

ICANN

**Moderator: Glen Desaintgery
October 24, 2011
7:30 am CT**

(Leslie): Okay, greetings everybody. This is the joint meeting of the GNSO - the ccNSO Council incase you wondered what it was you were coming for, apart from lunch.

We have an agreed agenda that we've constructed beforehand and we're starting off, I believe, with a conversation around the participation of ccNSO members or ccTLD managers in the GNSO Consumer Metrics Working Group.

And I must say that the ccNSO probably don't know a great deal about the Consumer Metrics Working Group so we would like to understand really from this the current status of this working group and how it might be best for us to participate or become connected with this group.

Stephane Van Gelder: Hello everyone, sorry, my mouth is full there. Welcome to the ccNSO.

Welcome back to the GNSO Council. So perhaps I can start on the topic you just mentioned, Leslie, by just giving you a very quick update. Unfortunately we - the person that's taken the lead GNSO Council side on the Consumer

Metrics issue is not at this meeting, not physically present and because of the time difference it's difficult for her to participate.

So I have a very short update I can provide on where we are, not in terms of the work that's going on but how the group is functioning. So Rosemary Sinclair who's GNSO Councilor has been leading this effort from our side and she has been appointment by the group as Chair of that group.

We have also put out a call for appointments for council liaison to the group and so far we have a volunteer to do that. We are waiting to see if anyone else wants to volunteer - if any opposition for that person volunteering. So we're looking in good shape in terms of the actual group working.

And the group has a workshop scheduled - apologies, if you want to go and participate it's early on Thursday morning from 7:30 until 8:30 am. I mean who works this schedule but there's a workshop organized on the group at that time if you want to learn more.

And the group has now - the group has completed its charter and has a charter ready and has asked me as Council Chair to advise the GAC of the charter as well. The status of the group of the moment is that and if you do have questions on the way the group is actually working please let me know. And if I can't answer them I'll write them down and try to get answers from Rosemary as soon as I can.

(Leslie): So the function of the group is to what? So the function of the group, the origins of the group, and what you would be looking for from ccTLD managers would be helpful?

Stephane Van Gelder: Sorry, I should have started there. So the group was created by a Council or Board resolution and if you give me five minutes to sort my notes out I'll tell you when that resolution came through. That's it, my memory's gone - Cartagena.

So the Board asked the GNSO Council to have a look at this issue of consumer - competition consumer trust and consumer choice in the context of the new gTLD program.

And in response to that the GNSO Council worked on identifying the exact - what the exact request was and there was informal discussion between the Council and the Board on exactly that so that we could determine exactly what - the question we were being asked was.

Following that discussion - and this was lead by Rosemary Sinclair. Following that discussion the group formed a drafting team to draft a charter and we are now ready to go to the working group phase.

Jeff Neuman: The group's already started.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: And not to put Steve DelBianco on the spot because he just walked in, Steve actually gave a presentation to the GNSO Council yesterday, two days ago, and they started defining some of the terms of consumer and some of the other - competition, trust, some of the other terms that are in there.

So given those definitions they're now in the process of developing metrics. If I can maybe put Steve on the spot a little bit, the question that (Leslie) asked

is what are we looking for from ccTLD managers and how can they participate?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Jeff. And as you know, the Board resolution asks for advice from all four its GNSO and ALAC and GNSO have been working pretty diligently for three or four months. We have a set of standardized - sorry, set of draft definitions along with a list of metric (attached to) 1.

We're going to be presenting that same thing we did Saturday on Wednesday at 1 o'clock here. And that will be a session where we'll run through that presentation and start to bring in a broader community input on that.

And you should know that on Saturday's discussion here at GNSO several Councilors asked right away in the metrics we're collecting for the gTLD space we ought to be bringing in other metrics that measure follow-on effects that occur in the registration and queries in the cc domains.

The attention generated to the new gTLD program by the launch of all the TLDs will undoubtedly bring registrants to not only pick up the new gTLD in dot(unintelligible) or dot bank but they may pick up a cc or two, hopefully some IDNs. And we'd also be able to measure that registration activity and the query activity both before and after the gTLD program that's indicative of an increase in consumer choice.

It's a separate question whether we also would want to measure any consumer trust impact that cc's drive, I don't we would, not really the part of the affirmation or commitments of the charter.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Steve. And I have a question from John - or a comment from John Berard online. John?

