Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting

Joint ccNSO/GNSO Council meeting

Monday 8 April 2013 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.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#apr

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Man: The meeting is scheduled to begin at 12:30 and end at 14:00 hours. It's the Joint ccNSO and GNSO Council meeting.

                Here we go.

Jonathan Robinson: Hello everyone. I realized the meeting was and is due to start at 12:30. Just going to give people a couple more minutes to get their food so that we're not excluding anyone who's in the food queue from participating.

                I'm also aware that there are - we're all in a tight schedule. We didn't - we weren't in complete control of the schedule and some of you will at least be focused on meetings that are due to happen towards the end of this meeting or immediately afterwards. So we'll do our best to keep a tight and focused meeting and get on with things within the next couple of minutes.

Lesley Cowley: Okay. So good afternoon everybody. This is the joint meeting of the ccNSO and GNSO Council and we have a number of guests in the room as well.

(Jonathan) and I, as Chair of the GNSO and Chair of the ccNSO, had a conversation about these sessions. And one of the first questions we asked each other was are they useful? Can we justify the time on our schedule? What value are Council members, members of the GNSO and ccNSO, getting from these meetings?

So to start with, I'd like to lodge that question for the start and for us to come back to it at the end, because we have had some good sessions with the GNSO, and we've had some not so good sessions. And I'm sure the GNSO would perhaps say the same.

So for us, the focus is how can we work together? Are these sessions useful? And what can we gain from the sessions that would help us deal with issues with a common interest? So that's the backdrop to this meeting.

So when we've got that question out of the way and said we're going to try in Beijing, we then discussed issues of common interests. What subjects might we want to talk about? And we came up with three topics, and I'm just going to share those with you and then we'll go back to Topic 1.

So first of all, there was the topic about how do each of our supporting organizations decide what we're going to cover? How are we going to provide advice at short notice for example? How do we plan our work and do we have capacity for our work? And how do we schedule our work?

And I know the ccNSO's done quite a bit of work on that lately, and I'm sure the GNSO has too. And we thought maybe we could exchange some ideas on that.

Then we move into two much more meatier items. Number 2 is the impact of gTLD's on ICANN. How significant and impact is there going to be? Are the existing structures and approaches adequate to absorb and deal with that impact?

And then finally, we thought it would be good to talk about global Internet governance. Lots of developments on global Internet governance. How would they impact on ICANN? How will they impact upon the ccNSO and GNSO? How would they impact upon the multistakeholder model? And I'm sure it would be helpful to talk about our shared experiences and perspectives in that regard. Are there any issues on which we could jointly work? Or, are there lessons from that that has gone ahead already?

(Jonathan).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (Leslie). I'll just agree that we did - when we came together and as you said, we - at various points, we've wondered how to either - whether this meeting is necessary or - and if so, how to make best use of it. It was very - it was useful to share through a set of topics that we could consider a superset if you like, and we came out with a draft of three areas of common interest.

I mean, personally, I'm a believer. I think there's something of value. We're under the same broad multistakeholder umbrella together, and I think it's incumbent - or the challenge is for us to make sure that we focus ourselves on areas that are of common interest and don't simply meet for the sake of it.

We've certainly faced a number of challenges as a GNSO Council and in our role as the policy manager within the GNSO, and some of that has been highlighted by this first topic in particular which we've in fact covered in some other forums as well.

So I think it would be perhaps - we might as well go straight into that -- we've got a relatively short time -- and start to talk about that.

I wonder if it's useful, (Leslie), to - if you've got someone who's going to...

Lesley Cowley: Of course.

We've asked Bart Boswinkle to (unintelligible) on this. And at the Council, we're doing quite a bit of work on planning our work and organizing it in such a way that we don't exceed capacity. And Bart Boswinkle can give you the latest update.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Good afternoon.

The ccNSO has appointed a - or the ccNSO Council appointed a study group to balance the workload and capacity, as (Leslie) already said. And one of - or in fact, two of the outcomes relate to managing the workload itself.

The first thing the study group advised to the Council is to establish what is called a triage working group, this triage committee, which will look into all the requests for comments and - yes, especially requests for comments and to deal with them in a systematic way in order to - and in...

And the way they do it is assess the importance of the request, and the importance meaning does it have an impact on the ccTLD unity, ccNSO, or individual ccTLD's? If it has, or it has a high impact, then it will have a high priority. And if it doesn't have a impact, then it will have a low priority.

