CR - GAC / ccNSO Joint Session
Wednesday, March 14, 2012 – 09:00 to 10:00
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Good morning, everyone. If you can take your seats, we will begin.

So welcome to the ccNSO. We're going to be meeting for the next hour on a range of topics. And, as always, it's a pleasure to meet with the ccNSO with whom we have certain perspectives in common. And we have, I think, quite an interesting agenda planned for this morning. So welcome to Lesley Cowley, the chair of the ccNSO.

Would you like to introduce the agenda or --

LESLEY COWLEY: Sure, I can do that. Thank you, Heather. And good morning, everybody. Lovely to join you again.

We have a list -- those of you who know me will know I always seem to come with a list. We're going to hope to discuss with you the framework of interpretation working group, the ccNSO finance working group. We've done a study. We'd like to share the results of that with you.

We'd like to talk about progress on the study group on the use of names for countries and territories and very much aware that is of interest to GAC colleagues. If we have time, we'd like to briefly then, to conclude, talk about priorities for the upcoming year and introduce you to a session we're going to be running in Prague as a sort of induction to the ccNSO. Thank you.

So, without further ado, we will begin with the framework of interpretation working group.

EN

KEITH DAVIDSON:	Good morning. My name is Keith Davidson, and I'm the chair of the framework of interpretation working group. I have a slide, which is just being loaded now. Just to -- I'll run through a few slides to have background of this working group, but it is a working group established by the ccNSO, but it has a number of representatives from the GAC, from -- we have observers from the GNSO and At-Large community. And we have a good number of inputs from ICANN staff and experts. So it's a diverse and large working group. And -- and -- no, that's not the presentation.

And the framework of interpretation working group grew from a former working group, the delegations and redelegations working group, which looked at aspects of delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs and reported back that there were a number of issues surrounding those delegations and redelegations that deserved further consideration. So the framework of interpretation was to provide a -- some depth and color to the existing policies and guidelines for delegations and redelegations.

Can the presentation be loaded?

Okay.

The framework of interpretation working group has been working through a set of topics, which I'll refer to as chapters, I think, is maybe the easiest way. So, rather than trying to do a single report at the end of our working group, we divided our work into themes.

Thank you, next slide.

A number of themes. And so today we'll look at where we are with those individual chapters.

Now, other than that, I'll give a quick update on the activities that we've undertaken since the last meeting and what we're doing here as well.

Next slide, please. So the scope of the working group is looking at RFC1591 and the GAC principles as the only substantive policies and guidelines applicable for delegations and redelegations. As I said, the framework is intended to add color and depth to existing policies and guidelines. And out of scope for this working group is changing applicable policies or guidelines.

And also the IANA functions contract.

Next slide, please. The normal process we follow is the working group prepares a draft, interpretation, on a topic. We undertake a public consultation period. The working group then reviews the inputs received from the consultation and we prepare a final report.

Next slide, please. The process that we use is that we're seeking support from the GAC and ccNSO communities. We certainly appreciate the GAC response on the first chapter relating to consent. And we are looking forward to GAC's response in the near future on our second chapter as to significantly interested parties. And, when we have that set of approvals on final chapters, we intend to submit them to the ICANN board and, you know, confirming that we have support from the GAC and the ccNSO and what the recommendations of that report will require for changes to the IANA processes.

Next slide, please.

The topics we have identified to interpret is. Firstly, consent and what that might mean as it relates to delegations and redelegations requests significant interested parties or local Internet community and so on. And we're currently -- that chapter is out for public consultation. We're currently working on revocation or unconsented redelegations and what the definition and color and depth of that topic is.

Then our next stage is to produce a terminology paper or a glossary of terms so that there will be a consistent language used in the report of future delegations and redelegations. And, finally, our last chapter

would be recommendations for IANA reports on delegations and redelegations. And we really can't start that work until all the other work is complete. Next slide, please.

Next slide.

Okay. Activities since ICANN Dakar: We've met seven times by teleconference. We've published a progress report just prior to this meeting. We've published a public consultation on significantly interested parties. We've published our final report on consent. And we're currently working on the topic of revocation.

Next slide, please.

Now, the status of our chapter 1 on consent is that no comments were received during the public consultation period. The GAC then provided comments, which we found very helpful. And we noted that those comments supported the recommendations of the consent document and suggested some improvements, which we're grappling with, as to how we can best accommodate those suggestions. So we will handle those suggestions in upcoming work within the working group. And, most importantly today, we are seeking the GAC's approval on its final on consent.

We -- just timing-wise, this is one of the difficulties of an ICANN meeting. But the ccNSO council doesn't meet until later this afternoon. But I'm anticipating that the ccNSO council will provide its stamp of approval at that point. And we're hopeful that, perhaps even by the end of this week, we might be in a position to be submitting on behalf of GAC and ccNSO to the ICANN board our -- this agreed final draft.

