

**Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting**  
**Joint ccNSO/GNSO Council meeting**  
**Monday 15 July 2013 at 13:00 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/#jul>

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

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

Lesley Cowley: Okay so we're going to make a start and I see some new faces around the table. Maybe a good place to start would be to introduce who you are and where you're from. And I'm going to start just to give us warning with Young Eum Lee and work my way around from there.

So welcome, everybody. Yung, would you like to start and then we'll work our way around the table.

Young Eum Lee: Sure. (Yung Lee), DotKR.

Sokol Haxhiu: Sokol Haxhiu, ccNSO councilor from Albania.

Man: (Unintelligible) from NCUC and as a (unintelligible) priority alternate for Maria Farrell.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann, GNSO councilor, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, ccNSO councilor, DotUS.

Man: (Unintelligible) councilor IPC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, the ALAC liaison for ccNSO Council and DotAU.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg, ALAC liaison so the GNSO.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff and GNSO Team Leader.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ICANN staff and ccNSO.

Byron Holland: Byron Holland, CEO of DotCA.

Lesley Cowley: Lesley Cowley, CEO of Nominet and last meeting as ccNSO Chair.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson, Registry Stakeholder Group, councilor and Chair of the GNSO Council.

Mason Cole: Mason Cole, Registrar Stakeholder Group and Vice Chair of the GNSO council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Wolf-Ulrich Knoen, ISP Constituency on the GNSO Council and Vice Chair of the Council.

David Cake: David Cake, GNSO councilor for the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Roelof Meijer: Roelof Meijer, ccNSO Council and CEO of DotML.

Oswaldo Novoa: Oswaldo Novoa, GNSO councilor, ISPCP.

Victor Abboud: I'm Victor Abboud, CEO of DotEC, ccNSO councilor.

Marie Laure-Lemineur: Good afternoon. Marie Laure-Lemineur, Costa Rica. And the GNSO temporary alternate for Wendy Seltzer.

Magaly Pazello: Magaly Pazello, GNSO councilor for Non Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Demi Getschko: Demi Getschko, ccNSO Dot(DR).

Joy Liddicoat: Joy Liddicoat, GNSO councilor from the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group and also, until the 31st of July, Chair of the Region 8 on Dot(Ed).

Hirofumi Hotta: Hiro Hotta, ccNSO councilor, DotJP.

John Berard: My name is John Berard. I'm the GNSO councilor from the Commercial and Business Users Constituency and serve as its liaison to the ccNSO Council.

Lesley Cowley: Okay so thank you, everybody. So the GNSO and the ccNSO Councils (unintelligible) over a number of years now and what we thought might be a useful way to approach this meeting is to firstly give some thought as to where we are similar and where we are different. And we have asked the Secretariat to help us with that task. They support us both extremely well, I'm sure, and know us extremely well too.

And as they are presenting we'd like you to start to think about how we might work more together, where we more naturally fit together and also if you're a veteran of some of these lunches over the years what has worked well for you, what may be hasn't worked quite so well and how can we use that to define how we might engage going forward.

But to start with let me hand over to Marika and to Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Good afternoon. I will use my soothing voice to put you really to sleep over the lunch. I can use it - there's some of the ccNSO members know, I can have - I have another voice as well which I won't use this afternoon.

To get started Marika and I looked at a - some of, as Lesley said, some of contrast and similarities of the GNSO and ccNSO. And we started first looking at the Council and how they function, operate and what their role is in particularly with regard to PDPs, etcetera.

But we soon found out that the real difference and why there is probably a difference in expectations around this meeting but also in the broader context of what the GNSO can expect from the ccNSO and the ccNSO Council and the other way around was the ccNSO can expect from the GNSO Council and different constituencies is mainly due to probably unfamiliarity with each other.

So we looked at - so where we started is in fact looking at different dimensions of the GNSO and ccNSO and is in fact putting the Council and its functions in to context in which they operate. And although you will see at some of the slides they look similar. If you drill down a little bit more you'll see there are huge differences.

And I think the first one is on the scope of activities. (Unintelligible). On the...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: There we go. So I broke the computer.