John Berard: Thank you, Stephane. Am I coming through?

Stephane Van Gelder: You are, please go ahead.

John Berard: Thank you, so I have recently been appointed the GNSO Council Liaison for this workgroup. I have been participating in its activities and it is a workgroup created by the GNSO Council but it has been encouraging participation of as many members of the community as possible because the original motion passed in Cartagena asked for advice from the four ACSOs.

And more than encouraging the ccNSO to participate in our modest effort I would like to get a sense of what the ccNSO has done to this point on whatever parallel path it's been on to respond to the Board resolution from Cartagena.

(Leslie): Okay, thank you. To respond to that, this isn't a current line of activity in the ccNSO at all though obviously individual cc managers will have their own metrics and views on the issues I'm sure.

Can I get some sense on - from ccNSO and participants, members and nonmembers whether there's an interest in this issue, whether we ought to bring this back to the...

Man: Yes, to me it's still a bit unclear what we - what kind of metrics we're talking about and what the objectives are that we really want to obtain with them as it is from the perspective that we've discussed on - of getting impression of how the new gTLDs add to choice, competition, and security and stability.

(Leslie): I think there's a bit of confusion here on the ccNSO's part and, again, we won't be able to make the Wednesday session. Perhaps we can task our secretary out for some of the (unintelligible) when we could have an update whether that can be shared online for this meeting, then we can have a more informed discussion, that would be great.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, just to clarify, as you know the schedule's been moved around a lot so unfortunately that - well, fortunately I suppose, that session has been moved to a more civilized time on Wednesday from 1:00 until 2:00, which is when you're meeting unfortunately.

Steve has offered to come over and do a briefing if ccNSOs...

(Leslie): We have an agenda that was issued in September so we might be a bit tight for space, Steve, but let's connect about how we can best share. Shall we move on? Okay. So the next item on our agenda was an update regarding the ccNSO Finance Working Group.

You will recall that the ccNSO has taken a great interest in ICANN finances - financial recording and also the link between the budget and the strategic plan. So we've done quite a bit of work in this area and colleagues who were at the Singapore meeting will recall some criticism of the (demands) on the budget that we alerted you to.

Thankfully ICANN has a new GFO who's been able to meet with this week and Byron as Chair of that working group will provide an update, subject to background noise and a very bad cough. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Yes, I'll apologize in advance for any coughing. So the finance working group has really started in May of this past spring. And in the intervening time,

particularly since the Singapore meeting until now, the work of this workgroup has been divided into two tracks.

One is really looking at possible financial contribution models. Today we have a banding model but it's been a review of the possible contribution models that cc's could use in their contributions to ICANN.

The work has been divided into various sub-teams and we've had - we've done preliminary reviews on nine different contribution models, benefit space models, different types of banding models, direct contribution models, etc., reviewing what would be appropriate, what would fit the circumstance, the non-contracted parties with differing environments in every country with the goal that we will try to widdle those down to what is most appropriate going forward for the cc's, that's one primary track.

The other primary track is actually looking at ICANN's finances in some details and reviewing them in terms of cost and asking the fundamental question, what do the cc's actually cost ICANN. I don't think there's too much debate about the cc's feeling that we should pay some freight. The question is how much freight and how do you support that number.

And that's where we started to really peel back the covers on ICANN's finances. And in working with the strategic and operational planning working group we're both addressing that question from different perspectives.

So we've done a pretty deep dive. Clearly what we've found is we probably don't have the detail from ICANN yet and in fact we await even mid-level detail, financial reporting, from them. The idea was they were supposed to be able to provide some over this intervening period since the Singapore meeting.

We're still waiting for any meaningful data on that front. We have had the opportunity to meet with (Xava), the new CFO at some length. And I'm certainly - I think we're certainly encouraged by his background and his technical expertise. He's sounding the right notes. However, we still don't have the data and we await that.

Unfortunately these two tracks do need to work in parallel because in order to properly review the contribution models you need to apply the numbers to them and see what happens. Without the details and the numbers from ICANN it's very difficult to do that in any meaningful way.

Further, for those of you have been around you probably remember the history from Wellington - after - from the Wellington era that we've been done this path before where we reviewed models. Never got financial detail and we kind of stalled.