An example of some of the recommendations in the consent document is up on the screen, things as elementary as IANA should report back to the GAC and ccNSO at each ICANN meeting on the plan and progress to date of implementing these recommended guidelines. So, if you're

EN

interested, go and have a look at these. But, you know, it's, basically, about process and procedure and reporting.

Next slide, please.

Significantly interested parties is our chapter 2. As I said, we've finished our work in January. And we have that document out for public consultation at the moment.

Next slide, please.

And an example of our recommendation from the significantly interested parties that is probably quite relevant to this group is that identifying or defining interested parties that can include, but are not limited to, the government or territory or authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD and any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others that have direct, material, substantial, legitimate, and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLDs, including the incumbent manager.

Next slide, please.

At this meeting we -- the working group will be meeting tomorrow -- and I believe it is in this room, but I will be confirming that on the working group list and then asking the working group to advise the constituencies of the actual room.

The main focus of the working group's meeting tomorrow is the topic of revocation and what was meant in RFC1591 by how a ccTLD would be revoked. And part of that is looking at misbehavior as it's defined in 1591 and what IANA stepping in to correct misbehavior might mean. So these are fairly substantive topics and need substantive debate.

So, if you have an interest in these aspects of delegations and redelegations, please come along to the meeting. As always, observers

are welcome. And, if we are able to progress the work of the working group, we welcome observers' participation as well.

Next slide, please.

And there's a link to the working group, the location of the reports, and the -- my e-mail address. And I'm the chair of the working group. Bernie Turcotte is the -- is contracted by ICANN to provide support for the working group. And his e-mail address there also. So, if you have any specific questions you want to address offline, please do that. And, with that, I conclude the report and ask the GAC to consider its approval of our consent document.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that, Keith. I'm looking to New Zealand who is the GAC lead on this topic. So please, New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Heather.

I -- I don't really have anything to add to what Keith said. GAC members will recall that on Monday I circulated an e-mail outlining the need for formal consent for the document but, in principle, recognizing that the GAC has some difficulties dealing with chapter by chapter cases such as this. But, in order to facilitate the work of the group to give, in principle, consent to this document at least would assist with that process.

And, as Keith said, we circulated a reaction, a comment on the paper. I referred to that in the e-mail I sent. The main issue, the recommendation, was that there should be some time limit set for -- where one party doesn't respond to a request. And the working party has suggested that, given that their job is interpretation, not creation of a new policy, that it would be open to the GAC itself to develop that new policy, or for any other group for that matter, to do it in a custom fashion.

I've made an error. And my apologies for that. I referred to the principles for delegations and redelegations, and I apologize for any confusion that caused. I should have referred to the principles for the delegation and administration of country code top-level domains. So, if any of you are struggling with what I was referring to, that is the document which, of course, is the current position of the GAC on those -- on the issue of delegation of -- and there is, I think, reference in there to redelegation as well of country code top-level domains. At any event, I wanted to draw to your attention that mistake. I've actually sent an e-mail out, and my humble apologies for that error. Thanks.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, New Zealand. Are there any comments from GAC colleagues or questions? Okay.

Seeing none, can we move to the next topic?

LESLEY COWLEY: We can. Does that mean you're happy with that one then?

HEATHER DRYDEN: New Zealand? We're being asked a question about whether we can support the consent final report and SIP interim report, I believe. Oh, just the consent. Okay.

NEW ZEALAND: Well, yes. I take it that, in this case, the absence of objection is consent. Isn't that usually --

LESLEY COWLEY: We were kind of hoping that, Frank. But we thought we'd better check.

NEW ZEALAND: Do you want me to object?

LESLEY COWLEY:	Not really.

NEW ZEALAND:	I don't really feel inclined to do so. Perhaps we should point out that, in fact, by silence it is consent in terms of consensus. And, if there are no further comments, I think it would be taken that we have given approval in principle. We can't go further than that at this point, but that would be the conclusion that anybody would have the right to draw on that. And I guess we'll reflect that in our -- in our communique. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:	Excellent. Very much appreciated. Okay.

So, moving on, we have the outcome from the ccNSO finance working group. Apologies to ccNSO colleagues. We ask for your patience, because I know you've heard this presentation a couple of times this week. But, knowing the high level of interest in the GAC on all things financial and the ccNSO comments on the financial matters, we thought it would be very relevant to share it with you. I'm going to hand it over with that to Byron Holland from CIRA, who is ccNSO vice chair and chair of this working group.

BYRON HOLLAND:	Thank you, Lesley. If we could go to the next slide, please.