Bart Boswinkel: ...starting point.

Marika Konings: So, yeah, so we basically started looking first, well what is the scope of the activities of our respective supporting organizations? So for the GNSO - and this is, you know, basically it's mandate under the bylaws it's responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies related to generic top level domains so basically very broad mandate.

This can be done through a PDP, as you have as well. We have our own version of the PDP. That, again, there's some similarities but also some substantial differences.

But then they also be done in other ways of developing input and advice as requested by the Board or on topics where we feel it's important as long as those relate to gTLD related issues.

And the GNSO as a whole, as well, is an important platform to exchange views between the different stakeholders as I think as we'll see in some of the other slides the very different views and perspectives and background within the GNSO as concretely (unintelligible) that contracted parties, those entities that have contracts with ICANN and then non contracted parties that have either a stake or an interest in gTLD related issues.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at the ccNSO - and we've put them now in - more or less in order of priority of the role of the ccNSO as a whole - it's first and foremost a platform of exchange of information and to share experiences. Again, first of all, internally that means across the ccTLD community itself and then externally with other SOs and ACs and ICANN as an organization.

It's there to develop best practices and best practices is more sharing what works in one ccTLD and what works in - where the others can learn than documenting really best practices although in some cases we've done so and there are some examples.

And, excuse me, and say part of it is - as part of the whole set of interactions we developed some guidelines, etcetera, for interaction between - that have been developed between the ccTLDs and ICANN itself. So I'm referring here to what is probably known as the accountability framework program so that's the documentation of the relationship between ccTLDs and ICANN and also guidelines on the financial contribution for individual ccTLDs to ICANN.

What is important to know? The ccNSO does not step into that relation; it sets guidelines for both ICANN and the ccTLDs in order to have a point of reference.

And finally and probably in some respect that is the policy related activities. And I think now we touch upon one of the major-major differences between the ccNSO and the GNSO is policy development.

Although there is an extensive set of rules, etcetera, in the ICANN by laws the ccNSO has completed one PDP that was in its early days and that was on changing the bylaws. And we now still have the second PDP which is - hopefully will be concluded in a couple of months but - and it's been running for six years.

And these are the only two - I can put it another way, the ccNSO tries to avoid using that method and has developed alternatives for PDPs. And so they've taken the freedom, etcetera, and agreed upon a set of rules and guidelines for itself to develop alternative methodologies.

And that resulted, for instance, in work on the interpretation of existing policies and one of the more well known ones probably in this forum is the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. This is on the interpretation of the delegation - redelegation policy for the ccTLDs, (RSC) (1591) which dates back to - no to 1994. And it was deliberately done to, again, to avoid the policy development process.

Marika Konings: So then looking at the scope of the policy so as I said, you know, in the GNSO a lot of policy development activities take place. I think we currently have four or five PDPs that are ongoing, you know, simultaneously. And it really relates to substantive policies relating to gTLDs.

Basically the process for running PDP is described in Annex A of the ICANN bylaws and we also have a PDP Manual that's part of the GNSO Operating Procedures that describes all the steps that need to be respected and taken.

And I think it's also important - I think here the difference you may see is that the scope of the policies is not outlined in the bylaws, which I think is the case for the ccNSO where it's described what you can actually do or not do within the - within policy development.

I think it's important to talk a little about the concept of consensus policies. Because I think the way the GNSO uses policy development in certain instances is to develop consensus policies. And those are policies that are - become contractually binding on ICANN's contracted parties so on registries and registrars, if they followed appropriate process and are ratified by the ICANN Board.

Again, of course, for those policies there is a restriction or there is a limited number of topics that can be run under consensus policies but those are actually defined in the agreements that ICANN has with its registries and registrars.

There are some similarities between the two, as well, some differences. And sometimes you may hear that referred to as being the picket fence. So the picket fence are those topics for which it's within the GNSO's remit to develop consensus policy using the policy development process and meeting all the criteria that are outlined there before it will actually become contractually binding on those parties.

So some of the topics that are included in the picket fence are, you know, principles for the allocation of registered names, resolution of disputes and also access to contact information, you know, Whois related to issues.