So we've made it very clear to ICANN that they need to ramp up the ability to produce the kind of reporting required and that we will have to slow down on the policy and model reviews track while they get their act together on producing the numbers.

You know, like I said, the good news is Xavier's technical ability looks strong from a CFO perspective. He in short order has been pretty clear on identifying some challenges they're working on in terms of system and process reporting ability but it's not in a position at this time to provide data. So needless to say, the first question we asked is, okay, you can't do it now, when can you do it and we await that information as well.

So I think the long and the short of it is, a lot of good work to start on the policy model side has been done. It was one of the main sessions in our

meetings in the next couple of days. We will continue to do work but, of course, until we get the numbers side we will have to start to ratchet down the effort on the model side, that's where we stand right now.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, are there any questions?

Man: I didn't quite understand the claim on the CFO or - on ICANN. They don't have the numbers or they - they don't have the time to collect the numbers?

Byron Holland: Well, I certainly wouldn't want to speak on behalf of ICANN or the new CFO so I won't but my perception was they are somewhat challenged in providing the reporting on the financial numbers at the kind of detail or the kind of slices that we would need to see to be able to do any kind of cost accounting analysis.

Stephane Van Gelder: Perhaps I can ask a question on how we - this topic first came up between the two SOs in Singapore if I remember correctly. And we were - the GNSO was impressed there with the work you had already done in analyzing the op plan in the budget and that started both SOs down the line of what can we do to work together on this.

Now I think it's fair to say we've probably been too busy with other things to really constructively work with the ccNSO on this since then. You've obviously - from what you just said, done a lot more work since then.

What's your sense now of how we could work together, both SOs, on these issues because the - what you've just told us here is in a way very specific to the ccNSO and obviously the way that your members will provide funds to ICANN in a way that's very different to the way that our members can sometimes do so and also the fact that some of our members don't do so.

So the initial take on this was that you'd dive in to find some problems, we thought that was great work and how could we work together to make sure that the problems that you dive in to find didn't go unnoticed and how could we look into the future, benefit - both SOs benefit from that.

Byron Holland: The working group that I chair is a finance working group which is really specific to the cc community and our contributions into ICANN. I think where the real work - the joint or some kind of work together can be done is (Rolof)'s committee which is the Strategic and Operational Planning Committee.

And we work very closely, I mean they're looking for forward and budget and we're looking at - the accounting for that budget and what do we contribute.

So we work tightly together but I would suggest, without putting (Rolof) on the spot, that that's probably where any kind of real joint work could take place or it would done to best effect.

Man: Well, in answer to your question about how we can further collaborate on this particular subject, the operational plan and the strategic plan, I think - well, there are two options we can either really do some work together so have some joint sessions.

I'm quite open to that or we can exchange the results of the work we do. And the first - next opportunity would be our commence that we have on the first draft of the coming strategic plan 2012-2016 Strategic Plan, then we'll provide them to you as well.

(Leslie): I mean I think we could certainly be very willing to share the methodology if it were because eventually we will be looking at strategic plan from the cc view points and I would very much assume that you would each bring your particular view points to that examination of strategic plan.

But we have the methodology and I think one of the most important things was about finding the appropriate space and the appropriate people within the ccNSO to work through the issues.

And I think that's been one of the key things that's enabled us to have input on the strategic plan and also to have that input taken into account because I think we realized from the user vote that it's all very well and good complaining about what's being done at a particular point in time but if you haven't contributed to - maybe to when those ideas were formed then it's rather difficult to critic years ahead.

So we took that an opportunity for our community, to get involved in strategic plan itself so that we could influence (and have) cc inputs into that plan.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, I know you have a question. Can I just ask a practical question before that? Do you have someone that works on your agenda for ICANN meetings that's tasked with doing that? Because what I'm thinking is if we look at joint sessions then we have someone - okay.

(Leslie): That's actually number 5, on our joint agenda.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Wolf. Last time I welcome the offers to incorporate or to find a level of cooperation in this area and I still (unintelligible), you know, some of your - what you have achieved so far.

However, as you know in my - anytime this (unintelligible) into your organized in that manner in the stakeholder group and constituency where - and they started as well, for example, (unintelligible) that you were looking for internally, looking at the budget and the financial issues.

I'm sure the other (unintelligible) do the same and or have already (unintelligible) things.

