

**ICANN San Francisco Meeting  
Joint ccNSO/GNSO Lunch  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 14 March 2011 at 12:30 local**

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.

Chris Disspain: Lunch meeting. Stéphane is still eating, so I'm - I've undertaken to start us going. We have a number of items on our agenda. Those of you who were with us in Cartagena will recall that we talked about at this meeting perhaps taking a short amount of time just to explain to the GNSO how the ccNSO council works and for the and for the GNSO to explain to the ccNSO how the council works. So we just thought that might be quite useful, because certainly from a CC point of view, there are, you know, bits of the GNSO structure that we're perhaps not as clearly on as it might be useful to be.

So I'm going to start just by doing a very brief overview of the way the CCs work. And you may - most of you probably know this already, but it's worth doing.

So the ccNSO is obviously comprised of ccTLD managers and we have a hundred and - currently 113 members. We have a council which is three members from each of the five regions and three nominees from the Nominating Committee. And that council also has liaisons from the regional organizations (center) APTLD, (lack) TLD and so on. And we also have a liaison from the ALA, and as you all know, a liaison from the GNSO.

The council - the ccNSO council works in a slightly different way to the - perhaps that the GNSO doesn't. We don't - we really simply do the formal decisions that the members have made. So what we do is we have at each ICANN meeting a two-day member's meeting and we discuss specific topics. And we take consensus in the room on stuff from the members and then that feeds into what is a very short council meeting at the end of the second day. It usually doesn't last more than an hour and we simply go through the administrative things that we need to go through and then pass - if necessary, pass resolutions on stuff like that -- stuff that's come up on the member's meetings.

Let's take a really specific example -- the delegation and re-delegation of working groups produced a final report. One of those recommendations from that final report is that we set up a framework of interpretation working group to assist the board and the staff in interpreting GAC principals and 1591. That will be discussed by the members on tomorrow or Wednesday. And if we get consensus, the council will simply pass the resolution to form that working group.

In a nutshell, that's it. We're lucky to some extent that we are a single - we're a single body. We generally tends to agree on stuff in the sense that we're all ccTLD managers, so we're all coming from pretty much the same place. While we might argue about - you know, if we're discussing financial contributions, for example, we might argue about methodologies or the way that it would be assessed and so on. But the - but on fundamental principles, we tend to be all coming from the same place. And that makes - for us, that makes the day-to-day work of the ccNSO reasonably smooth going, because we don't have massively competing interests.

So I think that's pretty much - you know, pretty much covers all I really wanted to say about the structure of the ccNSO.

Stéphane, you going to take the - sorry?

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Chris.

Yes, I think this is very useful. I'll just explain the structure of the GNSO council, and I encourage any counselors who want to to jump in and explain anything specific they want to about their own groups. Can I just...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stéphane van Gelder: Oh, that might be useful. Yes, I'm sorry. Of course, go ahead, ask any questions you like.

Man: How do you elect your counselors?

Chris Disspain: It's region by region, so we - the - I'm - where there's a vacancy - I'll start again. Counselors are elected for a three-year term, and then they can stand again. We don't actually have - currently, we don't have term limits, so you can carry on if you've got the support of your region.

So the way it works is that if you're in a particular region, you can stand for the council. An election takes place in that region in the event that there is more than one candidate, and that has happened, and we have an election process online - online voting.

Man: Okay.

Stéphane van Gelder: Any other questions for the ccNSO? Okay, so, Bill, you're up.

Bill Drake: I had my mouth full, so I - a little bit difficult. I'm Bill Drake from the NCUC. I just have a really naïve question, because I don't know how your dialogues go. In GNSO, we have (litus) debate, because we have representatives from all these different segments of industry plus noncommercial actors and we have different kinds of perspective, et cetera, on almost everything.

You were saying, "Well, we have kind of a more, you know, parallel structures and not really competing interests, et cetera" How do you go about making sure that the perspectives of different industry segments or noncommercial actors, et cetera, get brought into the discussion given the way your membership is composed and so on?