I think just looking at those lists of items probably already gives you an idea that that's a really broad scope that could fall under those topics even though, as said, there are some limitations as to what can be developed under the consensus policy model.

Bart Boswinkel: Say, in the case of the ccNSO as I said, we - the ccNSO has only run two PDPs and one was on the bylaws. And partly that is due to the very, very, very limited scope for policies in the ccNSO.

To put it the other way around all policies relating to the registration and that includes Whois, etcetera, are excluded of the mandate of the ccNSO. These for ccTLDs, at least, these are all done locally. The ccNSO does not have a remit in that regard.

So this is probably one of the reasons why you see hardly any reaction from the ccNSO on requests to participate in policy development processes of the GNSO because they all relate to the registration policies in one way or the other. And the ccNSO that is out of bounds of the ccNSO. That is individual ccTLDs who have the experience, who run their own policy development processes in that area. Some of them are very extensive.

Marika Konings: So I'm looking at the structure of the two councils and supporting organizations as a whole. So the Council itself consists of 21 councilors. Three of those come from the Registry Stakeholder Group, three of those come from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, six of them come from the Commercial Stakeholder Group, six of those come from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group and then there are also three NomComm appointees.

All those Council members are divided into two houses mentioned before so one is the Contracted Party House which houses the Registries and the Registrars and then the Non Contracted Party House which has the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Non Commercial - the Commercial and the Non Commercial Stakeholder groups.



So within those groups then you have, as well, again so you have constituencies or interest groups. So we have the four stakeholder groups as mentioned, you know, two per each house. And within those then you have, again, sub groups, for example, the Commercial Stakeholder Groups consist the IPC, the Intellectual Property Constituency, the Business Constituency and the ISP Constituency.

Similarly on the Non Commercial side there is the Non Commercial Users Constituency and the Not for Profit Operational Services Constituency, NPOC.

And for example in the Registry Stakeholder Group you have the concept of interest groups. So there currently you see that certain groups are organizing around interests in relation to the new gTLD program so there's - I think they're called the NTAG, the New gTLD Applicant Group interest group. And there's some other groups as well in formation so that's how the structure of the GNSO Council as well as the GNSO community that exists underneath that is organized.

Bart Boswinkel: As to the ccNSO fortunately it's not as complex. We have a Council which is 18 members, 15 are elected by the ccTLD members of the ccNSO, three from every ICANN region. So the ccNSO is really working with ICANN regions which leads to its own complexities. Three are appointed by the NomComm.

There are - ccTLDs manages our members - voluntary members of the ccNSO. To date we have 137 members. It doesn't cover - it's a bit biased, that number, but that doesn't matter, out of the 258 ccTLDs.

I've included non members although they explicitly - not in the ccNSO. The ccNSO is very open and its working groups are very open to members and

non members of the ccNSO. The most important criteria is probably to be a ccTLD manager or be aligned or affiliated with the ccTLD managers.

So, again, as I said in this Framework of Interpretation Working Group, which is probably very important for ccTLD managers in general, you see members and non members of the ccNSO participating in that working group although it is ccNSO. So there is no distinction there.

Marika Konings: So moving on to the role of the councils and maybe just to mention as well on the open list even though, indeed, we have constituencies and stakeholder groups and, you know, at a Council level, the work within the GNSO - so on policy development, those working groups are actually open for anyone interested to participate so it's not restricted to GNSO members but anyone interested.

We often have a lot of ALAC participants, and, you know, sometimes as well from other groups. I don't think we've had too many from the ccNSO but occasionally there's other groups that are interested to participate or individuals that actually don't have any affiliation with the GNSO or any other groups within ICANN.

So looking at the roles of the Council and, again, the thinking here as well one of the difference where, I think, you know, one of the main roles of the Council is decision making.

So basically when PDPs come to a certain stage a final report or, you know, ratified outcomes of those groups, you know, vote on motions and manage the PDP process. As one as well the task and it's specifically outlined in the bylaws as being a task as the manager of the PDP process.