The finance working group is looking at the question of ccTLD contributions to ICANN. As I'm sure we all know, it's a voluntary system that we use right now and has been in place for a number of years. The interaction with ICANN suggested that it was time to take a fresh look at it and make sure that the actual contribution model itself was appropriate and, if not, look at other possible options as well as look at the actual dollar value that CCs are contributing and getting a sense of if it's appropriate or not. And, if not, what should it be and how should it be structured.

So that's the fundamental task of the working group. There are three real themes of work associated with it.

The first was actually looking at different types of models, which we have done. The next piece was actually getting a concrete sense of what CCs are doing right now in terms of contributions, hard cash contributions, as well as others. And then the third piece, of course, is looking at ICANN and looking at their expenses and what they suggest are expenses associated with supporting the ccNSO and trying to get a clear understanding of that so we have a sense of what we're actually aiming at.

So those are the three fundamental blocks of work that we've looked at. As part of this, we did a research piece, a hard research survey that was sent out to all ccTLDs and, in fact, to everyone in the IANA database. All 255 of them.

We had -- of the 255, I'll just remind you that there are 126 inside the ccNSO, which, of course, is the group that we're working with and speaking on behalf of. And out of that population we had 55 respondents to a very detailed and in-depth survey. So we were quite satisfied in terms of the response that we received. I just want to point out that it is a -- there is a bias to this survey. And I don't use that in a negative word. But, given that it's a self-selected voluntary survey, it's not a randomized survey. So it gives us good guidance, but it is not necessarily statistically significant across all CCs. It certainly is statistically significant of the 55 who participated. I just wanted to make that clear.

We certainly found some interesting themes that came out and some initial findings.

If we can go to the next slide.

I think that one thing that's very interesting is what ICANN perceives they're delivering. And on the slide here we have a number of sort of

core themes that they believe they're delivering to us. Of course, first and foremost, is the IANA function but also local presence, engagements, and capacity building type activities, policy work, fast track, et cetera.

If we go to the next slide, next slide, then get a sense of the view that CCs take which, you know, in the vernacular is we run our own shop, we develop and implement our own policies, create and manage our own compliance environment, and certify and manage our registrars or the channel of distribution for our domains. And, of course, we run our own WHOIS and all of the associated policies around that.

So I think what was interesting here is there is, right out of the gate, a divergence of what ICANN believes they're delivering and what the CC community believes they need or are receiving. If we go to the next slide, I think it's highlighted here.

This is a bit of an eye-buster chart. I wouldn't suggest we need to read every line item. But what it shows is what are the actual services -- and that's a list on the left -- that CCs are consuming from ICANN. And, if you look at the red bars, the top one there is the IANA function. And you can see that all the CCs are using that. As you can also see, it starts to quickly tail off in terms of the services that we're using, with many of those services only being consumed by less than 20% of the community and less. So short story there is a few important services are being consumed, and few of us are using many of the others.

Next slide.

This is the same data but broken down by size of registry or number of domains under management between over a million, 100,000 to a million or less than 100,000.

And you can see that it generally follows the pattern. When we looked at the data, you know, at the underlying data -- if we go to the next slide -- our first finding is -- and probably not surprising, but the data

supports it -- is that the CCs that use the least amount of ICANN services make the largest financial contributions.

In discussion with the workgroup and through the community, I think it's important to note here that, generally speaking, those that are making those large contributions are okay with that. And I think that's important to note. Little more color here. If we go to the next slide, again, we don't want to necessarily spend time looking at this. But this breaks it down in further detail in terms of the size of the registry and the average contributions being made, which supports some of the underlying data that we just presented. The important thing here is -- a couple different types of contribution methods. Fundamentally, there is some kind of document in place, anywhere from simply an exchange of letters, framework agreement, MoUs, up to what we'd call a full contract. And then there are voluntary contributions where there is nothing in place. And, really, what this is saying is that the contribution method doesn't particularly dictate the size of the contribution. Next slide.

Again, breaking this down a little further, what we see is that those registries that are larger and have been around longer in the ICANN environment, that is, tend to have a higher average contribution rate.

So, again, probably no surprise there. But here we bear it out with the data. And I think it is actually important.

Next slide. We also looked at how else is the CC community contributing? Hard cash costs, but also how else do we contribute? The majority of us are here participating more than two times a year, regardless of whether we are under formal contract or not. Next slide. And we -- I think this is another important one, particularly in light of the cash component that really doesn't get spoken about but is very material in terms of funding ICANN activities. And that's who has hosted and how many CCs have hosted the ICANN event. Obviously, we're here. Dot cr has done a great job. I can tell you from personal experience, dot ca is hosting the Toronto meeting. So we're in the thick

of planning and, dare I say, writing checks to support that. This gives you a sense, in the bottom right -- and this is the average. Those on agreement here are spending on average $274,000 -- these are all U.S. dollar figures -- to support their hosting activities. Those not under agreement on average are spending $119,000. If we go to the next slide. Just breaks it down a little further so you can see that there are -- next slide -- that there are also a number of registries supporting the ICANN events that are funding over $300,000 to support an ICANN event. We're doing it three times a year. So it's certainly very material, financial, pure financial contribution to the ICANN ecosystem.