The second item they will look is urgency of a request, because sometimes these requests come in very late and the ccNSO has a couple of procedures to deal with it. So they - to deal with specific requests ranging from a letter from the Chair which can be done very speedily, up to a PDP which can take in the (extreme case), six years. So there is a whole range.

And including - and that is probably the most valuable one for responses, is a ccNSO statement procedure, which takes around six weeks. So if a request comes in with less than six weeks, then there is already an issue. So the urgency of the request is so high that we can't respond anymore.

So this triage committee - and the third part of what they will look at is the skill sets that needs to be included in say drafting teams, whatsoever, and whether the capacity is available.

Based on that, we will fully attempt it. That will be sent to the Council for adoption within five days. And in that sense, we can start helping the particular persons very rapidly. So that's the first bit. That's being implemented - or will be implemented post-Beijing. That's the triage committee.

The second part of it is the prioritization of the workload itself. And, that's again based on the same criteria as the triage committee will be using. So again, if a new work item will be put on the work list of the ccNSO, first is the assessment of importance. The second one is the urgency. And the third one is capacity needed, and (unintelligible) in capacity available.

If these items are met in they all say high category, then the work item has a high priority, and that's the way we hope that in the future we can manage the workload.

And again this is just a guideline, so there is always room for exceptions, et cetera. And the role of the Council is (ensure) so that it's more intuitive than anything else. But it makes it more visible and explicit than implicit (as it is right now). That's the most important changes.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Bart Boswinkle.

And we can talk at length about that, but it's really a very simple four box matrix that we are calling the Eisenhower Matrix. The word for this week, the Eisenhower Matrix. But it really is assessing is it urgent or not urgent? Important or not important? No real science.

Jonathan Robinson: Any comments or questions on that? It'd be interesting to see if there's any reactions, comments, or questions before making some remarks about - perhaps how we do things in the GNSO Council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, vice-Chair on the GNSO Council.

It seems to be very simple. I would be very happy using your exact title in the GNSO. A simple question, is that how it really works? You know, how it's - is it going? How do you decide what is of importance? What is of less importance? These things.

You know, since we have gone through a very, very detailed development process of a prioritization procedure years ago, as you may know we failed. It was all because our process we tried to implement seemed to be complicated and was not accepted throughout the GNSO.

So - and the question how it works? Your advice please?

Lesley Cowley: We don't know yet. We're happy to come back to - I suspect because it's simple, we will endeavor to make it work. The complicated thing is how you deal with the - all of the various requests, because I don't know about the GNSO, but we find we may have organized our own workload, and then we have requests or input that we were not expecting. Or we were expecting it, but we were not expecting when they were going to come.

And it's then overlaying that on top of the existing workload, which is why we've done a lot in terms of our own capacity, but also project planning work, planning too.

But as a prioritization method, we were aware of the somewhat complex method. And it's probably not the methodology. It's how you apply them.

Jonathan Robinson: Certainly - it's (Jonathan) speaking. Certainly from my perspective,
hearing that was somewhat refreshing. And you'll know the GNSO Council is
at least - this is - links back to an issue which we've discussed yesterday with
the Board and indeed amongst ourselves. Because for us, it's not simply a
logistical challenge of workflow management.

While that's one dimension of the problem, the challenge for us to make sure
that when - and we've had the - we've faced recently a series of shorter-term
requests. And the dynamic that we've been grappling with is a recognition
that we've got a new gTLD program and significant pressure from staff, from
the community to some extent, to implement, to move forward, to not stop
things.

And yet, we have a responsibility to our bottom-up you know a stakeholder
group, community, constituency model which says we need to go back out in
order to do that.

So regardless of how effectively we might plan our work and recognizing that
interrupt-driven phenomena might always be the case, we simply can't turn
around things in short order without compromising the model.

So I think in some ways, it perhaps highlights one of the critical differences.
And whilst you know I'm always receptive, and you know I'm appreciative of
anything that enhances our sort of project management or prioritization
capabilities, that's the challenge we face.

And in fact - I guess I was struck by it as well with Fadi's remarks this
morning on agility, because it's quite clear there's a message there that he's
not a man who's planning on slowing down a whole lot. So we've got to
recognize that somewhere along there, there's a program going very fast, yet
we've got a responsibility as a GNSO Council policy manger, and that
challenge is something very difficult to manage.

(Leslie)?