So the policy development takes actually place within the GNSO community through working groups and the GNSO Council is expected to oversee that and make sure that the required steps are followed in the process and be

able to intervene if there's a sense that the working groups are even meeting the criteria that are outlined in the Annex A or the situations where they may need to intervene or facilitate.

So I think those are the two main roles that the GNSO Council has.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry. If you look at the ccNSO Council it's first and foremost an administrative body so it manages the activities of the ccNSO. If you take the example, again, of the PDP the PDP - the final vote on the PDP is not by the ccNSO Council but is by the members of the ccNSO.

So although - if, say, and this is also embedded - this mechanism is embedded in the rules of the ccNSO itself. Every Council decision could be overturned by the ccNSO membership if they would take a vote. Fortunately it never happened and that means there is good alignment between the membership and the Council. But in principle this will - is in place so the final say within the ccNSO is with the membership.

And, secondly, again, that's why you meet with the ccNSO Council because probably you don't want 66 people in the room. The ccNSO Council has a representational role, especially the chair and the vice chairs of the ccNSO. They, you know, they meet a lot and speak on behalf of the community.

They're not really representing them in the sense the views up until, yeah, if they're mandated to do it they will but at least to share the views of the broader community with others.

Marika Konings: Then just briefly looking at the relationship that exists between TLD operators and that, as well, with registrars. So basically within the GNSO, as mentioned before, there's the Registry Stakeholder Group in which all the registries are represented.

And as mentioned before as well, like the relationship they have is that (unintelligible) of the contract that they have with ICANN they have to oblige or be aligned with policies that are adopted - the consensus policies which are directly applicable and enforceable by ICANN so there's a direct relationship there that the outcomes of the PDP process will have - will affect them as a group.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at the ccNSO, again, as I said, members - these members are voluntary members. They need to apply and then approve by the Council, the membership needs to be.

And as a result of their membership they, in a way, voluntarily abide to the policies that (unintelligible) through a PDP and that policy only applies to the members so non members - policies do not apply and are not binding for non members that is a policy developed through the PDP. And there's a whole set of exceptions, again, enshrined in the ICANN bylaws for this.

Secondly, as I said, the ccNSO does not represent individual ccTLDs or the ccTLD as a whole unless mandated to do so. And finally, and again, this is to show you the difference.

The ccNSO recommendation, for example, the ones on the financial contributions and the accountability frameworks, etcetera, are not binding on the members or non members. They are really guidelines in that sense to assist structuring the relationship between ICANN and the individual ccTLDs.

Marika Konings: And then looking next at the relationship with registrars - and, again, for the GNSO it follows the similar model as with registries, you know, they're represented through a Registrar Stakeholder Group and they also have to - they're also required to follow consensus policies that are developed through using a PDP which then are directly applicable and enforceable by ICANN.

And based on Bart's comments it may be important to emphasize as well that it also applies to registrars that are not members of the stakeholder group or that do not come to ICANN. Basically it's anyone, any registrar or registry that has a contract with ICANN is required to comply with consensus policy even if they weren't involved in the development or vote on it so I think, again, an important distinction.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, the ccNSO life is very simple. There is no direct relationship with registrars. This is one of the things that is completely done locally. Each individual ccTLDs - if they have registrars, if they work on the, say, a registry/registrar model they will accredit the registrars locally. So in that sense it's a very monolithic organization.

Marika Konings: Yeah and then I think also we're maybe very different. There are actually quite a few areas where we are working together and have shared interests. And we list I think those of those active - activities here on this slide. And I don't know if this the moment to actually hand it back to Lesley and Jonathan to look at these efforts and actually maybe try to determine what...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah. So moving on to the next slide.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Marika Konings: So basically this indeed summarizes. But we need to cover...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So basically it's to basically summarize a bit what are the current shared interests and issues that we have on the table so managing the joint activities. As you see before there are a couple of working groups that we're actually managing jointly between the two groups.

There is a shared interest in ICANN strategic and operational planning and budget although I think probably from the GNSO side that's probably more at the level of stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Because, again, I think that's an area of difference where I think you there, as the ccNSO Council, develop a position or comment on that. I think within the GNSO that's typically done at a stakeholder group and constituency level and not necessarily at the Council level.

