

---

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Good morning, everyone. If you could please take your seats, we can begin. So let's begin our session with the ccNSO. Welcome, first of all, to our colleagues. And Lesley, seated at my right, the chair of the ccNSO, is here to cover, I guess, one main topic and then, hopefully, a bit of discussion about what are the issues and things under consideration in our respective organizations.

So the first topic is in relation to the framework of interpretation working group.

And, from my side, some GAC members have been asking questions about how the work has been advancing, what are the current arrangements for GAC members to comment, how to comment, when, and so on.

So we thought this would be a good way to go over some of those questions or issues so that GAC members, governments, can be aware of how they will have opportunities to contribute to that work.

So we don't have the chair of the working group here this week, and we also do not have the GAC lead here this week.

So we've got some colleagues on the GAC side, including myself, and on the ccNSO side to try and, nevertheless, guide that discussion and provide some information to you today. So we will do our best to do that.

Lesley, would you like to say good morning?

LESLEY COWLEY:

Good morning, everybody. So a new acronym for you is FOI, which is the framework of interpretation working group. And we have the vice chair of that working group to present to you today. From the liaison with Heather, what we're trying to do is share with you how this working group came about, to share with you the scope of that working group and, equally, what it does not cover, make you aware of who is on the working group and have some feel for the time scales involved.

---

And, obviously, we're very keen that we have GAC input to that working group. So we'd like to invite the GAC input and to share with you when and how that would be most helpful.

I'll turn over to Becky.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you. You may recall, because we had GAC participants in the delegation and redelegation working group that worked through 2010 to, essentially, do an exhaustive review of all of the IANA documentation regarding delegations and redelegations and compare them to what we consider the policy and guidelines being RFC 1591, the restatement of that in IPC 1 and the GAC principles.

With the help of ICANN staff, without whom we would not have gotten anywhere, we did look at this each and every one of these reports and concluded that there was a significant lack of transparency about how these policies were applied in connection with request to delegations and redelegations. And there was also -- there were significant inconsistencies, at least as reflected in the documentation that was publicly available with respect to those -- handling those requests.

Go to the next slide, whoever has got the -- The framework of interpretation working group was chartered by the ccNSO in March. Its job is to develop an overall framework for interpreting the policies and guidelines. It's to add color and depth and to provide increased predictability and consistency where that is possible based on those -- on those documents.

Any changes to existing policy would be out of scope for the group and any creation of new policy would also be out of scope for the work of the group.

In fact, as we go along, if the group identifies areas where policy development might be warranted, that -- that could be recommended, but that would follow a -- you know, a traditional policy development process.

Likewise, the IANA functions contract is out of scope for this working group. But I would just note that the ccNSO as a whole, does have

---

views that it has submitted in response to the commerce department's frequent further notice of inquiry on this and which are relevant to this project. Next slide.

We started by identifying the key topics that we would be looking at in the course of our work. Actually, let me take one step back. Because I want to be clear.

This is a cross-organization working group. There are ccTLD operators, a very diverse group from around the world. There are actually five members of the GAC who are participants -- Heather, Jayantha Fernando, Frank March, Alice Munyua, and Suzanne Radell. And we very much appreciate and value the participation and input from the GAC. And we would love to have more.

So, anyway, the group decided that these topics were really the important and critical issues.

So RFC 1591 says, in the case of a redelegation, that both the proposed manager and the incumbent manager must agree to the change. And we decided to look at what agreement -- and here we're calling it consent for a variety of reasons, what that means and how it would be demonstrated in any particular case. The RFC 1591 also says that significantly interested parties should agree on the operator, on the manager of the ccTLD.

So another question for the group was, you know, who are significantly interested parties? Who is always a significantly interested party? What are the characteristics of significantly interested parties otherwise? And what is the process and procedure for securing their input so that you can reach the determination that significantly interested parties agree.

We are also going to look at the circumstances under which the policies permit a change in the ccTLD manager where the incumbent manager does not consent to that change.

We are, as we go along and then as a separate work stream, creating a comprehensive glossary for the terms used in the policies and principles

documents. One of the interesting inconsistencies we found in the IANA reports is that the way certain functions and certain things -- the word used to describe them changed from time to time. It was hard to know if the change was meaningful or not meaningful. So we want to try and make that process much more transparent by having, essentially, an agreed-upon vocabulary that all of us can rely on.