Lesley Cowley: I think it's relevant to say that that referred to the (six views) for a PDP potentially if you go through every single (site). And we have the case frequently of the IDN and the desire from the ccTLD community to go faster, which is how the fast track came about.

So I think it's quite different if the community wants something to go much faster in the existing process, a way can be found. But, it's important to balance that desire with the finding a quicker process. You won't necessarily want to do that for everything. We can't all go at the same speed on everything. And again, this is where the need to prioritize and plan will come in.

But what I'm saying is we - where the community wanted to go faster is easier than to do with a different process that the PDP process.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Just to respond briefly to that - and I'd love to hear from anyone else on this. But my - it's (Jonathan) again. My comment would be that I didn't in any way mean to suggest a lack of thoroughness on your part versus ours. It's just that we - well, there's certain procedural/structural constraints that we need to work with, and we're very mindful of that.

Because let's face it; there is a broader perspective on the work of the GNSO Council and its role of - and policy development within the GNSO that is seen to be - I'm not going to mince my words. It's seen to be cumbersome, pedantic.

And we talked this through quite thoroughly and with really some quite interesting outcomes I felt with the Board yesterday as to you know this challenge of words like - we dealt with a concept of whether policy needs to

stalemate. And in fact, some of Councilors I think very adequately and eloquently explained that a stalemate wasn't necessarily a negative outcome. So there's some quite hard work being done there.

And I don't mean to sit in a position of justifying working slowly or without priority, but it's just in that context, one needs to look at it in the round.

(Peta) and then I think if there are no other comments in this area, we'll pick up on the next topic. So let's hear from (Peta) and then perhaps move on.

Peter Rindforth: Well, just a general note that in fact many of the issues to be discussed within the GNSO relates to work that has been done or should have been considered in many ccTLD's, and especially those that also (advertise) so that at least use this generic, but is now (TV), et cetera.

And also, some of the new gTLD's (are geographic) or related to specific regions or cities - a city code. How that is shorted as a ccTLD, no? And in short, we have much to learn from each other in a number of common issues.

And I think we can both work more effective if we could share some of the experiences when issues come up. I mean, we have some - then we have to put it on to our respective groups to work further with. But some of the basic work may not be done twice.

So if we can come up with some way to notify each other on what has already been done and discussed, and it's out there on the market news, maybe we can actually, both groups, work more effective.

Lesley Cowley: Just to respond to the (city name) points. It's very clear that the whether they be city names, or geographic regions, or lands, or whatever are in the gTLD policy. Very clear.

Peter Rindforth: Yes. I think I understood your comment better to be not one so much of which
                     policy regime they sit on. It's really a matter of that certain policies may have
                     been developed to deal with specific issues and there may be some fast track
                     (unintelligible).

Lesley Cowley: I apologize. Indeed. I think the issue with these is the policies would've been
                     developed often using a multistakeholder model on a national level, and
                     therefore will differ from one nation to another. So we don't have a common
                     policy on disputes for example. Many territories will have similarities, but we'll
                     deal with them differently. And a lot of the work we do in the ccNSO is not
                     developing policy; it's about sharing what others are doing and not
                     reinventing the wheel every time.

                     But by all means, we're happy to share.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes?

Lesley Cowley: Okay.

                     So moving on to Question 2, the impact of gTLD's on ICANN structure. How
                     significant are the number of new gTLD's and the number of new gTLD-
                     related participants? How's that going to work with the existing structures and
                     approaches? Are they adequate to absorb and deal with efficiently and
                     effectively what's coming?

Jonathan Robinson: I suppose I've heard two reactions to this. One is that - well, let's wait and
                     see what the impact is? And there's the other, which is for goodness sake,
                     let's get organized before the impact hits. I don't know if anyone would like to
                     make any comments about this or if there's any particular work that's being
                     done.

                     I know within the stakeholder group that I represent as a counselor we
                     certainly anticipated this from a registry's point of view. And as you are - most

of you are probably well aware, there is a group being formed within the registry stakeholder group which has been very active in forming an umbrella for new TLD applicants. So that's one way in which we sort of prepared the ground for working. But I don't know if there are - if there's been initiatives elsewhere.

Clearly, this is primarily a GNSO issue because these are - in many ways, in the gTLD, that's what it's all about. But of course, we're all - we're here under the auspices of ICANN. So to the extent that that impact is felt, it's interesting to know what concerns there are or what preparatory work has been done or should be being done.

Any comments, or thoughts, or input on that?

Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Yes. Thomas Rickert, Nominating Committee Appointee. I guess at the GNSO level, we have to make a distinction between what's for the Council to discuss in terms of impact and work for the individual groups that are represented in the GNSO. And it is my understanding, although I'm not a representative of any of these groups, that a lot of these groups are actually planning ahead to be ready when the new players enter the scene.

I think however that as a Council, and I think that's also in the interest of the ccNSO. We need to closely monitor and maybe anticipate what the impact on the ecosystem as such might be. We see that new groups might be established. You know, new constituencies might be formed which will lead to more Councilors that will have an impact on the voting mechanisms.

We will also potentially see players that are registries but also registrars that are business users, so they would fit into the BC. They might be trademark owners and also fit into the IPC. So how are they - where will they move and

how will they impact on the respective groups and the outcomes of their decision making?

And this is where the ccNSO comes into play. A lot of the ccTLD operators being crowded in this room or represented in this room have entered the (G) space already by providing registry services or even being applicants.

And so I guess the question that we need to ask ourselves is to what extent (is) the demarcation on certain topics more or less becoming artificial? Or should we talk topic-wise, or you know special things that are not that much in the (G) versus cc space, but that are you know common interests of let's say operators?

Lesley Cowley: Okay.

So I need to say that that's a very prickly comment to the ccNSO because we have had (G) operators operating (C)'s for quite some time and have absorbed them in the ccNSO community with no necessity for huge change whatsoever.

And when they operate in a (C) territory, they operate under the national obviously in laws and so forth. So for many cc's, although they're operating in the (G) space, they - those are very different things, yes.

As a ccNSO, we were interested, however, on the subgroups that we referred to earlier because we have no site of that as a Council the preparations that are being made within the subgroups of the GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Certainly notwithstanding the issue of who's operating - who's the sort of backend operator of a TLD or the sovereignty of a specific ccTLD. I think you know Thomas's point about that broader blurring of the boundaries between either groups within the GNSO or just more broadly how as this starts to impact, perhaps some of our historic boundaries seem somewhat artificial.

And the interesting thing is whether or not in addition to the way in which we work perhaps currently, whether we start to - in parallel or at ICANN meetings find a way where topic-based forum starts to emerge. I think that's the concept you are referring to.

I don't know if that's come up at the ccNSO at all, but...

Lesley Cowley: We've come away from (unintelligible) doing gTLD's to get back to topic-based forums. Because certainly on issues like dispute resolution and sharing experiences of that. And - I'm trying to think of some of the other topics now.

But we used to have some very good cross-community meetings that have gone out of the window whilst gTLD's have just taken over the agenda. And very much, I think we would look forward to getting back to some of that cross-community idea sharing exchange of experiences and so on.

Man: I guess very specifically we have the debate around the data retention. For example, pre-validation or pre-resolution validation? And I think as we look further down the line, if a ccTLD operator also running a gTLD installs all these mechanisms that might be required by ICANN, that might also open the flood gates for the space to be required to do certain things that they haven't done before in their sovereignty.

And I guess that in - on certain topics such as this, and one of these might be data protection for example, there might be common interest of these operators in the cc space to avoid that - you know, that - you know, long-term impact is going to take place on their own operations.

Lesley Cowley Any ccNSO Councilor want like to comment?

Jonathan Robinson: I guess my only other comment is that I know this is - without wanting to - I know we did some work, and maybe it's something we need to think about picking up with you in the future again is reinvigorating then when we get a breathing space our work on cross-community working groups.

Because I know there was some sensitivity and there was some - perhaps I would call it a misunderstanding. That the GNSO Council's intention when we explored the - how - what cross-community working groups might mean to us.

But it sounds like that's really an area where there's potential - it's - maybe we don't need a framework, but that was certainly one potential way in which to develop a framework in which we could work together on some of these topics.

Lesley Cowley: For another issue that we ought to have some shared interest in is ICANN's strategic plan and contributing to that another conversation with you on that as well. It's an area that many of you will recall the ccNSO has a very active working group who are leading the way in that regard. I'm happy to share thinking with you.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll respond to that, because I noticed that - there certainly was another component of Fadi's address this morning. The launch of a new - perhaps even a new way of doing it, but I'm not sure I understood all of it properly. But he clearly is outlining a kind of five year vision which will translate into make into a strategic plan and (unintelligible).