I think one of the questions as well, "How can we improve interaction at the working group level?" I think as Bart mentioned, we don't often get participation from ccTLDs in our groups because, you know, those policies don't necessarily affect them. But at the same time there's a huge amount of expertise and knowledge within ccTLDs that could really benefit some of the work - GNSO working groups are looking at.

And we actually had the pleasure of meeting with the ccTLD community at one of the recent meetings with one of the working groups looking at change of registrant policy where I think all of the ccTLDs were looking at us and saying like are you really discussing this? We all have a policy - you don't have a policy for that?

So they actually were really willing to share their experiences and their best practices in that area which really benefitted that working group that was looking at it and basically take the parts and pieces that would work in a gTLD context.

So at least from a GNSO perspective I would be very eager to see how we can enhance that kind of collaboration and information sharing because I think there's a lot of expertise and knowledge that exists within the ccTLD community that would really be to the benefit of GNSO efforts. And, again, I

think it's trying to see how we can make that work and make sure, as well, that it's of interest to your community of course.

And I think there are, you know, other - I think, as well, you know, this is really a discussion or starting the discussion here. Are there any other interests where we should be working together and looking at how we can evolve this model of cooperation?

Bart Boswinkel: And that is the last slide. Going back to Lesley and Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Well first of all thank you both. I mean, I think that's a really, really useful presentation. It frames and explains the position very clearly and usefully. You know, I've been involved in various aspects of the business and/or policy aspects of this industry for quite some time. And I - I have, in fact, both in cc and in gTLDs, and I'm not sure I knew all of the detail in that. So it's been some learning for me and I suspect for others.

And so it's very useful for me that we set that framework. We have grappled with these meetings there's no doubt there's been a struggle. I mean, in Beijing even having come together with some good intentions we sort of grappled to get things off. And by setting this out I also think this is a useful presentation that we should have on our GNSO Website.

I think ICANN could usefully use this as material as well. It's just - it's the kind of thing which I think we're probably all guilty of at times. We run ahead of ourselves and forget that, you know, setting a common base level of understanding is very, very useful. So thanks for that.

I suppose - it certainly inspires a couple of questions from me but I think we should let others ask questions as well on the presentation itself before we go into the how move forward because there may be some clarifying questions that people want to ask before we go into that. Lesley, I'm not sure if you

would like to say anything more and then perhaps we can have questions on the content and then move into suggestions.

Lesley Cowley: That's absolutely fine as a way forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so who - does anyone have any questions on the content that was brought up there? I mean, I certainly have one about the best practices and how those - I wouldn't mind knowing a little bit more about how those are framed and then how those are published and how they - how or not they're accepted.

Because I think I understood the discussion around - and presumably they're just - it's simply voluntary is what I think I understood. But it would be useful even how you communicate and get those out. And, frankly, we could do with publishing those to us I suspect. It may be just useful to know about and understand.

Bart Boswinkel: I think, say, there are different ways and we didn't go into that level of detail. There are different ways how the ccNSO organizes activities, sorry. I think the best example on best practices is what was called the Wild Carding study group.

The Wild Carding study group I think it was established in 2009 or 2010, it doesn't matter. But they came up and they did an extensive survey and talked to individual ccTLDs who were using wild cards. And they documented it and that was the result of one of the SSAC advices and that urged the Board to take action. And the Board got back to the ccNSO.

As a result of this, say, report of the study group, which was published and which was sent to and as a result of engaging with some ccTLDs and understanding why you were using wild cards we've seen that, say, one of the largest users has informed the ccNSO Council recently, after an extensive effort, that they stopped using wild cards.



So that's more or less the method of developing best practices. It is hard work to develop it and it's not so much as this is the way to do it but is putting and documenting, say, the different views and perspective and engaging in dialogue both with the experts and, say, in the security and stability area in this case and with the ccTLDs and the broader community and then sharing the results with the larger community that you can see this is a best practice that has been developed.

I think this is probably one of the best examples ever happened. But it is doable. And another way of doing it is just by informal communication during the ccNSO meetings itself because there are several sessions dealing with, say, security and stability, we've got the ccNSO (TAC) day on that.