So we are looking from - maybe from slightly different perspectives from that point and you have to (unintelligible). I would suggest that you start trying to discuss it on GNSO level how to (unintelligible) on the GNSO level, come to a cooperational or discussion on this (unintelligible). Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephane. I just wanted to suggest another way we could probably work together even sooner. I know that the ccNSO is looking for more detail from a financial point of view related to cc expenses but we've been doing the same thing for years with regard to the GNSO.

And I would just like to suggest to Stephane that we also in the GNSO joined them in requesting for that additional detail, again, similar to what they're asking related to gTLDs because it's a common need, one that's been expressed for years.

And it (unintelligible) progress and increased detail two years back for several years, then it kind of dried up. And then there have been no improvements in the last couple years.

So I would encourage the GNSO to join with the ccNSO in asking the CFO for additional detail with regards to GNSO expenses.

(Leslie): Yes.

Byron Holland: Just two comments, one very quickly to get ramped up is all of the comments on the Strat and Ops plan are available - we have made as a cc community are all available for all to see so you can read them for yourselves or - you know, they've done a great job in that working group so you can clearly get an idea about where the dollars are flowing and the concerns that we see.

And then, of course, the other side which (Leslie) mentioned, the (unintelligible), where do we think they should go from the cc community. So all of those documents are available to read.

And I would also strongly encourage the comments that Chuck just made - I mean we have been making a lot of comments about this issue from the cc community but if we could triangulate it from other communities I think that would be exceptionally helpful for all of us.

(Leslie): So just to be constructive we have a very good meeting with the new CFO and ICANN has been without a CFO for some considerable time and he clearly has a task on his hand, not least of which is the introduction (to the) financial system and one of the aims of that new financial system I am told is to enable better reporting to the Board, to the management team, and also to the community.

So I'm sure if he were here he would ask us some space to do that. I think he's survived a few weeks so far so we don't want him to leave just yet.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you, any other questions on this? Move to the next agenda item then. Do you want to...

(Leslie): Yes, okay. So on the Item 3 was what's known as a cross TLD registration scam which was a suggestion from the GNSO for the agenda where it's my understanding you were talking about a deceptive sales practice where an existing registrant is sent a notice or rung up.

There's another party who's interested in or attempting to register the registrant domain name in another TLD. And I understand you have or you will be discussing that on the GNSO and there was a discussion to see whether this was something you might have in common, move cc's to LDs. And it will be no surprise that yes indeed it is something that we have some experience of. Peter?

(Peter): Hi, my name is (Peter) (unintelligible) from (Centran). Within (Centran), more particular within the center of legal working group we've come across this issue for some time now and some members have addressed it somewhat success, some still lacking success.

I think (unintelligible) is a good example of the former type of member where they had a successful work case and it's handled quite recently, I guess.

So happy to try to discussion this if we can help and contribute to that. We've also looked at - to some of the other scams that have been going on and the people behind them are quite often one of the same so it might be useful to maybe look at it from a slightly global scope but happy to contribute something any time.

Man: From one of our - hello Councilors, we've got part of the report that deals with this particular subject and it raises a question with (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) we've had similar experiences but research we did into those

offense always led to the conclusion that if you approached (unintelligible) registrants did not registering.

So did not accept the proposal and did not register the same domain name under the other TLD then it was never registered. So the scam was - there was no point in exchanging information between the two registries because there was never - there's never going to be an attempt - there was no other client who wanted to register the same name in another TLD.

I don't likely have the same - do I make myself clear?

Because the scam is a registrant of an existing domain name and the doc now gets a phone call and says, listen, there's somebody who wants to register your domain name in .EU. It was always .EU. And you have to act quickly, it costs you 200 Euros, and we'll do it for you.

Of course, when they yes, please, they pay 200 Euros to have the domain.

But if they say no thank you and you check two days later that domain was never registered under .EU. So there was no other client. The scam started there already. And there was no point there in exchanging information with Europe on it. So I don't know if you have the same experience or that you really see that there is.

Stephane Van Gelder: So I'm not going to answer your question directly but just to remind the ccNSO that we had a working group looking at registration abuse, one of the things that it looked at was this issue across TLD registration scamming, that was the group provided a final report to the Council and in that final report one of the recommendations to do with this was that even though the issues

weren't reviewed there was not enough (unintelligible) at the time to start formal - the formal process on this.