And I know that we have as a GNSO Council, it's less so in our groups, but certainly as a Council we've struggled to keep on top of that work before, and we've been immensely grateful for the work that you've done in exposing - you know, in keeping on top of that. And in fact at times, educating us on some of the activity that's going on there.

Lesley Cowley: (We'd like to take you to the next point.)

Okay. Let's move on to the third question then, which was around global Internet governance and post-(wicket). At the international level that quite clearly are for the longer term. How will they impact from ICANN and the multistakeholder model? Do we have shared experiences? Are there issues and lessons to be learned?

Well thank you. We've reported when we last got together the CC and NSO members and nonmembers and the regional organization have been very active in WICT from attending a part of their government delegation. So we thought if it's okay as a start of the ten we'd just share some of those experiences with you and we'll see where that conversation might go. And I have (Yeman) and then Byron and then Keith.

(Yeman): Thank you (Leslie). This is (Yeman) from (unintelligible). Just like to share the experience in (unintelligible). The governance of the Internet space has been handled mostly in - by the Ministry of Information. But our Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the one that was involved with ITU affairs and so, I mean, mostly - and - mostly international ITU related (unintelligible). And of course when it was technical they did cooperate with the information industry.

But this time when they were preparing for the WICT it was primarily led by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. And a lot of different groups participated but there wasn't a complete understanding of what had been going on within the ICANN arena. And so with regard to the WTPF that's coming up we are now gathering our information in more cooperative meaning more in a team effort kind of way.

And so I don't know if you know but Korea did sign WICT and when they did sign it they got a lot of criticism for singing it when they came back home. And so they've told me a lot more.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, (Yeman). Byron?

Byron Henderson: Sure. I was part of the Canadian delegation. I'm a relatively late entrant into this debate and discussion but started participating with the Canadian government's preparatory process about six months prior to the WICT. Within the Canadian government it's handled out of a department called Industry Canada and it's led primarily by IT Centric folks.

However as you may know Heather Dryden, Chair of the GAC is an industry Canada person. So she certainly had a role in informing the internal or the domestic government opinion. But really that the group is led and managed primarily by IT Centric individuals.

So it was an interesting experience for me to participate in what is quite a different world than the one we know in terms of Internet governance. And once there I think I was most surprised by the comments leading up to it by Troy and some of the leadership that, you know, the governance of the Internet is absolutely not on the agenda and yet when the documents came out Internet governance was most definitely in some of the draft documents.

And even in the end though it could be argued not much changed that's only because there was very significant debate and of course many, many countries did not sign on to the treaty. There were issues in there that spoke - or articles in there that spoke directly to having (CCs) come under the treaty in some way, shape or form. Internet exchange points are - there is reference to them in there right now.

And I was also struck by the fact that in terms of some of the basic underlying technology around DNS a real profound lack of understanding by numerous delegations about how some of that - how it actually worked. And that particularly relates to the accounting or the settlement methodology in the traditional (tel-co) world and how there was a desire to have it apply to the Internet space in some way, shape or form.

So, I mean, those are some of my takeaways. And in the end I think you could argue that quote not much changed and some people would definitely make that case. I think it's only because of the very strong objection by a number of governments and then of course the 55 or so who did not sign on to the treaty. So it's an important issue and it behooves all of us to pay close attention and to make your feelings known to your respective governments on this subject.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Byron. Keith? And then I already have a queue started.

Keith Drazek: Okay well I won't reiterate any of the points already made but I attended to look at the member of the New Zealand delegation. And I was really pleasantly surprised by the number of CCTLDs who were participating and I think to (Ed), to Byron's point actually helping to inform their governments of what the DNS actually does and how it works.

And so I think it is really, really critical that ICANN remains engaged and the board of ITU forum going forward. I think the elements of multi-stakeholders and that have entered the ITU need to be fostered and developed further so that it becomes a more level playing field. And I think we can all play a part in that.

And, you know, I think a lot of people saw the WICT as being an end in itself and of course it was the start of a new setup process and from ITU as it (unintelligible) the WTPF, the policy forum coming up in May, the (unintelligible) plus ten reviews, all leading up to next year's (unintelligible) are all really further points where the ITU will entertain further resolution about the place of the Internet on their stage. So I think the continued sharing of information, the continued participation by all member driven multi-stakeholder community is very, very important. Thanks, (Leslie).

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Keith. I mean, that was just three examples that there are many CTUs who've been working with their governments and this is where working

at the national level is hopefully - helps influence the government position on the WICT and all things post-WICT. Milton?