And, again, that's - ccTLDs who are at the front of, say, some of the developments and (unintelligible) and that they present to others and that you see other ccTLDs taking over.

Lesley Cowley: It's interesting, Jonathan, I think we've got some real differences culturally between our two communities. So just by the way you framed the question about there being a best practice document that actually is quite unusual in the ccNSO context.

And in fact, best practice, the best practice, is a difficult phrase as well because from your question best practice might be a, you know, this is the way it should be done kind of ideal paragon of virtue. From the CC perspective there will be your practice, there will be my practice, there will be somebody else's and we can maybe learn from each other.

So it's not as formal as it is elsewhere. And certainly as Bart has alluded to there are probably only a couple of examples as to where we have come up with a position that could be considered to be best practice.

Jonathan Robinson: Are there any other questions? I had a remark - a follow on from that but, Petter, go ahead.

Petter Rindforth: Yes, to add to what you said, within the ccTLD you can learn from each other. And frankly I think that both of our groups can learn from each other. I see a number of issues that are - or at least have become quite closely related and talking about TLDs and practices and so there are a number of them that are country codes but they're more known as generic, they use this as some kind of generic.

And we also see a number of the new generic ones that are actually geographical names. And so - and there are policies and practices with everything that you have dealt with that is new for us in the GNSO and the vice verse.

And I think that we can actually help the time limit for our work if we can - it doesn't need to be a formal working group every time but if it can, so to speak exchange our information and knowledge, which could speed up for us.

Bart Boswinkel: It's - probably what you just alluded to is one of the reasons why we made this presentation. This presentation was about the Council - the ccNSO council is not the forum to have that discussion. That discussion, in the case of the ccNSO, should be with individual or the ccTLD community. But you don't have the ccTLD community at this table, you have, say, some of them.

They're now wearing their Council hats. And some of them do run the ccTLD. But say what we shared about best practices is discussed at ccNSO meetings which the program, etcetera, is set by the ccTLD community itself. And I use the word ccTLD community deliberately because, again, there is a program working within the ccNSO which is - has members and non members on it in order to come up with a program that they find interesting and what they want to talk about.

Lesley Cowley: So I think the other key point briefly to make in response to that, Petter, is the fact that CC policy is made locally so back somewhere in one of those slides we said there's a (squiggly) little tiny bit of policy that is made at the global level; everything else is local.

And as you quite rightly say, some of those local policies are much more broad that maybe one would see sometimes, which makes the CC look more like a gTLD. That will be a feature of the local policy hopefully with the support of their local Internet community and/or government or whatever.

But from a ccNSO point of view there's a bit of policy but not much (unintelligible), everything else is defined locally which is why we use the majority of our time to discuss issues of common interest. And this is how we did something in the UK or Germany or wherever, how can we learn from each other. Very different.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Yeah, thank you, well, for the good presentation. It's really helpful. Just for my understanding so you mentioned you were dealing with recommendations as well so what I understood you develop recommendations as well. That's what I understood as well.

So how do you - and those recommendations could be overruled also by your community. So but how is that process within the Council? Is that kind of consensus finding here? You are doing so? Are you going to vote for those (unintelligible) you're making? Just to understand, you know, we have a specific process here and rules for that in the GNSO. Is that the same as you are doing?

Lesley Cowley: Some of us can come in here. But I guess as Chair I would say yes the Council does vote. But generally as Chair I would hope to only take something to a vote where it (unintelligible) where in consensus. So generally it's not - we wouldn't move forward on something if it looks as though there are diverse views on it.

In the small bit of policy that we do have that is subject to a member vote, not a Council vote in effect. The Council would decide to take it to the member vote.

Jonathan Robinson: Joy, I think you're next.

Joy Liddicoat: Thank you. Joy Liddicoat for the record. I just wanted to (unintelligible) on a point that (unintelligible) put very elegantly I thought what was a reference to the different cultures of the two groups. And I think that's borne out of the nature of the interests that are at the table (unintelligible) care about that. And I think that it produces a different sort of tensions around how policy is shaped and how consensus is reached.