Chris Disspain: That's a really good question, Bill. Historically, our view has been that it's the responsibility of each ccTLD manager to do that in their own territory. If you look at the way that the CCs should be set up under the GAC principles and RFC-1591, there's an obligation to (unintelligible) community, et cetera, et cetera.

So we actually - we jealously guard that - you know, that territory by territory situation. So, for example, I would say I come with my Australian hat on with a view on a particular issue. I - in order for me to reach that view, I've had to go through, you know, processes. So my board, for example, includes representatives of (SLKU) and so on.

The - there is, I think, a recognition that with the sort of ALAC becoming, you know, growing up more and having been around for as long as some of us, that from a global perspective there's certainly in a - there's certainly input into stuff. So when we do - generally speaking, in all but a few cases when we set up a working group to look at something, we always reach out to the ALAC to put somebody on that working group and usually also to the GNSO to put somebody on that working group.

So we're - we are very conscious of the fact that, you know, we don't want to be discussing stuff in a vacuum and meetings are always open -- anyone's welcome to come, so.

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Chris, maybe - this is Jeff Neuman with Neustar, the Registries Stakeholder Group. Maybe you also want to talk a minute about the ccNSO

also has a limited scope of policies that they would look at as opposed to GNSO, which is much broader. And - so I don't know if you want to...

Chris Disspain: Thanks, Jeff. Yes, we take a very, very, very limited view of what it is that we're there to do. It's a - it's - you know, global - the global policy that affects ccTLD is very, very narrow. So the best example, and in fact, the only example, I think, to date really that would be - that would fit into that specifically is the IDN ccTLD situation, which clearly fits in the ccNSO purview, and the delegation and re-delegation stuff, because that's all about - for us, it's all about ccTLDs.

The other stuff we do is to do a bit of talking about - to reach other about best practices, exchanging ideas and so on. But from a policy point of view, it is a very, very narrow area that we work in.

Stéphane van Gelder: Any further questions? So perhaps I can just explain the way the GNSO council is structured. And it's less of a homogenous body than Chris has just described for the ccNSO, because as people have been mentioning, we do represent a great many different types of stakeholders.

So we have a council of - that's split into two houses. And the structure that we're looking at now is actually the product of an extensive restructure effort that has been going on for the past three years. And the council has changed during that time to reflect some recommendations that came out of previous work and to try and better represent the nature and the diversity of the stakeholders that are in the GNSO as a whole body.

So the council has two houses. One is for the non-contracted parties, and that means, obviously, those people that do not have a directly contract with ICANN. And so in the non-contracted party's house, we have some stakeholder groups and some constituencies. The difference between those two types of entities -- in the old structure, we just had constituencies and

stakeholder groups were introduced to - as a kind of way of going one level above what we had before and grouping people of similar interests together.

So we have two stakeholder groups in that house -- the commercial and the noncommercial stakeholder groups. And within them - - within the commercial stakeholder groups, we have some constituencies: commercial and business users constituency, the intellectual property interest constituency, and the service and connection providers constituency.

The noncommercial stakeholder group does not have constituencies at present, but some may be forthcoming. There is the NCUC. Sorry, Mary. Sorry. So, the noncommercial users constituency, which is the only one in that group at the moment.

On the other side of the house - the council -- sorry -- we have the contracted party's house, and there are two stakeholder groups within that house: the registries and the registrars. We have our counselors elected to the GNSO council. So each group will elect in their own way counselors to sit on the council. And taking the example of my own stakeholder group, the registrars, we elect three representatives on the council and those are chosen according to the ICANN regions.

We also have on the council three people that are nominated by the Nominating Committee. One sits in the contracted party's house, one sits in the non-contracted party's house, and one is what we - in a jokingly way, we refer to as the homeless NCA, because it does not have a vote on our council.

So those positions actually are subject to change every year. And what tends to happen - this is still a relatively new system, remember. What tends to happen is that the NomCom appointee that sits in the middle will rotate one year and that tends to give that person coming into the council time to learn

its ways and the kind of work that we do on the GNSO council. We also have two observers. We have the ccNSO observer and we have an ALAC liaison.