So that suggests that although the group looked at these issues the problem that you encountered that you've just told us about was probably linked to the problems that they found of not having enough data to be able to actually start something.

Perhaps it's a type of - and I don't want to speak for the working group.

The working group no longer - it's produced its final report so - but perhaps that type of scam is something that once the person as you've just mentioned that's put forward the offer of cross registration and disappeared, you can't trace that anymore.

(Leslie): So if I can just pass some information around, the (nominate) court case that was quite a few years ago, not recent, but that - there weren't any registrations ever made in those cases either. There was no intent to actually make a registration at all but to receive the money was nice.

So it was dealt with by both our consumer enforcement authorities and as a registry we were able to take action because they had abused our data base. That was - there were two kind of avenues of action but there were no registrations ever. That wasn't the point.

Man: This is probably (unintelligible) a little bit but we have an organization called (DRock) in Canada so is well-known I think for abusive marketing practices let's say. And unfortunately they're actually based out of Canada too even though they do their dirty work all over the world and they were a registrar of (CERA) or .CA and we took action against them this past year.

It's in the public record. We threw them out. They sued us for a considerable sum and we've gone to court but basically we did take action against them and we have removed them from the official registrar group in Canada.

So it's certainly possible to do and I think it's incumbent upon us to take those sorts of actions to prevent the kind of practices that we're talking about here today. And when you shine the harsh light of day on their practices they do not stand up well in court.

(Leslie): Any further comments or questions on that one?

Man: Yes. I have a question on line from (Yoav).

(Yoav): Yes. Actually I just wanted to add kind of the same thing from our experience as a Brand Protection Registrar. We've been getting from many of our customers this kind of notices that they were getting mainly by email.

It was mainly from a different people every time coming from - usually from Hong Kong or somewhere around. Every time they use a different name - a organization name and we had the same experience that the domains were never registered.

Afterwards the main thing that we did was educating the public, educating our customers. We did some PR also about it so people will know that it's there. Practically we didn't find any way - any different other way to fight it.

And in most cases they were addressing different ccTLD, (unintelligible) like .CN, .TW and but also sometimes also gTLDs in their emails. But it was never the same. It's one that we've seen that was really different from the other.

Man: Thanks, (Yoav). Any further comments? Okay. So, let's move to the next issue, Jeff. I think you're taking this one.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, this is Jeff Neuman with Red Street Stakeholder Group. I had asked for this topic to be put on the agenda. We have an issue that we're working with the GAC relating to a proposal sent over from the GAC to GNSO on the protection of Olympic and Red Cross trademarks in the new gTLD process. This was as a result of a resolution at the last ICANN meeting Singapore.

We're looking for ways in which we can coordinate or collaborate with the GAC and we understand that the GAC actually - or members of the GAC - individual representatives from the GAC - serve on some of your working groups and at least some capacity.

We have been previously been led to believe that the GAC doesn't generally participate in working groups and so if we can just get a discussion on how they participate in some of your activities I think that will help us to suggest ways forward with the GAC and with some of our groups.

So if there's anyone that could address that, that'd be great.

Man: Good afternoon. To answer your question I think what I will represent is two models the GSNO is currently using to engage the GAC in its activities. More ways but they show diversity or from participation.

One is a very very structured way, that's what we in the ccNSO is called the framework of implementation working group and that's modeled and structured as the (IDNC) working group was in the past that came up with the (fasttrack) idea.

So it was, say, the participation of the GAC is already envisioned in the charter. So before the discussion starts on the charter there is a sounding of the board - sorry of the GAC whether they want to participate in such a working group and there are different options foreseen in the charter already how they could participate.

Now in the case of the framework of implementation working group there is, in fact, full participation of the GAC and this is reflected in a couple of ways. First of all we have I think around five to ten members of the framework of integration working group of individual GAC representatives.

So they don't represent the GAC, they represent their government officials and that's it but they're bringing a certain perspective. So that's a starting point from a working group.

What we've also done in that charter of the framework of interpretation working group is ensure that the GAC is informed in a timely manner that is through their participation but also that whatever is the result of this framework of interpretation working group needs to be adopted and supported or supported in its (unintelligible) language by both the ccNSO that it includes members and the council and the GAC. Only then the result becomes final.