And then the 5th task is to identify standard information that would be included in all of the IANA reports. Next slide.

We have set a very deliberate timetable and process by which these -- these topics are getting considered. We're taking them topic by topic. Once the group has reached agreement on the text for an interim report for that topic, it is published, posted, and a public consultation takes place.

After the consultation, the group takes the comments and revises the report and publishes it as a final report.

And then, following that, the report would be -- it would be formally considered by both the ccNSO and the GAC after that for acceptance.

So we've built in a process where this goes back to each of the groups, in this case the constituency and the GAC, to look at entirely as a group and determine whether it is acceptable. Our working, basically, requires us to get agreement from both of those groups to go forward.

Just by way of example, we have published an interim report on the consent topic. It is available for public comment through December 1st. And we're hoping that we do get some good input on that. Next slide.

Just the sort of nuts and bolts. This is a group that is working very, very hard. We meet by teleconference once every two weeks at -- on a rotating clock schedule. We've had nine meetings since Singapore. All of the meetings are open, and there's -- the meeting schedule is posted on the ccNSO page on the ICANN Web site.

In order to respect the fact that the time -- to sort of accommodate the wide variation in time zones, we do not resolve any issue during a single

---

call. We have at least two calls -- in fact, we've had many more than two calls on any issue. I don't think there's anything that's really been resolved in two calls. But we have a formal requirement that no issues get resolved in a single call.

We have set out a 2-year timeline. A lot of people have said that's a really long time frame. But we think, given the importance and complexity of these issues and the need to reach true, you know, consensus and agreement between the ccNSO and the GAC on this, we wanted to leave enough time to have that be delivered. We were very conscious of making sure that ICANN meetings, physical meetings, were built into the schedule of consideration because we understand that that's an important way for the GAC to work. So there is no occasion on which any topic report would be completed, agreed upon, or anything like that without a physical meeting.

There are lots of background materials, working documents, and other resources on the ccNSO web page on the ICANN Web site. That's just by way of background, and I think we would just like to have a discussion. Oh, okay. Go ahead, Chris is going to --

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Morning, everyone. Thank you, Becky. Everyone on the GAC should have a copy of this or have seen this, I hope. This is the framework of interpretation working group GAC input schedule, which we sent out to try to help or, hopefully, provide some guidance. So Becky has done an overview of the background to the working group.

And the document that you've got includes that information. It's under number 2, which is the work plan. And that goes through the areas that we've talked about.

Perhaps the key area or the key thing for the GAC to look at or to understand right now is the timeline. It's a timeline that we've put together to specifically assist the GAC with providing us with useful and timely input at the necessary stages of our work.

And it goes through until the 15th of March 2013, which is far too far for me to even think about. But it starts right now. We've got -- as Becky has said, we've got the consent document out for comment. And we're looking for GAC input on that by mid-January.

And I won't -- I don't need to go through all the dates. You all have the document. But, basically, we've done this in a way that enables you to have as much time as is reasonably feasible to read the documents, to talk about them, and come up with feedback and input.

Number 4 in the document is the mechanisms that we've put in place to assist you. So, first of all, the people on our working group that Becky has listed, Jayantha, Suzanne and so on, have been told that they can circulate the documents to the GAC, once we get past an initial draft to a second version. So everything is open to you, and you'll be able to see it.

We are going to include in all of our documents a private executive summary for you to comment. So we understand that this is an intensely technical, complicated area. We understand that your bandwidth to deal with these sorts of things is not particularly large. But we also understand that these issues are critical to you, just as critical to you as they are to us in the ccNSO.

So we're working on providing you with information in a format that you can understand and deal with. And we encourage you to post individual comments to the public consultation, but we understand that sometimes that's difficult for you.

So we're happy to accept individual submissions from GAC members in confidence. We would like very much to have as much input and participation from the GAC in this area as possible.

We're dealing -- effectively, dealing with two standing documents. We're dealing with RFC 1591, and we're dealing with the GAC principles.

I know that some GAC members have expressed concern about us -- sorry -- about us reaching consensus on one particular chunk of this. And then you -- does that mean you have to run away and redraft the

---

GAC principles? So I wanted to make it clear that the answer to that is no. Our intention is that we're doing this piece by piece, as Becky has laid out. Let's take the consent one first. If we get consensus on the consent document, that becomes a document -- an output from that working group that is, effectively, coming out to the board of ICANN with an imprimatur of the ccNSO and GAC.