Next slide.

Finding number 2 -- and we've just teased out a couple of the elements that support this -- that the financial contribution of a cc is independent of any formal arrangement between ICANN and the ccTLD. Or, in statistical terms, there's no correlation between financial contribution and formal arrangement. And, again, I think that's an important finding.

Next slide.

This gives us a sense of the contribution methods between voluntary or some type of formal or some combination thereof. Because, as I've said, there are quite a range of instruments in place, anywhere from nothing to a full contract and a handful of different methods in between. But the majority have some type of instrument in place.

Next slide.

Those who are contributing purely on a voluntary basis, no real instrument in place, on average, are contributing $25,000 to the ICANN process, on average per CC. This doesn't take into account the size of the CC. This is across the entire group. Next slide.

This just shows that those with a formal agreement on average are contributing $22,000. Next slide. Finding number 3 is that the CC

financial contributions disclosed by ICANN are materially less than the actual financial and non-financial contributions made by the CC community.

Next slide.

So, just in sum, those were the core findings that we came away with. We've only received all of the data, really, at the end of last week. The financial working group has literally only had one meeting to work through it. But we felt it was very important, given the nature of this discussion in the community that, as soon as possible, we were able to come to the table at least with our preliminary insights and share it with the community. There's, obviously, far more data behind this which we will be making available after we've had our first real go at it. But we will be making it publicly available. And I think that right now ICANN publishes a figure that we, as a community, have made cash contributions directly to ICANN between approximately $1.7 million. But, even just in the hosting of an ICANN event, we're contributing another, on average, three quarters of a million dollars. So CCs are making considering cash contributions into the ICANN ecosystem that are not really being reflected.

I'd like to make a couple other comments. In the data that we showed -- but perhaps we went by the charts faster than it was noticeable -- there are about 20% of CCs who are not contributing. And that's certainly a concern. We don't want free riders here. But, inevitably, like any ecosystem, there are going to be some free riders. And we don't know what reasons that folks aren't contributing. So there are many -- there are many CCs who are not in a position to make material contributions at this stage in their development. And, again, back to finding one, those who are in a position to make material contributions, we're okay with that. And I think that that lifecycle element -- and we showed that chart about maturity of a TLD and participating in the ICANN ecospace, leads to increased contributions. So it's part, I think, of an evolution and a lifecycle there.

And I think the final point that I'd like to make is that the ccNSOs -- only 126 members out of a 255 CC universe -- and it's important to note that that we're only speaking on behalf or for the ccNSO landscape.

Thank you very much.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that presentation. That was very informative about truly how the contributions work and the survey you conducted. It's quite thorough. So I commend that.

So do colleagues from the GAC have any questions or observations on this topic of contributions to ICANN?   No, we're quite quiet this morning. U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, good morning, everybody.   And thanks very much for that really very informative presentation.   It's very interesting to see that -- the survey results.

I wasn't clear if it was coming through what ICANN's approach is in terms of developing services for CCs. For example, capacity building. Is that extent of provision going up, developing in a way that you support? Or what's situation, generally, with regard to capacity building?   And how do you feel, generally, about that side of the equation, if you like? Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think we've had an interesting dialogue with ICANN in terms of how do they provide services and what do they provide. And I think there's a really interesting visual metaphor here, if I could just share. If you look at the report right now that ICANN has actually just recently published on all additional budget requests -- I believe there's 39 of them -- and the community that they come from, not a single one comes from the ccNSO community. Not one. So, as a visual metaphor, I think that's an interesting representation.   The dialogue that the CC community has

typically had -- and my colleagues will correct me, if I'm wrong or add other color -- has been asking senior management how do we actually take services off? What is the process to do that? Because we're being delivered services whether or not we're asking for them. And some of them, very, very few people are using.

That's a comment more on how the services come to us.

In terms of capacity building, I think there's an important role there for ICANN, but it isn't clear to me how they decide which capacity-building services they want to deliver and who they are delivering them to. We have certainly asked that, and as I mentioned at the outset, we continue to await the financial data from ICANN.

So it's difficult for us to really answer that question in a meaningful way.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for that clarification, Byron.

Are there any other -- Italy, please.

ITALY: Okay. Thank you, Chair.