So that is one way of doing it. And that's the most structured way of doing it and it depends very much on the topic. Say the framework of interpretation for those who are not familiar with the lingo that's about delegation or re-delegations of ccTLDs and how to interpret the current policies regarding the delegations and redelegations.

So from a GAC perspective that is probably a very - it's implicitly high on their agenda because it deals with sovereignty issues, et cetera. So that's one way of doing it.

Another example which is almost at the other end of the spectrum is the study group under use of the country names. I think there is a GNSL observer on that working group as well. We - GAC was involved in the initial discussions within the ccNSO on the new gTLD policy but that's a long time ago.

And as you are far more aware than we are in the new gTLD African Guide book say the use of country names - their country names are not permissive under the African Guide book for the first round.

In order to move forward and be able to compare the policies, et cetera, we invited - the ccNSO invited the GAC at several instances and finally there is one participant from the GAC with an interest and that's probably the way - but that's a GAC internal matter how they want to participate and we've been pushing this to get it on their agenda as an interest and there is from history there is interest in this topic as well because you deal with, again, a very sensitive topic for government which is country names and territory names.

So these are the two, say, if you look at the charter, the final bit of it from the study group, there is this working group will only make recommendations from the ccNSO council but in the mean time say as a kind of progress report we update the GAC constantly or the GAC is updated constantly by the ccNSO at the joint meetings. That's more or less the two ways.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Just to make sure I understood clearly what that last bit of what you said. On that second example there's an individual GAC member attending in his own personal capacity but the GAC has not found that- one then.

Man: It's - Yes.

Jeff Neuman: It's more than one, then.

Man: No, that's that the FOY. That's the FOY working. That's the first example.
That's the very structured one.

Jeff Neuman: The second example that you gave...

Man: The second example is there is in the GAC, there is an interest but this person attended knowing he was representing a government as a GAC rep but she's in no capacity representing the GAC as a whole and that's the constant dialogue the ccNSO has with the GAC and what capacity do you want the GAC in there.

It's a bit like the discussion you had this morning about the (metrics) working group whether you want the full ccNSO to participate or whether you want individual members to participate because, say, the thinking behind the second model is if you have individual members they will report back and that's the way of informing the GAC as well.

Woman: I just wanted to put a little bit of context in this because it's - the GAC members in both of those bodes, although actually not in the informal but in the more structured and formal undertaking, they are quite reluctant to - they are there, they are observers, they will answer some questions but it really tends to be more that they are aware of our progress as we go on then that we're getting input from as a, you know, context from the GAC.

So making sure you understand what the role has been so far. We would like it to be more but that's been our experience.

Man: Thanks. (unintelligible). Any further comments or questions please?

(Carlos): (Unintelligible) from Malawi. I think that on this issue we - the ccTLDs in the Africa region are struggling with a similar topic which is the African (M) .Africa which tends to have often slipped through the cracks of protection and I think you'll hear during this meeting that African governments are agitating strongly for its protection.

So we would be interested in learning how the progress on the (unintelligible) and the other names has gone and the primary interest to African ccTLDs as well. I don't know how they took our (unintelligible) evident to us so work with us on this as well so that we can mend from the processes (that you've already gone through). Thanks.

(Leslie): Thank you, (Carlos). I guess we need to note that comment. I'm not sure if it's relevant to our agenda but I think it's very important that people are aware of that issue. If that's okay with you. Thank you. Okay.

Are there any more comments on this particular item? Okay. Move on to the (unintelligible) which is likely trailed earlier. So the ccNSO have been talking around how we can strengthen our meetings between GSNO and ccNSO and we have some options for you.

So the agenda is currently constructed through sometimes last minute (chair) discussion either by phone or by email but we work differently with other groups from the community.

So for example we have some time to joint a vendor working groups or we've had individual (councilors) volunteering to do that liaison work and we'd like to invite the GNSO to consider maybe getting a couple of councilors involved and structuring the agenda so we can make the best use of our time and discuss things that are of interest to CCs as well as GNSO members during this time.

Man: Thanks for the (CTNSO) for bringing this topic up. It's true that our agenda - for this type of meeting our agendas have actually been built up in one of two ways. It has for this meeting I think being an informal and kind of last minute dash because both being very busy with other things but in the past we have tended to see suggestions from both SOs.