Is it possible that things in that consent document might -- might usefully be reflected in the GAC principles? The answer is yes. But we're doing things in such a way you do not have to go back to the GAC principles every time we do something. You go back to the GAC principles at the end of the process, gather up everything that we've done as we've gone along, which you've been involved in and are happy with. And then, if you choose to, you can make changes, amendments, to the GAC principles. But the fundamental concept here is that none of what we're doing is policy. And so, therefore, simply adding color and depth means that everything we do would sit under a particular paragraph in the GAC principles or a particular paragraph in 1591 and; therefore, amendment of either of those two documents is unnecessary.

Heather, did you want anything else in this particular document to be covered? Did I miss anything?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

I think those are the main points, from the GAC side. Frank March, New Zealand, is leading the effort. So he would seek to circulate information to the GAC to help facilitate informing sharing and notifications about the progress of the work -- the working group to the GAC membership. Along with Frank, others that have been involved in the previous effort in relation to delegation, redelegation, and retirement are also involved, as well as the vice -- the chair and vice chairs have been added to the e-mail list as well -- vice chairs have been added to the e-mail list as well to track the work as it developed. And then, again, we're very aware that there needs to be a way to be clear about when and where GAC members can comment. And, also, we will need to have GAC discussions as well on some of these issues.

---

So this document, I think, is aiming to help make clear how and when and what the issues are. And I thank you for preparing this. I do think it is very helpful. So, if I understand correctly, the current issue under consideration relates to consent? And that is the current focus? And then the working group will move through the list of issues, as reflected in the timeline. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Well, the timeline -- like all of these things, the timeline is a timeline. And it's an indicative timeline. You can pretty much rest assured nothing will happen any more quickly than the timeline; but it may be that, obviously, things happen more slightly than the timeline. But, yes, what we're aiming to do here -- and, look, this is borne out of the experience of the GAC and cc's working together on the fast track and various other times that we've worked together. We're giving you as much advance notice of things that are likely to be coming down the pipeline as we can. We're conscious that -- we're conscious that, in the same way sometimes we don't understand you, you don't understand us.

And so, therefore, we're trying to provide you with summary documents that you can actually understand.

And we're just encouraging you to be involved and give us input.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. That is appreciated.

Becky, did you want to speak?

BECKY BURR:

I just wanted to say that, in terms of the public consultation, consent is the public consultation in terms of the work that's ongoing right now. We are looking at the significantly interested parties issue, which I suspect would be an issue of particular importance to this group.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. Chris?

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just one other thing. We are -- you've got your representatives on our calls. But everyone's welcome. If there's a particular thing that's being discussed and you want to sit in and listen and participate, that's absolutely fine.

And I also -- I know that this is probably challenging from a time point of view. But at each of the ICANN meetings, the FOI working group has at least one and sometimes two face-to-face meetings. And, again, those are not closed. And, if you are able to come along, that would be much appreciated.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for that invitation. I know the weeks (sic) are held every two weeks. And that can be a challenge for those that are trying to participate to contribute. So we appreciate your flexibility in how we can participate and contribute to the work.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This has only just occurred to me, and I humbly apologize to everyone in the ccNSO. And perhaps I'll take this on as a personal mission, if the others are not happy.

But it strikes me that this is so important -- it strikes me that if there are individual governments or individual representatives of the GAC who are having a particular issue with something as we go along, I think we would be quite happy to have, you know, like a one-on-one conversation, put one of the members of the working group, one of the executive members of the working group to talk on the phone with an individual member of the GAC to walk them through stuff, if that's necessary.

It's -- especially with the model that you operate under with -- you know, with your consensus-based model and people -- you know, it often means a conversation is couched in the negative. I think, if we can do anything at all to help -- not that I'm anticipating there will be any major issues, of course. But, if there's a way that we can help, we'd be delighted.

---

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. So with that, I'd like to ask GAC members whether they have any questions or comments about the working group. I see an arm. United States?

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. Thank you, Heather. And thank you to our colleagues on the ccNSO for giving us the briefing and the paper. I really, really think the paper has gone a long way toward clarifying for us what our timeline is.