So that's the main structure. Just a word to tell you that each house nominates a vice chair, so we have two vice chairs. Mary Wong, over there, is the vice chair for the non-contracted party's house, and Jeff sitting next to me is - this person here, is the vice chair for the contracted party's house. And the council as a whole elects the chair for a one-year term. So in December, the council elected me to serve as chair for this year.

I'm happy to answer any questions. And if any other groups want to speak up and add to the explanations I've just given, please do so. If not, we can move onto the next topic.

Chris Disspain: Don't seem to be any questions, so, yes, we can. All right, so the next - this working? Can you hear me? Hello? Okay, it is working.

So the next topic on the agenda is - oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I apologize. Sorry about it. Thanks.

There are some slides available -- if you're interested, we can send them out -- which do a comparison of the GNSO policy development process to the ccNSO policy development process. It's too late to go into now, but I think it will be quite useful for you - for everyone to get a copy of those so that you can see there are differences in the way that the PDP actually work.

And that's useful from the point of view of when we're - if we're involved in one of yours or you're involved in one of ours. It's actually quite useful to. There are - you know there are differences. So we can organize that, yeah? Okay, thanks.

So the next one is, what is the - what's the ccNSO currently working on and which of the projects do we think that there's a link with you on, and vice

versa, what's the GNSO working on and which of these projects will need feedback from us?

So from the CC point of view, currently, the major things are that, as I've already mentioned, the delegation and re-delegation work. If we get consensus from the members tomorrow, we will be setting up a new working group: the FOI -- the framework of interpretation.

The purpose of this working group - it'll be a joint working group with the GAC in the same way the I - that the fast track working group was a joint working group. And the idea of that is simply to - and I work the word "simply" probably inadvisably - is to provide the board and the staff with some guidelines on the interpretation of 1591 and the GAC principles.

If you're interested in that sort of thing, the reports of our delegation and re-delegation working group that made these recommendations are worth reading. They go into a great amount of detail about the history of this and how we ended up where we have.

So there's that working group. And we will, as is our standard practice, I think be asking for the GNSO to provide a - at least a liaison to that working group. I mean, it's entirely up to the GNSO, but I recommend that just normally that, if they can do it, you're - you know, their ALAC liaison will be on that working group liaising for ALAC and vice versa for the GNSO, but that's a matter for you.

We also have the country - we have a study group that we've set up for country names, which you're involved in. And we've got - I think we have some volunteers or we will have some volunteers shortly. So obviously that's a key area of cross interest for us.

We haven't yet finalized, but we will have to finalize in the next day or so the over - the cross-community security and stability working group. Again, it's - we're just finalizing volunteers for that and we'll get that moving.

Have I missed anything, Lesley, (unintelligible) that you can think of as any real relevance for the GNSO? Funding? Yeah, that's right. Thank you.

We have recently formed a finance working group to deal with the financial aspects of ccTLD's interaction with ICANN. And one of the areas of that we'll be looking at is obviously contributions to ICANN. It's no secret that this is a really tough area for ccTLDs. I - we had a meeting with (unintelligible) yesterday. The finance committee had a meeting with (unintelligible) just trying to start the ball rolling.

And one of the things that makes it difficult and perhaps you guys will just innately understand this, you - the contracted party outside of the GNSO is contracted to ICANN to pay money. So as a formal contract, you pay money to ICANN and that is effectively the only income that ICANN can guarantee to get. I mean it might go up and - or down, but that is its core income.

The ccTLDs pay a voluntary contribution to ICANN. We can discuss the contents. That's a different discussion. But fundamental principle is that the ccTLDs pay a voluntary contribution.

It is very, very hard to mix those two things together to try and come up with what is a sensible voluntary contribution, because we - ICANN cannot rely on the ccTLDs to contribute to its core operations if the payment's voluntary, which they have to be. So we're working - we acknowledged that there are - that there's an issue that needs to be dealt with. We're working very hard to try and find some ways of both, A, lifting the contribution level, and, B, finding a mechanism that works. But giving the key principle is voluntariness, it's pretty hard to do that, but we are working on it.

Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: The other side of that, of course, is reducing the cost so that one doesn't have to lift the contribution model.