There is an evaluation of ICANN, of how much is in percentage of their budget, the contribution they gave to ccNSO. And there is a discrepancy.

Just looking at the global figures of the ICANN budget and then the contribution of ccTLDs, the contribution of 1.7 is in the frame of a little bit less than 3%.

And how is the evaluation of ICANN about what they give inside on the budget, and there is a convergence of these figures?

BYRON HOLLAND: And I probably didn't make the point, which I should. There's a general acknowledgment in the CC community that 1.7 is probably not the right number; that there should be some more material contribution. The challenge for is us we don't actually have a target yet. ICANN says a number but then doesn't support it with any kind of detail.

And I'm not -- you know, as operators, I'm not looking to get ahold of their chart of accounts, but they have to do better than four, five categories if they want to bill the community $10 million, which is what they're suggesting.

We continue to await that detail.

Once we have that and we actually can look at what is being provided, is it reasonable, but is it actually being consumed? Because it's one thing to say it's being provided, but is it actually being consumed? And that's the discrepancy. But there is a willingness, I believe, to make that contribution more significant, but we need the right target to start with.

LESLEY COWLEY: If I can just answer that. From financial year 2009-2010 and financial year 2010 to '11, there was a 25.6% increase in recorded ccNSO contributions.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

Next I have Norway.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you. And thank you for this thorough and informative presentation.

I also want to say that it would be very useful for us to get access to this more detailed information from these 55 respondents, so also so we can sort of make this independent evaluation of the financial situation

and compare that from the GAC side towards the information provided by ICANN.

So if that can be -- You mentioned that, that that could be provided, made available for the GAC. So that would be very useful.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: We will be making it publicly available in relatively short order. As I said, it's hot off the press for us and so as the working group we want to wrestle with it a little bit longer, but then we will be making it available to all.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Singapore, please.

SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chair.

We would also like to thank the ccNSO for sharing with us this very detailed survey. Thanks for the effort.

I just want to know, after the survey, is there any further action contemplated by the ccNSO, whether with respect to ICANN or internally?

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: The original goal, the timeline was that by the Toronto meeting in October, we would be in a position to make recommendations to the ccNSO in terms of the model and suggested contributions.

We have to bear in mind this is a voluntary group, so the ccNSO does not have billing power. We can make recommendations, and that was our intent to do so for Toronto.

As I said, there are three main chunks of work. We have done what would I call our two that we can control. We await the data from ICANN to finish the third.

At this point, I have some concern about our ability to meet our original timeline, which was Toronto. We may be, we may not be. But it depends on when we get ICANN's data.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that, Byron.

I think we be move to the next topic on our agenda.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Heather. That was an update on progress from the study group on the use of names for countries and territories, for which I would like to introduce Paul Szyndler who of course is known to you as a previous GAC colleague.

PAUL SZYNDLER: Good morning, everybody. Greetings from the antipodes, both literally and geographically within this room.

My name is Paul Schindler. I am general manager of international and government affairs for auDA and I will start by saying it's always a pleasure to be back in this room, especially with the added comfort of having a turncoat -- I mean, former CC colleague sitting at the right hand of the chair now in a position I am so familiar with.

I will try to be both brief, concise and expansive on the work of this study group because I am aware we haven't provided much briefing to segments of the community previously, and it is an area that is of

interest to many GAC members. And on top of that, we are getting to a couple of action points now which will be particularly of significance to GAC members, and I will highlight them as we come to that.

Next slide, please.

Just very briefly about the group. We were established by the ccNSO Council in December 2010. That's not to suggest that there's been a year and a half's activity. It probably took us about six months to find our footing, determine our purpose and scope and commence our activities.

The time since has been spent commencing that work, and now we're comfortable we are at a point where we can begin reporting on it.

The group was established with the acknowledgment that studies required across the ICANN community to better understand how we use country and territory nails. We use them a lot. There have been issues in the past. There will be more issues in the future. And we could all benefit from a greater collective understanding what have those issues might be.

And broadly speaking, the response -- the output expected of the group is to provide the ccNSO Council, and then also to advise the broader community, of what issues there might be. We will provide an overview.

Next slide, please.

Now, the group's work is divided into three areas, and the first is looking at the current and proposed policy and procedural landscape. So by that I mean the policies by which ccTLDs are delegated and redelegated, the new gTLDs process, IDNs, et cetera. Anything that has referred to country and territory names. So we have taken stock of what is and what has been.

The second step, now that we have put that aside for the time being, is to look at the different representations of countries and territories, how do they see themselves represented within international fora within ICANN and outside of ICANN, how a country and territory name is used. That is the work we are undertaking at the moment, and that is why we have started the process of liaising with stakeholders.