Milton Mueller: So yes, when we talk about this issue I do think we need to be forward looking other than commiserating or whatever it is about WICT. And the WTPF is the next episode in what is actually a 15-year process which started with the ITU and the Internet Society trying to jointly take over the domain name system in 1996.

And I was reading the WTPF - the Secretary General's report leading into the WTPF and I think that the key battle is not, you know, the ITRs are always a very strange way, a very orthogonal way to approach the Internet and it's probably doomed for those governments who wanted to have an impact. Not much that can be done with the ITRs.

But the battle to me is at the level of principle. I mean frankly, I am seeing - certainly there's some adoption of multi-stakeholder language and norms by the ITU and I'd like to call your attention to the degree to which there is a very heavy pressure within ICANN to adopt inter-governmental influences, processes and norms.

And so if you look at the GAC and their influence on the policy processes is that it's a sore point with the GNSO I think because we view it - I don't know, I can't speak for everybody. Some of us view it as almost a competing policy making process. And when you get down to the level of the GAC now talking about specific vetoes of specific TLD applications - in other words governance instead of formulating a policy based on rules or laws it's simply going to say I don't like that one, I don't like that one, I don't like that one.

And the expectation is very clear that the board is expected to follow that and not to take it as advice then I think we're looking at an inter-governmentalization of ICANN and I think we should be as concerned about that as we are about the external influences coming from the ITU. Indeed, it is

virtually inconceivable given the politics that the ITU would actually take over ICANN. It is not inconceivable that the GAC would take over ICANN in some de facto way.

Man: I thought there might be some others in the queue; there's no one. I mean, I - it's interesting because, I mean, Milton highlighted very clearly how in his view this is not just - I mean, it could be tempting to sit back and think well this is an issue more for the (CCs) than the (GTs). It's very clear that this is an issue for the multi-stakeholder model and process as a whole.

I'm not sure how many of us have flagged it in quite the same way as Milton does but I take the point loud and clear that, you know, there's going to be alert to - if the - if you can't influence us from the outside and in that sense take over why not influence it from the inside? So it's a interesting point.

Any other comments or thoughts on this? Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks. Joy Liddicoat for the recording. And sorry if my comments slightly repeat points that have been made previously. I had to step out.

This is sort of a couple of reflections strategically around ICANN and our experiences and relation to - into government. Certainly I'm seeing much more comfort and transparency about talking about ICANN and ICANN related bodies and other Internet governance spaces. And this tension around that then has been the case over the years strictly in the - not only the global ideas but also original ideas.

I think that it's partly a reflection of the fact that many of the stakeholders here in ICANN included participate across those forums. So I think that is strengthening both those spaces out by ICANN but also (unintelligible).

And I'd just like to just - and I also would say more corporations like some of the technical community in those other stakeholder groups. For example with

the work that I (unintelligible) when I was (unintelligible) around human rights and thinking about how those external policy discussions can benefit ICANN.

And for many in developing countries the idea of (unintelligible) used to be about ICANN. But they're not anymore. Internet governance is much more than that. It's much more about public policy, filtering content, you know, robust CCTLD policies that particularly (unintelligible) human rights and how that works with GNSO policies.

So I do think some evolving here that I think would benefit from slightly more strategic discussions and perhaps even joint collaboration and preparing for our input into those spaces in either IGF workshops around other ways.

Lesley Cowley: Joy, if I can just (unintelligible) word. So when (unintelligible) working on ICANN strategic plan we pretty much were saying what is the ICANN strategy for WICT? And what is the ICANN strategy for post-WICT in terms of (unintelligible) and all the plethora of things. Milton is right: this is a long term journey or a long term multi-front battle depending on which side you lean as it were.

But certainly has been very actively encouraging ICANN both to put more resources in this area which has haappened and then to have a strategy long term for dealing with this scenario.

Man: I don't think I have a whole lot to add except to be supportive of the long term thinking and it's something which we need to, I mean, weave into the way in which we plan for the future as we go through. And I think some of us have started to be mindful of how we think more strategically and reemerge from the sort of shorter term fog of all these short term requests and start to think more long term about the role of the counsel, the role of - within the GNSO and how we work effectively and when we talk with the board about in a sense reestablishing and reasserting our position and it has to be with this kind of thing in mind.