Chris Disspain: Yes, I'm sorry. I wasn't suggesting that we shouldn't be talking about reducing the costs. That would be an excellent thing to discuss.

Are there any questions from the J's on those areas that I've outlined? Yes, Jaime? Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Jaime Wagner from the ISPCP and I have a question on the difficulty. I understand if the ccTLD had no fee -- doesn't charge fees for its registrants. Then it would be understandable that they don't. But - pardon, but I think that if there is some contribution from the registrants, there should be a contribution from that ccTLD to the ICANN funding. And it could be a -- how can I say that -- progressive, I mean.

Chris Disspain: (Unintelligible) do you want to take that?

Man: Sure, it might not necessarily address the question specifically, but just for your knowledge, I'm the chair of that particular working group -- the finance and fundamental contributions working group. And we're really just getting started on it.

One of the things that I was going to perhaps suggest to this joint session is that an ongoing - on an ongoing basis, since I know it's of interest to this community, is to provide just a quick status update of where our working group is at as we work through the issues.

Because as Lesley mentioned, there's a couple sides to it. One is the, what should a reasonable model look like for organizations that while we do all do common thing -- operate a CC -- come to it from a number of different

positions or points of view and to try to find a model or models that will be able to address all of those unique environments? That's one side of it -- what are the issues? What are the models that might be appropriate?

And the other side is, how is ICANN allocating its costs? Do they make sense? Are they spending them in the right places and having some accountability on the expense side of ICANN that then we can bring back to the CC community and justify fundamentally the contributions that we do make?

So it's not specific to your question, but hopefully, that gives you some idea of we're - how we're approaching it and, you know, we'd be happy to provide updates as we go forward.

Chris Disspain: It's very, very complicated because you have to look at all sort of different things. (Unintelligible) you know, if you've been getting - if you're not getting money in from your registrants. But you've got a point. I agree.

There are all sorts of arguments. There's the pay-to-play argument. You know, if you want to come play in ICANN, you should pay. All right, fair enough.

But we are still - after all these years, we've been pushing for now -- I've lost count -- eight - no, yeah, eight years or so or more probably to get clear on what ICANN thinks it costs to manage to do its ccTLD stuff. And it's unfortunate. We get - what tends to happen is we get a reasonable way down the line with that information and then something will happen like they'll change their accounting system and that'll start all over again. Or, you know, the finance guy will leave and be replaced by somebody else, and then we're into - back into relationship building and so on and so forth.

But the point I was trying to make about voluntariness of it is to say, you know, really, it - we're at the baseline of talking about the concept of making

contributions. And it's a - to find a model that fits or fits the most, because you're never going to find the model that fits everyone, but to find the model that fits most is very hard. The message I was hoping to deliver was that we are working on that. We're not ignoring it.

Adrian, you had your hand up.

Adrian Kinderis: Adrian Kinderis, stakeholder group. I would be interested to find out - first of all, I applaud the effort that is going on to, you know, try to work through this issue. I'd be interested to know what is the make-up of this working group that is looking into it?

And the reason I ask is we - that is maybe I can speak potentially on behalf of my constituents that we feel we bear a lot of the costs here (unintelligible). Sorry, the revenues rather, not the costs. And therefore, feel like we have an invested interest in your outcomes, right? All right? Okay good.

And (unintelligible) watching every word I say here, so I - so don't say anything that'll turn me off. So, you know, with that in mind and given the working group, is it not worth having a diverse range of input? I'm trying to be...

Chris Disspain: Do you mean we should have some representation on the working group from outside of the CC community?

Adrian Kinderis: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Okay, so...

Adrian Kinderis: Because otherwise, the CC is...

Chris Disspain: ...you want to...

Adrian Kinderis: ...(unintelligible) how much the CC, so...

Chris Disspain: No, no, no, no, no.

Adrian Kinderis: I mean, just...

Chris Disspain: I get that. I get that.

Adrian Kinderis: ...saying the naysayers could sit there and say...

Chris Disspain: I get that.

Adrian Kinderis: ...you're in a working group, you say, "Do you want to contribute?" No. "Do you want to contribute?" No. "Do you want to contribute?"