And the third step is basically to map the two together. So we take the policies that are there, we take the country and territory names, and when we mesh them in there, what do we see? Are there any gaps? Are there any problems? Are there any inconsistencies? Are there any eventualities that we didn't foresee which would result in what could potentially be called problems?

Next slide, please.

Every time I present this, I always point out this is my favorite slide. This is what we don't do. This was particularly calming for the GNSO, I suspect.

We're not in the business of defining what is and is not a ccTLD, and we're certainly not going to intervene in the first round of the new gTLD process. That was particularly pertinent a few months ago as we got moving in our work. It's self-evident now. But roughly speaking, our goal is to provide some input in advance of the second round of new gTLDs. And to that end, nobody knows when that will be, but the study a group must work towards an expectation of delivering something by the end of this year, because in a perfect world, we could be into round two early next year.

We're also not about judging previous policy approaches. To suggest that there are gaps or inconsistencies isn't making a judgment. Again, it's just make studied statement of fact. And we are not about making recommendations for additional protections for country and territory names.

And finally, we are definitely not about developing a definitive recommendation for how they should be treated across the ICANN community.

This is our work plan and schedule, and as I said we have developed a preliminary policy overview.

We are now working on a typology which we are also calling a survey. This is the area which I really want to focus on because it's of relevance to GAC members.

It is a survey that's being undertaken under the auspices of UNESCO with thanks to former GAC chair Janis Karklins. UNESCO, through the agreement with ICANN, have agreed to circulate this survey out to their member states or some of their member states. And please consider this briefing as a heads up, as it were, that your colleagues in government, both on UNESCO side and then whatever units of government look after geographic names, will be contacted about this and they may independently approach you and say is this valid, is this worthwhile, do you recognize this process.

After this we will then go into the substantive discussions of the issues we expect to find, and we'll continue doing so, reporting and consulting with the community, again, with the aim of reporting at the end of 2012.

Next slide, please.

Now the survey itself is something that we've stressed all along is just a tool for gathering information. And when I get into some of the categories a little bit later on it will become clear why we have to be so adamant that it is just a tool and it is necessarily expansive in nature. So we are asking a lot of questions about what types of country and territory name representations are used.

There will be clear caveats that no inferences should be drawn about the possible use -- about any sort of possible uses or protections that may arise from the questions we ask.

Also an initial survey. We are testing the process. Do the questions that we ask member states of UNESCO make sense of them. And if not, we'd like to refine that and hopefully get that back to a second survey that would go out to UNESCO, to a broader group of members. And most importantly, we repeatedly ask for examples and citations of claims within the survey. That's a methodological issue. It is very easy for a whole list of country and territory names come back to us. We would like to see those mapped back to where they are used in international fora, what organizations uses them, what list they appear on.

Next slide, please.

Again, UNESCO agreed to help us back in September 2011. It's taken the time since then for us to work out what we want them to do.

The study group will be working out what questions are in there and that's finalized. We will probably have a very final discussion on that tomorrow.

States will be selected in consultation with UNESCO, and they will be both geographically and linguistically diverse. So we try to get as broad a sample as possible.

And the survey will also go out to the wider ICANN community. We will approach colleagues within ALAC, those that are well connected with NGOs back in their countries. They may themselves or they may know someone who is an authoritative source on this information within their country.

It would be inappropriate for us to limit our survey simply to member states of UNESCO, and, therefore, the survey will be made available both for comment and for input from members of the community.

Next slide, please.

There's a lot on that one because I have summarized what was ten slides in my working group down into one, but this gives you at least a good summary of the questions we will be asking. That is the ten of them. Starting with the very easy ones, what is your country name in ISO 3166-1 alpha 2. We know the answers that we will receive, but we give them a nice, gentle question to start with.

And similarly, we will expand into what is your country code's representation on the alpha 3 list. And to that end, I was quite expansive in comments to the GNSO about this is not meant to be -- I have used the term "land grab" before. It's not meant to be an expansion of where CCs currently sit. It is relevant to ask the question.

Everybody knows that a certain dominant gTLD is also a country code for Comoros. So it's just a statement of what is; that gTLDs and country code representations have coexisted for a number of years. That's not necessarily a problem. We just want to get some evidence, some examples, as many as we can of where that coexistence is.

And then we will basically work through other examples, such as common abbreviations and acronyms. The ISO list is not consistently used everywhere. The IOC, for example, have their own list and runners from Barbados will be running under BAR not BRB in London.

So there may be other abbreviations that aren't captured in the ISO list. And then we're into other terms such as the long form name. We're hesitant to use the term "official name" because that has no meaning in some countries. But, roughly speaking, the long form name, the short form name, and then how they would represent themselves in the six official languages of the U.N. And as part of the explanatory memoranda that's going out with the survey, we provide some guidance as to areas where that may be difficult and where they may find this information.