Having participated in some of the calls, I have to say -- to share with my GAC colleagues, the discipline that you all have, that you are following in your work program is very remarkable. It's truly stunning that every two-week calls. It can be challenging to GAC colleagues. I can tell you I've been on a few of them. I try to join as many as I can. And it's extremely helpful for us to actually listen in and to hear the exchanges, I have to say.

So I just wanted to sort of note, as a member who is quite interested in -- as all of my colleagues are, I'm sure, in trying to keep up, it is really an impressive effort that you have undertaken. And the way you've structured it is quite helpful to us to know step-by-step.

And I also wanted to express my appreciation for your patience and understanding that, at the moment, we're juggling quite a few other priority issues but that you do understand that we care very, very deeply about this subject and certainly look forward to our continued partnership. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, United States.

Singapore, please.

SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chair.

Like the U.S., we also want to join the U.S. in congratulating the FOI Working Group for having done so much work and for the detailed plan that telling GAC how you want to carry its work going forward, and appreciate very much on that.

I have one question, I think, in the paragraph 2, the work plan, it was stated that the guidelines -- it's not intended for the guideline to lead to the ccNSO to revisit RFC 1591. As we know, RFC 1591 is a rather old document and it doesn't mean it is within the mandate of ccNSO to revise RFC 1591. If it so wishes, and perhaps some clarification on that will be helpful.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Good question. Who would like to respond?

Is there a response?

Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah. Yes, it is within the -- Well, sorry. 1591 is an RFC, and there is a process by which RFCs are created.

It is within the mandate of the ccNSO to make policy in respect to delegation/redelegation.

If that were done in the ccNSO, that would be done by way of a policy development process, not by way of an RFC.

What the document actually says is that it's not expected that as the work of each chapter, each section is finalized that there will be a need to change 1591 or the GAC principles.

At the end of it, we'll be able to assess the situation. And the intention is that the guidelines that we produce, the working group produces, will go to the board and we'll monitor the -- we'll monitor the IANA functions use of those guidelines and make sure they are actually following them.

And if they do follow them, then that's all fine. If they don't or there's a problem, we may consider the possibility of actually going further, which is to put it into policy.

Does that make sense?

---

SINGAPORE: Yes, thank you. I think we just want to know that the brand of how this RFC 1591 could be revised and through what mechanism.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR: I just want to reiterate, the work of this group would not involve any changes to RFC 1591. It may be that a product of our work here is that we recommend some additional policy, but that is not within the mandate of this -- the actual policy-making is not within the mandate of this working group.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for clarifying that.

Are there any other questions or comments?

Okay.

All right.

So we have a bit of time.

Lesley, how should we spend our remaining minutes?

LESLEY COWLEY: I think we talked about the ccNSO being more familiar with what we'd loosely called GAC world because we have an impression that most of your work at the moment is involved with the new gTLDs. And then I think we were going to reciprocate with our view of ccNSO world and the other things we're working on in addition to the Framework of Interpretation.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Okay. So GAC world. All right.

Well, I can tell you perhaps a bit about some of our recent work. I think you're quite right that new gTLDs has been a focus for some time. And at this meeting, we've needed to look at various issues related to new gTLDs, including some of our foundational documents, like the operating principles, which we refer to in our working methods.

So we have wanted to define consensus so that it can be clear for us and for the community how we work. And also, in relation to early

---

warning and providing GAC consensus advice in regard to sensitive and controversial strings and applications.

So this has led us to have a significant internal focus this week in looking at the operating principles and related mechanisms for the new gTLD program.

In terms of some general comments about GAC world, we've informed, I think, some of the communities this week and at other times about the recommendations in relation to accountability and transparency for the GAC as well as the Joint Working Group that had been formed and produced a report between the GAC and the Board raising similar issues. And in that, we talk about what is a GAC advice, what constitutes GAC advice.

And there are frequently questions and queries about this, so I think that's a useful document.

There was a public comment period on it, and we didn't get a lot of comments back on the report, but one of the key recommendations made in that report is the creation of a register for GAC advice so that advice can be tracked by the board, by us, by others, so that we know what action has been taken in relation to particular pieces of advice. And, in fact, it allows us to confirm that it's been received and acknowledged.