Chris Disspain: Sure.

Adrian Kinderis: (Unintelligible) not contribute and we're out. And then, you know, but then the perception could be the other way.

Chris Disspain: No, I understand.

Adrian Kinderis: (Unintelligible).

Chris Disspain: I understand that. And I think...

Adrian Kinderis: (Unintelligible).

Chris Disspain: I mean, the answer is that I think our view is that this is an intensely CC-specific discussion at - you know, at this stage. We need to go through having - but having said that, we are never closed to outside input. And, you know, we'll - stuff will be published with comments. And I think, you know,

Byron, you said you were - we'll provide - did I hear you right? That we'd be providing updates to the GNSO?

Byron: Yes, I think two things. One is we - like said, I think it would be helpful if we provided updates so you could get a sense of where we are. At that point, while somewhat inform, this just being a conversation, there's an opportunity to provide feedback. We will also be publishing our activities, issues, potential models, the documents or artifacts of this process along the way and seeking comment and feedback on those. So I think there will be a time and a place, absolutely, for feedback into the process from people within and without the CC community directly.

Stéphane van Gelder: Can I - I have a queue with Adam, Jaime, Jeff, Jonathon, Lesley.

Adam Peake: Thank you. What I'm about to mention may already exist and I'm simply not aware of it. But in the interest of transparency, it would be really useful to see a list of all ccTLDs, the number of domains that they have registered, and the amount they are paying to ICANN either, you know, whether voluntary or whatever the terms are. That would be a rather interesting document to see.

Byron: It does exist on the ICANN Web site. I can't point you to the link by memory, but it is very clearly there, and it breaks it down by CC, by number of domains, by annual contribution and has a historical perspective back to '03 or '04.

Adam Peake: That's amazingly quick service for satisfying my request. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Jaime was next.

Jaime Wagner: I would like to know if there is - speaking of accountability. Does the ccNSO have any information on the amount - I mean, the ccTLDs are accountable to the ccNSO or to ICANN on how much they earned from the - each - in each count, because one may have a policy of not charging anything, the other can

charge. It's free, okay. But do they have any accountability to ICANN to show their number - I mean financial numbers?

Chris Disspain: No. No.

Jaime Wagner: Only the bulk amount of...

Chris Disspain: Well, they don't have any accountability to do anything. I mean, if you - the bottom line is that, you know, we have - we - there are 246 ccTLDs. We're - we've got - we - I think our 130 members account for something like 92% of registrations, but you're never going to get - there's a whole rash of ccTLDs that don't involve themselves with ICANN at all. And none of us, I think, with the possible exception of Australia and Japan who have contracts with ICANN for historical reasons, have any obligation to provide information to be involved at all.

Jaime Wagner: Okay, but even with no obligation, there is no voluntary providing of the - this information?

Chris Disspain: Well, we - I think we pretty much know roughly speaking where we all sit in the scheme of things. I mean, I know, you know, that Canada's got, you know, 1.6 million names or something and, you know. I'm sorry. I mean, we have a rough idea of where we are, but we're not - there's no reporting, because the - you know, the - each ccTLD is its own territory.

Jaime Wagner: Even if it's not, I mean, accountable, but such an informal way of information could be put...

Chris Disspain: Well, quite clearly, Jaime - you can go ahead, Byron.

Byron: I was going to say, informally, certainly, most of the large CCs publish an annual report making all of our various facts and figures open to the community to see. So certainly - well, the three of us at least that are talking

to you all produce an annual report where you can see all the revenues. And that's generally the case from what I've seen.

Jaime Wagner: I would say that also (unintelligible) publishers, and so I think this would respond for 80% of the...

Chris Disspain: Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks. Jeff was next.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is a question that's come up a couple times in the - at least in the registry stakeholder group and it's on the IDN Fast Track and contributions made from ccTLDs as a result of being delegated or applying for IDN Fast Track. In the final approve process - and I may not be using the right words to describe that, but in the final documents that are out there it talked about a \$26,000 processing fee and it talks about a prearranged and recommended annual cost contribution fee.