Then we start getting a little more expansive. We start taking respondents away from thinking about how they would represent themselves to how they would represent other country and territory names. By that I mean the other 20, 25 countries that participate in the survey will be identified to each other, and they will then be asked how they represent those countries in their language or languages.

And then we have also included some other important ones such as commonly used local names. This is where Holland would be captured as part of the survey process. And also how their country or territory is represented in minority or indigenous languages.

Again, for each of these there is quite a lengthy explanatory note making clear what we mean when we use terms like designated language or official language, et cetera.

And then finally is the catchall. I would be very hesitant to put this as a first question because we could get a massive response, but "other" representations. Is there anything that we have not asked you about in the survey that you use to describe your country or territory. Hopefully respondents as they have worked through the process of the survey will begin thinking in the way we are and hopefully we will get some interesting responses there.

Next slide, please.

So the next steps. And the first one is the distribution of the survey. And as I said the questions of the study group are pretty much finalized. What we'll now do immediately after this meeting is go away and develop a progress report. So that will be sort of a consultative mechanism that will go out to the ICANN community.

Once the survey is finalized, and that means a little bit more discussion with UNESCO as to what format they are comfortable with, given that they are assisting us in circulating this, and it will then go out to the community here just so that they are aware of where the a group has

gotten to. And then, therefore, GAC members will also be able to see the survey in detail, even though that was the ten categories.

This will all be happening sort of within the next few months, so again, time wise, it is happening now, and I just wanted everyone to be aware of that and beyond that we will continue our briefing. We will consider what comes in as part of the new gTLDs process. It will be fascinating to move from the theoretical to the actual, to see if there's something that arises that will be of interest to us. Summarize the survey. Possibly go out and survey further. And then draft a draft report and a final report at the end of the year.

End there. I am over time, but thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much, Paul, for that overview.

A question for you, then.

As the survey is being carried out by UNESCO, that means that member states would be responding via that channel so that most GAC members would be -- would be -- that's how that engagement would happen. I think that's probably the question for GAC members, is what do GAC members do in light of your presentation. So....

PAUL SZYNDLER: Yes, thank you, Heather. We have left the mechanisms for consultation up to UNESCO. They have been very gracious with their time, input, and advice for the best mechanisms for them.

What they will do is send this out via notification directly to 20 representatives, 20, 25 representatives in UNESCO. So, yes, the GAC members will not necessarily be aware of that communication, but it will also go out via a newsletter that goes out to everyone who looks at country indicators within UNESCO.

Therefore, anyone else who sees it, any other member state, is also welcome to respond. There will be at least 20 or 25 that will do the survey.

Other than that, I suspect the mechanisms will be a coordinated awareness-raising effort here within this community. That is, once we are nearing the finalization of our consultations with UNESCO we will come back to this group, we will come through the chair just to let you know that that has happened.

It's not for direct member -- direct input of GAC members, but perhaps through your own mechanisms you may be able to identify, or again, we can all work with UNESCO to identify who is providing those responses. And there's an opportunity for intersection there; just not a formal mechanism for GAC input at this stage. It will go to the bodies that are responsible for geographic names in each constituency.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

                          Italy, please.

ITALY: Thank you, Chair.

                          My question is about the scope, let's say. Not immediate scope.

                          I think that this study -- this is very, very interesting and should be also food for the new gTLDs; in particular, the geographic gTLDs. And, of course, all these considerations that you described are very important just to start making an idea, because we don't know how many, which sort of new gTLDs will be called and so on.

                          Then my question is what is the aim after finishing this study? To elaborate sort of best practices? Because of course country codes are

relatively independent -- are independent, without "relatively," to treat geographic names in the countries that they represent.

And I understand from your speech that you think that coupling also the factor of the new gTLDs might encourage country codes then to have some more homogenization in treating geographic names in their country.

Is this the scope, the idea?

PAUL SZYNDLER: In a way we have a luxury of being labeled a study group, not a working group. Therefore, it's our responsibility to be studious, to be as expansive as possible in how we consider and how we discuss country and territory names.

It's not within the scope and purpose of the working group to come back with recommendations or advice on how the community collectively should proceed. It will be -- Our final output will be a report and largely a statement of what is. So that mapping that I described between how country names are have been used in ICANN previously and what country names are out there, and that's largely where our work stops.

From that point we can make the observation that there may be additional work that needs to be done, and we would report to the ccNSO Council accordingly, and then it would be up to the council. And of course our final report is circulated to other constituencies, but it would then with to the council to determine what subsequent work may come out of this.

Does it then mean a formal -- it wouldn't necessarily lead to a policy process but would there be a more formal working group that would look at this in greater detail.