We need to demonstrate that we can work effectively and continue to demonstrate the - I think the word is probably ethicacy or the at least the efficiency and effectiveness of the model we all work within. So I'm mindful of that in the larger context.

Lesley Cowley: Any more comments or questions? No? Okay. So to wrap up with the question I started with: is this session useful? Is there value in us coming together? We can do any thoughts on that now or we can take that back to both of our communities for some discussion and further dialog. Welcome to do either. (Unintelligible). Thank you.

Man: All right. So, I mean, I wouldn't mind - if there's no comments about - I mean, we're very happy to take it back and hear. I mean, it's clear that we haven't had the most engaged topics - we've picked up the most engaged group on some of these topics. I mean, we clearly picked up a little bit on this Internet governance issue.

And then I would encourage a discussion as (Leslie) suggested back in the groups. And if it makes sense to pick up on specific topics and do what we intended to do via our working group between the two groups to make use out of it then that may be the best way forward. But in any event we will liaise as chairs at least and come back and exchange some thoughts on how - whether - there may be other ways of working other than this kind of slightly formal environment. So we'll - John.

John Berard: John Berard from the business constituency. I think (Leslie) puts her finger on it when she - the way I think of it is is we have ourselves lost in the weeds of the new GTLD program. Sometimes we find our way forward but mostly we're sort of just kicking about trying to sort out some pretty thorny issues that create a fairly GNSO-centric view of things.

My hope is that once those tactical requirements are met that we can then begin to reengage on a strategic level which is where I think we might be most helpful. Just listening to the session before this on the Directory of Services Expert Working Group it struck me that there were some areas for discussion that might be useful down the road that have to do with point of view and perspective not mechanical attributes of the system.

So I think that if you give us a little time to find our way through the weed, lift up our head a bit then I think there will be an opportunity if we focus on the strategic issues that we can collaborate on.

Now the only other point that I would make is that I do think that we all are going to have to deal with expectations of new players. Perhaps the on-boarding that I've heard so much about will be helpful but we may be quite comfortable, confident and committed to the processes that make each of the communities work. But even if it is just the expansion of the GTLD space there likely will be a significant set of new players without the grounding, the history who will have - bring with them expectations from how they live elsewhere and how they work elsewhere. And that could tweak our two universes as well.

Lesley Cowley: (Unintelligible) too, John. We're actually dealing with that - a large number potentially of IBM CCTLD operators joining the (CCs) (unintelligible) as well.

Man: Yes, speaking from the perspective of a member of the group who was working on the agenda for this meeting but also as the chair of the SOP working group of the CTNSO where I shared the results of our work with you a couple of times and personally I find these meetings useful. I think we have to be very careful and make sure that we get topics that both sides are interested in and maybe we need a bit - maybe we need to start a bit earlier with preparing for the agenda so that we can really liaise together. But I think it's too large considering because it's very useful that we exchange.

And if we can't think of any topics at a particular time than we can just skip. I haven't researched anything but I think in the future we will still have sufficient to share and to learn from each other.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you (unintelligible) information that makes sort of clear the strategic and operating plan was improved. (Unintelligible)?

Man: Yes. I'd like to pretty much echo what we've just heard that I guess the working group that has been set up is very useful in preparation of these meetings. And I think that we need to do more work or maybe a little bit more ahead of the meetings to prepare and as the case may be if the working group recommends that there's not enough substance to have a meeting of this format then we should know early enough and then just skip one.

Man: Just have lunch.

Man: Just have lunch. But otherwise I think that the exchange is of utmost important. I mean, I was one of those that - I tried to put the finger on the source but some issues where I think we - it is imperative for the two groups to work together and think particularly strategically.

Lesley Cowley: Excellent. So can we task this group with straightaway starting work on (un because that will be not very far around the corner? Yes? Okay. Anyone else?

Man: Just to add that if we cooperate most certainly continuously between our meetings we can also have a more efficient follow up when we meet physically.

Lesley Cowley: Like a volunteer for the working group, yes?

Man: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much everyone. That's great. I - that's - it feels to me like there's good for some either informal or semiformal engagement by a working group perhaps that picks up whether or not there are topics to deliver here in our meetings. But thank you very much for attending today. I know it's a busy schedule, everyone has plenty of other things they could or can be doing so I appreciate your time in this forum.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you Jonathan.

Man: Okay. Closing time stamp for the meeting. It is now 1:42 pm. This is the end of the joint CC, NSO and GNSO counsel meeting.

END