I think that one thing that, for the ccNSO, I've watched with interest in developing is this (unintelligible) look of interpretation that happens to pull out of the best practice and experience of all diverse ccTLDs, an area where there wasn't clear implementation guidelines and - but practical help was needed.

And it would be one of the area I think perhaps that when you're talking (unintelligible) could really discuss in terms of that experience particularly, as you know, we have a discussion on policy versus implementation of policy and implementation (unintelligible) it's (unintelligible) discussion and perhaps if we're looking at these (unintelligible) about how we can engage I think the more experience of being beneficial for our discussions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Joy. I think I had a comment. Is anyone else in the queue immediately? Oh, I suppose my thought was - and I have to say I'm speaking individually because I haven't thought - or socialized these thoughts with the council at all. But there's a feeling sort of running that may link to what you're saying, Joy.

We, within the whole policy and implementation and what the GNSO Council could or couldn't or should be doing with respect to policy and policy advice it strikes me that there's a - that the work - the work you do on non-binding policy or on ideas around is something we could potentially pick up on a little better because the area we're - we've got this kind of feeling that's running through with the GNSO's ability to be agile yet constrained by the PDP.

And we know that there are good reasons why the PDP is constraining because of what it seeks to achieve. Yet we know we would like to produce outputs that is helpful and more speedy but not necessarily binding on contracted parties.

And it just may be an area of overlap there that we could, you know, understand better. I also liked what I think Marika said earlier about the possibility of simply engaging on an expertise level rather than necessarily trying to say well can we find areas where we developed common policy but simply relying on some of your members' expertise to participate in things like working groups and so on. So there's a couple of thoughts to add to the mix.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Jonathan. So two comments from me. Ten years ago, as you may have noticed from the pull ups around the room, the ccNSO was created. And I am one of those people who was around 10 years ago and there are many also still in this room today.

And we came out of the thing called the DNSO, which of course, was the predecessor of the GNSO and those acronyms (unintelligible). But I think the reason the ccNSO was created was because of these differences particularly because of the contractual differences, and particularly because of the way that local policy is made in countries, etcetera.

So I often think that compared to Jonathan's role as Chair I have a comparatively easier job as Chair because we have a much easier route in terms of what we need to get done though it is challenging at times.

Particularly, to your point around perhaps, you know, ideas in which this could work better because I think this meeting it's been great to have a lunch, etcetera, but we all struggle to get value from this session. But there are many CCs who could share experience where appropriate on policy areas that you are looking at.

And like Marika, the revelation that we had solved an area that you were beginning to look at a few meetings ago was a good one. I have to say if we move to that kind of format it would need to mean a few more lunches, though, because you would have more members here. But maybe that would give more value to your geo-policy making. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you. I just wanted to say as an observer of the GNSO I think that it would be an excellent idea to take particularly contentious things out of the formal process and have the kind of roll up your sleeves, sit down at the table, you know, really get into the hard questions before you go down the formal road. So my experience is is that this would be a very valuable tool for the GNSO.

Lesley Cowley: Okay so this session, which we're naturally drifting into anyway, was to talk about what has worked well in the past. If you can cast your mind back to previous meetings of the two councils, what maybe hasn't worked so well and very importantly, what could we do going forward.

Is this of value? How could we make these sessions with more value? Or do we cancel and do other things because we're all incredibly busy and over-scheduled people during an ICANN week? I'm really happy to get inputs and ideas from all of you.

Woman: Well I was just to suggest as a practical suggestion that we share topics, you know, emerging issues is always good, you know, what are the new changes in practice (unintelligible) perhaps sort of more that outwards horizon look,

perhaps away from the weeds of today but things that might mutually impact on each other. It's always good to just sort of step back from the day to day things and ask what are we seeing from our different perspectives in gTLD or, you know, TLD practice, or innovation.