And I know those are recommendations. They're not requirements. But I was wondering if - and maybe this is not necessarily for CCs, but any ICANN staff that's here, I've - we've been asking for some details on whether those contributions have been made. Not necessarily, you know, kind of anonymous or aggregate details. We don't want to get any sensitive data, but just basically how much has been collected from that and certain - you know, what kind of percentage does that constitute of ccTLDs and information on the annual fees.

Chris Disspain: We - I don't think - I don't anyone who has - necessarily has any idea on the ccNSO. I don't think we know. And - but I certainly don't see - I mean, this is a question for ICANN to provide an answer to.

My understanding is that financial discussions have occurred at every new IDN ccTLD, but what results of those have been, I can't say. I don't suppose

there's anyone here who can - no, Bart, wouldn't - you know, no, Bart has no clue.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chris Disspain: No, Bart's just leaving, because he doesn't want to be embarrassed. So, I mean, yes, keep asking, I mean, it's - you know, it's an interesting question.

Stéphane van Gelder: I have Jonathon and Lesley.

Jonathon Robinson: Hi, Jonathon Robinson with the Registries Stakeholder Group. I think - and a question, really, to follow on from what Byron said, and I think Byron understood when you were talking about the - both the contribution and costs. Clearly, the contribution's an age-old challenging issue as Chris alluded to as well.

But on the costs side, I assume, first of all, that you mean more broadly than simply the costs attributable to CCs. When you talk about costs, you're interested in the costs. And if so - sorry, I should just - and if so, really, that's an obvious area of common interest. And it's perhaps a - you know, it's a - it's something to - if one's looking for areas of common interest and how and where we might actively cooperate, that's one area of common interest.

Byron: Yes, I think presumably we would all share that interest. We happen to have a working group that's going to take a good, hard look at it. During the process, I think we'd welcome your feedback if you have anything to add to it. We also, I think, submit a pretty robust contribution in terms of the actual budget discussion.

So we get involved every year, and I don't know if you've been reading it, but the CC community puts forward a pretty robust piece on the budget every year. So there's an opportunity to do it there, but we will certainly be looking

at it in our finance working group in a holistic way but obviously with more emphasis onto what's relevant to the CCs.

You know, it's been an interesting with Akram is relative - obviously, quite new, but in his presentation of the budget, one of our feedback items was, "Well, how do we submit elements for cutting?" And he looked at us, you know, quite surprised, and he had no process or way to do that. In fact, they never actually thought about submissions that would include getting rid of services and trimming the budget.

So, that's certainly one of the areas that we'll be looking at and that all feeds into the contribution. I mean, it's two sides, but they certainly inform each other.

Chris Disspain: Yes, and we - that's right. And we have - so we have another working group, which is the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group and it's that working group's job to put - to gather input into the strat plan and the ops plan. And I think - I mean, it might pay us to think about the possibility of some sort of liaison function. Do you have a group that looks at the strat plan and the ops plan across the GNSO? Whatever you call it, Byron? So you only put in individual input into that? Okay.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, the process is actually still relatively new as well. So to be honest, we haven't structured ourselves around responding to that fully yet, but we do look at it in individual groups.

Chris Disspain: Did you - and Lesley was next, I think.

Lesley Crowley: I think some of which I was going to say has been said, so let me just kind of cut up some points here. It's always been my impression over many, many years that CCs are not looking for a free ride. And sometimes in the comments that we hear from the GNSO, I tend to get that feeling of guilt that we're looking for a free ride. That's not the case. Let me be clear on that.

And also, CC contribution has risen by over 150% in recent years. And again, that kind of got lost in some of the dialogue about the dollar signs, whatever. But not all CCs contribute and not all CCs recognize ICANN or wish to be involved in ICANN and, you know, we're very much aware of that. But many of us do recognize that there are core services that we need particularly around the IANA function and that we might be able to find a way of looking at the funding of core services.

But also, many of us kind of operate what feels like a mini ICANN at times. And so where does the money go? A lot of money goes, in my country, towards a mini ICANN with local policy development processes and ensuring that we have local Internet community dialogue, et cetera operating.