We - I don't know how the ccNSO obviously but the GNSO during their weekend sessions will discuss the agenda items that have been suggested, try and hone them and make sure that any other aspects that we would like to discuss with you we are able to or try to identify any answers to questions that you've already asked.

So we do try and work actively to towards the preparation for these agendas and also we, in the preparation for our overall ICANN meeting agenda, we find someone that's from the council leadership team - so one of the two vice chairs - to overlook that agenda and make sure that it can be as effective as possible.

So there is a person there that could easily interface with the ccNSO so if you are able to accommodate that. That can open that up to also the GNSO council members here if they think that's a constructive approach.

(Leslie): We'd be willing to accommodate that. In fact we've already had kind of volunteers from the ccNSO take on that role. (Duff Rodolf) and (Uhani) though I'm not sure he knows yet.

Man: Any comments on these proposals? Agreement.

(Leslie): Thank you very much.

Man: So how do we proceed with it. Do we know who contacts who?

(Leslie): Not yet.

Man: We have a rotation for who does the agenda. It's a volunteer-based system. I volunteer them and so we will determine who will do the next agenda and I will suggest to that person or person that's sharing the GNSO council then will suggest to that person to contact the two people on your side doing exactly the same thing.

Man: It's good to see we have at least common ground on the volunteering system.

Man: I did note that...

(Leslie): I did tell them before I connected. Okay. Thank you for that. So the final item on our agenda was a follow-up discussion from previous discussions that we've had around the idea of the cross community working group. How do we deal with working groups that cut across the SOs and we wanted really to understand what are the issues and whether this is a high priority.

It currently doesn't feel like a high priority from the GNSO council in which case we have other things to do but I think it is of interest to us.

Man: So it is something that we've looked at unfortunately - and this is not on purpose I assure you - the person that's overseeing this effort on the GNSO council side has fallen ill today, Jonathan Robinson.

So we briefly spoke this morning so that he could very quickly update me on what was going on but obviously I'm not in a position to speak with as much depth as he could do this.

mean, we do have a team working on this headed by Jonathan and the council passed a motion at its previous teleconference on October the 6th and on this issue of looking at the way that we could work on proposed framework for handling cross-community working groups.

So Jonathan's words to me this morning were the work is being done. It's going well. Tell them everything's okay. I don't know if that's as much use to you as you like but maybe Jaime can fill in.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime Wagner. I'm a member of this working group. More a group than working and we will have a meeting at Thursday and it's open and we have made an all invite - everybody's invited to join.

We are mainly concerned of the chartering of these grounds community working groups. That's the main concern on this first effort and we would like to welcome any members of other SOs. I think the participation this (unintelligible) began. It will be Thursday in this very room. 8:30.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jaime. Let me just add that the motion that the council passed approved the charter and (saved) a set of objectives of the group's work. So Jaime's already mentioned that they'll be a workshop there and the group is

looking to deliver thoughts some time next year to the GSNO council. So the work is - it is a working group rather than just a group. It is working.

(Leslie): Could I just ask a question for clarification? The subject to the fact (unintelligible) participation. Is there cross-community participation in the working group because I don't recall the (season) as so being invited to send a representative.

Tim Ruiz: Am I in the queue?

Stephane Van Gelder: Tim, we've got you in the queue. We'll get to you in a minute. Thanks.

Jaime Wagner: Can I? This is Jaime. And there was a general invitation from staff to other SOs and that's what we were told to participation in this working group. And GNSO working group by this time. It's not a cross-community working group in itself.

This GNSO working group owned this theme and there is an invitation to all the community to participate on a voluntary basis.

Stephane Van Gelder: I have Tim next.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I just wanted to add to that. It's not the GNSOs intention, at least my understanding is it's not our intention that we're going to, you know, figure this all out in a vacuum and then expect that to be the way things are.

That, first of all, as Jaime said, anyone's - as they always are - anyone in the community is invited to participate in our working groups.

But I think that Jonathan's intention that as we get a better idea of where we are the GNSO and some of these concepts and some of these issues that have come up that we begin to broaden the participation to start including the other SOs and ACs more fully so that - because we know we have to have a community to come to agreement on how we're going to move forward with community working groups and that's not something we're going to figure out in the vacuum completely.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Tim. Adam.

