan.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Lesley and thanks for your comments. Although relatively new to the GNSO Council I can honestly tell you that nobody in the GNSO Council, as far as I'm aware, has been complaining of under-capacity.

Stephane van Gelder: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: As someone who straddles a lot of different groups I think it's safe to say it's everyone's problem. And I suspect also the answer is all of the above. The GNSO certainly has tried a bunch of them. You know, we've had some Inter Register Transfer groups that we decided was too big a task in I think 2006 and we're working our way through and we're almost - we're partially finished the third of five. So, you know, there's a consequence of breaking things down into little pieces; they take a long time.

But all of the above has to be tried. And probably there are different answers to different problems. And of course the largest single answer is the most difficult one; get more people involved who really know what they're talking about and are willing to work.

Lesley Cowley: Indeed. If I can just add to that? We've also been talking about how we're creating work for each other by creating cross working groups where needed and also cross border requests. So you think you have a all singing or dancing work plan and then you suddenly find there's work coming in from outside your constituency to add to that.

And we just maybe need to get better organized and think about how that's going to affect capacity as well. We don't have all the answers but I think maybe we're no longer in denial about the problem.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you. Wolf.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Thank you. Wolf Knoben speaking. So the issue is of a long-term issue. We are discussing it a long time in GNSO how to cope with the amount of

work and also prioritization wasn't on our agenda. From that I think we learned - we started and tried to introduce a kind of sophisticated prioritization process which failed, let me say this, because we couldn't convince people to accept this so in that way, which we had in mind.

So I would like to give you that advice how to carefully think about that. And do it in a very simply - simple way so otherwise you have another project about prioritization. And the other thing is what you mentioned as well how to get more people in outreach. So how do you is a big issue as well in our committee.

But we are fighting about how do outreach, you know, everybody is convinced that outreach is necessary but we have to get more people involved. But - then we really we come to the point that in a deadline let me say which we have different positions on how to do that.

So if you (unintelligible) you have support in that (unintelligible) it will be very helpful. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, I've got Thomas and John. I just want to say I think Wolf's account is very accurate; it provides a good explanation of the things that we're grappling within the GNSO at the moment. On the prioritization I'm not sure it failed, I mean, there was extensive work across the projects as you say.

However (unintelligible) this was a project that we undertook, if memory serves, more than a year ago. And I think it - and stopped after six months so at least we managed to learn how to stop something that wasn't providing useful results.

So that led us to look at - do more simple methods for prioritization. I think we've - over the past six months quite a lot of that. And if you look at the pending projects list for the GNSO now I think while it is plentiful I think it's

better organized and I think the Council is more aware from that list than in the past.

And I think part of that is also due to the work of the group that I believe Wolf was a part of and worked on that effort. So just to make that point. I have Thomas next and then John.

Thomas Rickert: I pretty much share (unintelligible) or the comments that have been made by others in this discussion. However I'd like to say that we very much appreciate that you share with us your concerns about workload. And I think it's a joint effort to maybe monitor this and seek for answers in the whole ICANN ecosystem because that we're seeing is increasing list of tasks that we have to deal with. The expectation is that we come up with results in a timely fashion, that the process is (unintelligible) by flawlessly.

At the same time there is the limited number of staff supporting the work that we're doing. And it's hard to cope. And I think that's, you know, we have a much stronger (unintelligible) saying no in terms of (unintelligible).

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you, Thomas. John.

John Berard: So I was a member of the GNSO (unintelligible) cross community working groups. And if you wanted the CCs (unintelligible) be more than happy to do that. And I think (unintelligible) was more specifically (unintelligible). I began to appreciate how it could represent one of the great (unintelligible) outcomes of the bottom up (unintelligible) initiatives which of course if subversion.

And I would agree to take a look at the work process because there may in fact (unintelligible) and the opportunity to exert some control over the organization in its entirety by working more closely together.

I don't see it as doubling the amount of work; I see it as having (unintelligible) because (unintelligible) instead of one. And I (unintelligible). I would encourage you to look at (unintelligible) in that regard.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) obvious point in terms of the CC community has more people getting involved. We have people joining (unintelligible) quite often now which is great.

Our challenge is (unintelligible) how you get those people engaged and then participating and we're going to do some thinking on that between now and Prague.

I would (unintelligible) with the new Gs you'd also have new participants in the GNSO community and have people from those get engaged and get involved. Maybe also might be good thinking.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Lesley. And we're getting close to the end of this session. We just had one more topic that (unintelligible) wanted to discuss with the ccNSO. If I can ask Marika to come back to the table please? Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika again. As some of you may recall at (unintelligible) meeting we had a discussion on the cross TLD registration (unintelligible) someone is (unintelligible) register for (unintelligible) in another TLD. And this is (unintelligible) of the scams that the gTLDs have in common. (Unintelligible) got on that topic.

Following (unintelligible) further what they wanted to do on the topic. And we're (unintelligible) discuss the first thing they wanted to do is to see whether there was anything the ccNSO would be interested in doing together with the GNSO on that topic, possibly further discussions or exploring the options further.

And I think an email was (unintelligible) Stephane to that end (unintelligible) in December. So I think it's just one of the new topics where it would be helpful to get your feedback on that so that the GNSO Council can then take a decision on how to move forward or not on that topic.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you. (Unintelligible) I don't think we were very clear in the direction (unintelligible) with that request. But I think there was something CCs when we were last together who offered to share (unintelligible) going on that there's always a new scam going on but this one's an old one in this sector.

And I think if I remember rightly you'd offered to share some council members' experience in that area. But maybe that's a topic we could pick up further.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, thanks. I mean, the idea was just (unintelligible) and not to get on to it straight away. Obviously it's not something that we'd sent to you on the schedule.

So are there any other comments in general? In which case thank the GNSO and everybody from your SOs. Once again I think this was a very useful discussions. I look forward to having some more. And I think we're seeing both the SOs working closer together (unintelligible) so thank you very much.

END