And so we hope that this will help us in working with the board and contributing to the policy development process as we go along.

So those are the key issues, I think, that I would highlight for you. But I will look around the table, see whether other colleagues would add anything to that.

Okay. All right. So perhaps you could give us a sense of what are your pressing issues in ccNSO world?

LESLEY COWLEY:

Touché. Thank you, Heather.

---

So I'm aware that we have some new GAC members here this week, so I thought I'd just quickly cover a bit about what the ccNSO does and our work plan for you.

Next slide.

So what we're about, as we touched on just now, actually, is developing global policy for a very limited set of issues. And delegation and redelegation is one of those very limited sets of issues. But for the time being, as you will have heard, we are looking at clarifying and interpreting the documents that currently exist.

But most of the time the ccNSO is about cooperation, skills building, and information sharing between country code managers, and that is where we spend a great deal of our time.

We also contribute to the multistakeholder approach of ICANN, and particularly through our work on the ICANN strategic plan and finances.

So we've got about 120 members. Our most recent addition that we are very pleased to welcome is Iran. And I very much hope later on today we'll be welcoming Burkina Faso to our group as well.

So we'll be up to 122 later on, I hope. And we have 18 councillors and 12 working groups, and a very good, like your own, dedicated Secretariat. So we have developed, in our attempt to be organized, a very comprehensive ccNSO work plan that now extends to circa three pages, but it's so that we have -- and this is a public document -- an overview as to our work and also so that we're able to plan our work going forward. And particularly with a view to looking at capacity of the volunteers. Like yourselves, we all have very busy and demanding day jobs, too. And what we're trying to do is organize our work so we're not over capacity and can be a bit more planned and organized about what we're tackling.

We have 12 working groups at the moment. Some are more active than the others, but I thought I would highlight for the GAC the five groups that I think should be or hopefully are of particular interest to you. And we have a strategic and operations plan working group. And

GAC members at our last meeting will recall that we were talking about some of the thinking in that working group, which is about making sure that ccTLD managers are engaged and are able to comment on ICANN strategic plans and their operating plans. And I think of many groups, this one has been particularly active in recent times, very engaged with that whole process and making comments. And, indeed, it's pleasing to see that a number of the ccNSO comments have been taken on board in the revised strategic plan red line.

The working group may well take a position and provide comments to public fora and otherwise. And of course, though, ccTLD managers and regional organizations, for that matter, may also make comment on their own behalf.

Related and closely linked to that we have a finance working group, which is looking particularly at country code related expenses and to develop some models for CC contributions to ICANN. Most country codes do contribute to ICANN on a voluntary basis, and the ccNSO isn't looking to represent individual CC's but really to work together to look at finances and to develop some options for that going forward.

And now that the new chief financial officer in ICANN is in post, we are looking forward to working with him, with hopefully some information to inform those discussions.

Last slide.

The three other groups to highlight are the Framework of Interpretation working group that we have just covered, the IDN working groups looking at the overall policy for IDN country codes, and also how we figure out the inclusion of IDN country codes in the ccNSO itself.

And lastly, but by no means least, the study group on country names as gTLDs within the gTLD process.

Very happy to receive your questions or comments, and I have a number of ccNSO colleagues in the room who would be happy to contribute, too.

- 
- HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that, Lesley.
- No requests to speak. GAC members have any questions or comments for the ccNSO?
- No?
- Okay. That's great.
- All right.
- Lesley.
- LESLEY COWLEY: So I'll be provocative, then. Is the GAC planning to do any work on ICANN finances and strategic plans? Is there GAC advice or maybe interest in sharing discussions on that?
- HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. I think I see a request at the back of the room. Yes, European Commission. Do we have a roving mic?
- Do we have a microphone, please?
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much. Andrea Glorioso from the European Commission.
- I am not speaking on behalf of GAC here. I do not think that GAC has taken a position --
- (dropped audio).
- Is it working? Yeah. So as I said, I don't speak on behalf of GAC, but simply to say the European Commission is, it is a signal already, is interested to discuss issues related to the funding of ICANN and would welcome a discussion with the ccNSO on the matter.
- HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for that.
- I have Australia.
- AUSTRALIA: Very similar comment, I guess, to European Commission. I guess, first of all, it will come as something of a confession, perhaps, but we are really busy, and it's a good question to pose to us, to be perfectly honest.