Many of our publish accounts and annual reports somewhat more quickly than ICANN seems to have been able to publish its own annual report on accounts for examination. But I do think we must have a common interest and strategic plan. And if there's one thing I think we could be proud of in the ccNSO in recent years is how we've been able to coalesce our act together around commenting and contributing towards the strategic plan as a group.

And many of us, of course, as involved in strategy in our own organizations which helps, because it's no good commenting on the budget being too big or the cost being too high if you haven't contributed to the strategic plan in the first place either to put new initiatives on the table, which have a cost implication, of course, or to take costs off the table.

And one of our big hobby horses, or my own hobby horses I have to say, is about how we can iterate the strategic plan to both fit with the volunteer capacity and the staff capacity but also the financial boundaries around that and so that we can ensure that we're not remembering all the communities with an ever-increasing bill of spiraling costs. And I suspect that might well be

a common concern that we share on which we could usefully have some dialogue.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, Lesley. Adrian's next.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, and then Jonathon.

Chris Disspain: And then I think we should move on to the next topic, otherwise we're just going to get stuck on this further, but carry on.

Adrian Kinderis: Sure, Lesley, I - if I gave the impression of lying you with guilt, I apologize. That certainly was not my intention.

I think, I certainly, having been in the industry for a long time, have felt it - you know, beyond the GNSO. So I think to categorize it as the GNSO trying to lay the guilt on you is, I think, unfair.

And my own - that said, my only comment would then be, be careful quoting 150%, because 150% of a small number is only a slightly bigger number. So, you know, looking at the numbers here combined between registries and registrars, you've heard all this before. But just to give you some context to 150% that it's roundabout \$61 million in the budget for FY '11, and for the CC, it's 1.6, so you can round it out to 2.

So took the 61 and reversed it, yes. So I just want to get some context to that. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thanks. Jonathon?

Jonathon Robinson: Well, I'd just like to say those two things I've heard sound very positive - the work on the Finance and the Strategic Operation Working Group, they sound structured, interesting, and positive. And I think one thing that strikes

me is that the GNSO is burdened with the weights of many things including extensive PDP work.

So I might be clutching at straws here, but I just - if there is a way in which we can leverage that work of yours rather than try and repeat it ourselves with the limited resources we have to do that. You know, you sound like you're doing in a structured and organized way. And if we could sort of in some way work with on that, it may be a more effective use of resources since it's the same we're burdened with many policy development issues.

Chris Disspain: Certain - that's certainly something worth following up I think. So now, perhaps, I guess, you, Stéphane, could just take us through briefly what the GNSO's currently working on and what you think - where you think the CCs might be of interest or help.

Stéphane van Gelder: I love your use of the word "briefly" in that sentence. We have a number of pending projects. I will try and be as brief as I can and open it up to questions rather than just lecture on.

So a lot of the work that we've been doing over the past year or two is actually to do with our restructure that I mentioned earlier on. I'm not going into the detail of that specifically. It's obviously very GNSO-centric and it's to do with refining our processes and the way we do things, so I'm happy to answer all - you know, I'm sure any of the GNSO counselors present would be happy to answer questions on those. That takes up a lot of our bandwidth.

We also are currently working on WHOIS studies and looking at various aspects of the WHOIS. Currently, there are a number of studies are the pipeline. Not all of them - one has been started. This stems from an initial request by the board. I believe that GAAC requested it as well. So that is one of the work that we are on - doing at the moment.

We are also spending a lot of time looking at prioritization. We did have a group work on that last year. It's a real problem for us, and in more general terms, the problem is the workload and how to help both the GNSO volunteers and the staff, you know, just span the sheer amount of work that there is to go. So that's something that we're looking at very intently.

We are about to start working on the UDRP -- looking at ways that the - if the UDRP requires improvements and if it does, are they - what are the ways to improve it. We are also looking at registration abuses and there's a group that's working on that -- various aspects of possible abuse through registration of generic domain names.

We were asked by the board in Cartagena to have a look at some metrics to measure consumer trust, consumer choice, and competition within the context of the new gTLDs specifically.