Adam Peake: Yes. My recollection is - maybe I've missed something - that this was a working group primarily put together a GNSO perspective of how cross-constituency working groups should work and what the issues are and the work product that they developed would then be presented to the other ACs and SOs. I believe that is what our charter said.

Man: That is my recollection as well. Internal working group to determine how the GNSO should first of all approach the topic and then share this with the other groups. But there's been an open call for...

Jaime Wagner: Well, certainly in my position I'm not normally hesitant to participate in GNSO activities. I exclusively did not and didn't forward that to at large because I thought this should be an internal GNSO thing of you figure out the issues that you believe are there and then the rest of us will start talking about them.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jaime.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I think though that we never restrict our working groups. I mean, that's the whole point of the working group concept that they're open to all to

participate. You know, we might form grafting teams or other things but when we form working groups anyone in the community is invited to participate.

At least that's my understanding.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Tim. And Alan is nodding saying that's what he said.

Alan Greenberg: That was a voluntary position on my part to not participate in this and let GNSO - true GNSO councilors come up with the position first, not that I thought I was restricted and wasn't allowed to be.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you.

(Leslie): Sounds like (unintelligible) ccNSO workload is unsure. You and (unintelligible) GNSO workload. If we can find a way of maybe an update of our next session, that would be really helpful and could use people's time I suggest.

At present we have I'm sure your work plan is just as bad. We have a work plan that we're trying to get control of and prioritize so it's quite difficult for us to offer volunteers to too many groups unfortunately.

But obviously it's very clear at certain point it could value for us to engage when maybe some of the initial thinking has been done.

Man: Can I? Certainly this group would benefit from any input from the community so since I think this pertains to interest of everybody.

But as Alan said, the first thing is to build a GNSO perspective but I think we could benefit of the voluntary work and sure we will be able to give information as long as the process goes.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. Any further comments, please?

(Leslie): Yes. I'm (unintelligible). I am actually getting more confused after the comments. Is it open or is it not? If it is open then maybe we should - even if we don't get engaged formally maybe it would benefit us if we could at least sit in during the Thursday meeting, send one or two people from the cc to the meeting or, I mean, is that what we should do or is it...

Man: May I respond?

Definitely it's open. It's open to all participation but it is a working group that was chartered by GNSO so since it was chartered it is a formal group from GNSO open to participation of all community but it was not chartered by ccNSO so it's not - this group is not formally a cross-community working group itself but it's open, definitely.

Stephane Van Gelder: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. It sounds like you're saying this is not a cross-constituency working group where the ACs and SOs can debate issues and try to come to a compromise but you're welcome input and insights from any other AC or SO that may want to participate.

Under those conditions I will try to make sure someone's at this week's meeting and future meetings.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. Any further comments?

John Berard: Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes.

John Berard: This is John.

Stephane Van Gelder: Go on, John.

John Berard: It strikes me in listening to the discussion that the ccNSO does not feel the same urgency that the GNSO feels on the subject of cross-community working groups and that's totally understandable.

But I think that the effort on the part of the GNSO council is in fact due to not just a current urgency on this matter but we see as the community reorganizes itself particularly as caused by the introduction of the new gTLDs and the new working relationships that community members will have in which companies will become registries and registrars become registries and all around that there will be an increasing likelihood that cross-community working groups will be valuable.

So the charter that we passed is to create - created a working group of the GNSO to scope out these issues.

Alan is absolutely correct at any time any working group, anybody can participate but our hope is that we will be able to create a framework by which we can officially and formally create a way in which we can have cross-community working groups that deliver unified output that can help guide the board.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, John. Any further comments. (Leslie).

(Leslie): Yes, I guess our feeling around urgency is because they're already doing some cross-constituency working groups, for example, (unintelligible) working group that we referred to earlier.

But the comment just now from John Berard is the bigger issue perhaps is that other communities it doesn't feel though there's been a great deal of time talking about post gTLD structures.

So while it might be opportune to look at cross-community working groups there is a bigger conversation around the shape of the community and how we engage and develop policy post-integration new gTLDs and I wonder if we've missed an opportunity for that discussion.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Leslie). Anything further? In that case as we've come to the end of our agenda. Thank you all for your participation and we look forward to seeing you again at all these open workshops that we've just mentioned.

Thank you very much. (Leslie), any further?

(Leslie): No. Thank you.

Man: Thank you. Operator, this session is now over. Thank you.

END