I think it's no surprise that the GAC is focusing a lot on ICANN's sort of high-level governance structures at the moment. We have had a number of discussions about things like conflict of interest, and we are also looking very closely at the ATRT recommendations. Certainly trying to get involved in, I guess, the next level of detail down, like strategic planning and financial structures and so on, but I guess it is a resourcing challenge, I think, for us.

And I recall at an earlier one of these meetings, it may have been in Singapore where the ccNSO and the GAC had a very useful exchange that it was a resourcing challenge keeping up with everything going on in the community for both organizations. And I wonder if we could actually do something like in recognizing that, work together somehow. We can actually communicate more closely or share experience and so on so that we're not all trawling the same documents and so on. If we can actually find a useful way to work together on this.

I'm not sure I have a solution exactly in mind but it may be something for us to look at.

There is a lot going on in this community and for individual communities or individual members of communities, it is, just to be perfectly honest, a challenge to keep across everything.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. We'd welcome that invitation. We had a similar invitation from the GNSO but we feel probably that the work of the GAC and the ccNSO is more likely to be closely aligned.

We have a very well organized working group on the strategic plan that shares out the divisions of the strategic plan and develops comments. We should, I think, be ready for our next meeting to share some outputs from that with GAC colleagues, if you would find that helpful.

And just a response on the finances point, of course, until one gets the strategic plan going in the right direction, the finances then follow, or not, from the direction of that strategic plan.

Roelof, the chair of the working group, is here in the room. I don't know if you wish to add anything.

>>ROELOF MEIJER: Well, I don't really have anything to add but maybe just to confirm that I am very willing, with the working group, to provide information to the GAC at the next ICANN meeting. We will have our comment ready then.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for that.

I have U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks very much, Chair, and good morning to everybody.

Lesley's sort of quick overview of the key working groups within the ccNSO is very helpful, actually. It's a very good heads up on the work that's most relevant to the public-policy interests. And it certainly would be very interesting to have an update.

I don't know whether, as a suggestion to facilitate an easy digest of work that's going to be of most interest to us, if you prepare some kind of report or quick summary of each of those five working groups that you mentioned, the strategic and operations plan, finance, FOI, and IDNs and country names as gTLDs, I think some kind of regular submission between the chairs just quickly recounting the progress of those groups and highlighting where there are emerging, contentious issues, perhaps.

I mean, I have no idea, really, how -- what the ccNSO is going to propose for the strategic plan might intersect with what the GNSO is seeking and whether there is any contention developing there. It would be certainly interesting for us to be aware of that.

And, obviously, just picking out another one, the country names as gTLDs. I mean, that is pretty critical to us as well as we engage pretty intensively on the preparations for and the launch of the new gTLDs application round.

So I think I just want to underline, it's good to have some regular communication with us in an easily digestible manner that we can quickly keep -- that will enable us to keep abreast of what's happening

---

within the ccNSO and generally broadcast where your priorities are and what our objectives are for engaging within the ICANN model.

Thanks.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that, U.K.

You have touched upon, I think, an area where communication is quite important and beneficial between the GAC and ccNSO. And certainly as we do need to track issues and work that's emerging in other parts of the community covering quite a broad spectrum of issues, this is continually a challenge for us.

The chairs do communicate regularly with each other at ICANN, and we're finding that that is a very useful way to get a sense of what's happening in the various parts of ICANN. And if we are to find a way to identify priority areas of work and focus our work -- I mean, we hear throughout the community concerns about the volume of work. And so the -- the tool that would be best suited for trying to address that as an organization would be via the strategic plan and those kinds of exchanges, I think.

And I think everyone is keen to help focus the work of this committee, and I'm sure others at ICANN would agree.

So with that, I see our next guests are here.

Before I conclude, just as a kind of reply, some of the new members to the GAC. So we have Costa Rica, Tunisia, Iceland, and Brunei Darussalam that have joined. And as observers we have INTERPOL and Secretariat of the Pacific Communities that are recent members. So there we are.

So thank you very much to our colleagues from the ccNSO. We appreciate your meeting with us today.

Thanks.

For the GAC, we can stay seated, please.

I see that our guests from the SSAC are here.

LESLEY COWLEY:

And for ccNSO, we're back in the big room.