We are at the point of gathering the evidence and improving a shared understanding of the issues. We speak of them in examples in the hallways and after hours, but we will have a better understanding of what's out there, and that's really where our mandate ends.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that.

                               Nauru.

NAURU: Thank you, Chair.

                               Just a small query. I have posited this query at various forums and the feedback I got was more or less it was a gray area.

                               And my question is I know that you have stated that you do not determine what is and what isn't a ccTLD. Therefore, my question is who actually owns a TLD? Can I as government lay claim to a TLD as a national asset, foreign asset -- sovereign asset? Thank you.

PAUL SZYNDLER: I think I might have two minutes, not two hours.

                               That is a certainly more expansive discussion for outside of this group, but, as I said, we don't talk about what is a ccTLD, what isn't, and what is or is not a territory and country. That, to an extent, will be identified by the survey respondents themselves. But then, of course, from our perspective, we start with our understanding of countries and territories from ISO 3166-1. That is where ccTLDs come from. So that is our base understanding.

                               And then issues of delegation, redelegation, and sovereign rights are perhaps something we will continue discussion with Keith afterwards, I'm certain.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for that clarification, Paul.

                          We are close to going over time. I see the U.K. asking for the floor.

                          Did you have a question? And then we can move on.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks. I hope it will be very brief, but I wonder if you have an example
                          of a problem that you have identified where perhaps the GAC
                          representative, if it is a GAC country, a country where there is a GAC
                          member, with assist or where we would usefully engage?

                          Could you give a quick example, perhaps? Has something emerged?

                          Thanks.

PAUL SZYNDLER: I don't know whether I should take Annabeth's example or give her the
                          floor for a moment to give one.

                          Would you be comfortable giving your example with Norway? Not so
                          much a problem, but how it could end up as a -- Perhaps I'll do it.

                          It is possible Norvege (phonetic) and Norway and how they could end
                          up.

>>   I'm not sure what examples you want, Paul.

PAUL SZYNDLER: That's all right. Leave it to me. We had discussions previously about
                          whether a particular linguistic representation of a name as characters in
                          it would see it, non- -- A non-Latin character that would see it as part of
                          the IDN process and through that would become a ccTLD?

>>   I see what you mean. So as it is is that, for example, in Norway, Norway would be only with Latin letters, and then it will easily fall under the gTLD process if we don't have rules for it. But Norvege (phonetic) is according to the IDN definition of what should be an IDN. Because it has the accent over one of the letters, is an IDN. And that will make it more confusing for users than it is today.

                            So that's the background for it.

PAUL SZYNDLER: And though not necessarily a problem, we would observe that one would end up as a ccTLD and one would end up as a gTLD.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that, Paul.

                            So let's continue through the agenda briefly.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. So I have an invitation and a discussion point, but I think we probably need to have the discussion later.

                            So the discussion point is around priorities and GAC and ccNSO priorities for the forthcoming year. And the ccNSO and ccNSO Council have been doing quite a bit of work developing a comprehensive work plan for the ccNSO with the very able assistance of our secretariat. So we can now do you mine maps and project plans and all sorts of things that demonstrate we know what task we have ahead of us and we know we are probably at capacity.

                            And we have been having a conversation about capacity planning and really how we can increase capacity or drop things or get more volunteers involved, et cetera, which I know is a matter that a number. ICANN communities have also been discussing recently.

So the proposal is that we perhaps could have a joint discussion about priorities and shared priorities during Prague. And we'll be happy to share with you the work plan and some of the constraints that we are experiencing.

The second point is, very quickly, an invitation. We, as a result of the ccNSO review, are actioning the points from that review, the recommendations from that review. And we'll be writing to CC managers that are, in effect, the government operated ccTLD managers to invite them to be engaged in the work of the ccNSO, if they're not ready, and are planning to do an induction which will be open for everyone on the work of the ccNSO also in Prague. That's my update. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much, for planting those seeds with us. That seems like a good course of action. So let's undertake some preparations and anticipate having those exchanges when we meet in Prague.

I think, for priorities for the GAC, I do think we need to be paying more attention to the work underway in the framework of interpretation working group. So this is as much a signal for my GAC colleagues as for the ccNSO that this is an area that does have an impact on GAC members. And I think there are a number of issues there where we do need to be paying a fair bit of attention in the future.

And the various presentations that we received today, could we also receive them via e-mail? I think there will be interest in receiving those as well.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. Can I just remind ccNSO colleagues that we now need to do the roof march to our roof terrace out in the back and beyond where we continue our meeting. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much, ccNSO, for meeting with us today, as always. And, for the GAC, we're going to take maybe 15 minutes just to prepare for the next session, and then we will begin again.

Thank you.