And particularly I think looking beyond the gTLD rollout and some of the particular implications that's had for ccTLDs who are going into new areas. I think that both would be interesting things to share around discussion on. So emerging issues and then key topics that are (a lot) to discuss might be one way to do it.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Actually something that Bart and I discussed a little bit on what, from our perspective, maybe a workable format or something to explore is possibly have - I don't think (unintelligible) in the lunch kind of setting because there's probably be more people, but for example have a first half hour that's ccNSO/GNSO Council where you, for example, review the projects you have in common so very concretely, where do those efforts stand.

Is there anything we need to be discussing or looking forward to? You know, are there any other items we need to be looking at? For example, one of the things we had put on is the geographic regions report. That may be an item where you may want to discuss as two councils like is there something that we have shared in common here that we may want to prepare a common position on, for example?

And then you may consider actually opening it up and actually have a more focused in-depth discussion where it's more ccTLD operators, community members and as well broadening it the GNSO community and really maybe then picking some topics that you want to share experiences on.

And from the GNSO it can be very concretely and saying well we have a working group on, you know, transfer dispute resolution processes and we're

looking at ways of revamping that. Are there any ccTLDs that are willing to share how they do it and what they consider, you know, best practice in that area?

And maybe there may also be topics from your side where you will be interested to hear how maybe individual, you know, registries or registrars at the gTLD level do certain things or how things are viewed from a non commercial or commercial perspective.

So that may be way - a different format to the meeting but it may be something you're willing to consider explore.

Lesley Cowley: I think that's an excellent suggestion. Certainly I think it's key that everyone gets value from these sessions. And I know that when we do (unintelligible) your working groups come to visit it's quite difficult to fit you in as well. But we do have a working group that looks at developing the plan for this meeting of both of the councils.

And if we know well enough in advance the areas of interest then I'm sure we can always volunteer a ccNSO member to speak to particular issues and share some of the things they're doing.

Jonathan Robinson: Can I just clarify that what Marika was actually suggesting - so what I thought I heard her saying was the councils would meet together for, argument's sake, for the first half and then we would break that part of the meeting and move into more issues-based topics or (unintelligible). We might even need a different format in the room.

We may even think about, you know, tables with themes and we could publish in advance that there are going to be three or four topics per, you know, on the different tables and advertise that as an opportunity. So in essence we become facilitators of an information exchange.



Yeah, fire away. First Marika and then Bart and then...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just a more practical thing we would need to consider there that where on the agenda would something like that go? Because I think you probably would need a little bit more time. And, as I said, the lunch setting may not be idea so it would be, as well, as a practical matter, looking at where there would be a time where it would work for both communities to actually come together especially if you're looking at broadening the discussion and involving more people.

Bart Boswinkel: So to reinforce what Marika has been saying. Say, there are current areas of shared work. That means, well, we have members and - of the ccNSO and the GNSO working together. And there is still the pending issue of the cross constituency working group principles, etcetera.

So there are areas for discussion both at Council level and say, or ccTLD managers individually. And I - you could imagine that, say, the management of these current or future groups, say, that's an area for topics of, say, the Council meetings and then you go into more detail.

Lesley Cowley: So how about if we had a session together with roundtables and the first part of that session is on updating on shared work, the second session is topic related and maybe we can tack on at the end for Joy and for me a bit more forward looking. Would that work? Shall we delegate that item (unintelligible) which is great.

Jonathan Robinson: Just a comment, as well, and I know we all have one too many telephone conferences and so on but I'd just (unintelligible) with everyone that it's not - we're not prohibited from doing some of this work in between times as well. There's no reason why we couldn't - other than simply coordinating the face

to face meeting there are other areas which we can pick up on in the interim if there was the right level of interest and topic and sort of circumstances.

Lesley Cowley: Okay. Any further comments?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So that's - I mean, we've kind of talked about what we're going to talk about and I missed lunch so there's a - we haven't actually talked about what we should talk about. But I think we've got a very good way forward which is great.

And, you know, I'd like to thank the presenters. I think it would be - it's appropriate to congratulate Lesley on her term as Chair of the ccNSO even if it was an easier job than I have to do. But she's clearly done a very good job and - so, Lesley, we'll look forward to working with you, I'm sure, on an ongoing basis and in particular your successor as well and the rest of your colleagues in the ccNSO so thanks very much.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thank you, everyone.

END