We are involved in a number of joint working groups, so we have one - I mean, some of these have already been mentioned, so I'll just glance over them, but we have a GO Regions Working Group. We have the (JIG), which is a joint ccNSO-GNSO working group on international domain names. We have the SSAC - a working group with SSAC looking at internationalized registration data. We also have a working group looking at DNS certs and the (JAS) which is a working group looking at new gTLD applicant support, so ways of supporting applicants from developing countries, for example, so that they may also be part of the new gTLD process.

So I hope I haven't forgotten anything -- probably have. But that's a brief overview of the work that we have ongoing at the moment and please anyone from the GNSO side step in and add anything that I've forgotten if I have.

Chris Disspain: Okay. It strikes me Stéphane that certainly in respect to EDLP and registration abuses, we might have some input for you on those. Many of us run our own of these, the EDLP in our own dispute resolution processes in

our respective countries, and registration abuse is obviously something that occurs just as much in - or might occur just as much in the CC world as it does in the GO. So if there's - if we can, you know, help in any way or give you some input in anyway, we'd be happy to do that. Let's do that. Would that be - that's okay?

Okay. Are there any questions or comments on what the GNSO's working on right now? I like the way you said "currently working on WHOIS" as if there was something new that you (unintelligible). No? Okay, cool, we'll go to the next item then.

Stéphane van Gelder: Great, so we wanted to ask you if you saw value in meeting with us. The question sounds a bit blunt, but we felt it was important to just constantly look at the way we do things. And we certainly -- I think I speak for a lot of us -- appreciate the time that we spent meeting with you, because as we've just seen from the conversations we've had, it's just at a basic level an opportunity to understand the way each group does things. And I think that's extremely useful.

So we also wanted to ask you, you know, if you saw value in the way that the - in these joint meetings or if you wanted - if there were any suggested that you wanted to make that we might look at improving those meetings? That's it.

Chris Disspain: Any council - ccNSO council want to comment on that? Don't all rush at once. You'll receive a (unintelligible).

(Peter Varos): Hi, good afternoon, everyone. My name is (Peter Varos). I'm the general manager for center of the European organization for ccTLDs. I'm probably just stating the obvious here, but I didn't want the awkward silence to apparently mean anything else.

Yes, they're pretty useful, and I think I can speak for quite a few counselors. Obviously the level of their usefulness will depend from meeting to meetings. Sometimes we have things that are more urgent to discuss and one of the, I think, excellent examples here is probably the IDN variance discussions that we had a couple meetings ago. So sometimes it will go a bit more in detail, but I do appreciate in any case everybody's plan to make these meetings possible. Thanks.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, and I'd echo that I think these are - I think these meetings are important and will become more important. I mean, you know, if you look at what we've discussed today, we've identified some area of common interest and a whole heap of other things. I mean, the key to these is follow up, of course. There's no point just having meeting. We need to make sure that we both - the both of us, that the G's and the C's, you know, institute some follow-up on those. But I think that's how we - you know, I think we're pretty clear that this is a very worthwhile exercise.

We - part of my - part of the introduction was something about, you know, talking about the ccNSO council and one of the reasons why I wanted to do it is to get across to you that there is a fundamental difference. We're not - we are not as conflicted - anything like as conflicted as you guys can often be.

So for us (unintelligible) you know, when we do talk to each other, we're not necessarily aware of the nuances or the political difficulties that you might have. So you might get a request from us that for us seem really simple. Like why don't we do this together? But for you that's incredibly complicated. So these sorts of meetings are really important to establish those (unintelligible) and base levels.

Stéphane van Gelder: We're not conflicted at all.

Chris Disspain: Any further questions on this? I do want to try and get onto the last topic, so perhaps we can move onto that? Is that okay? Okay. So the last topic was

just to talk about the NTIA NOI and obviously that is important to all of us. If you talk about the IANA function, then that's the key to everything that we all do, so I'm sure you'll have some comments on that. I wanted to first of all ask Andrei Kolesnikov to introduce the topic and lay the groundwork.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Thank you. Good afternoon. First of all, thank you for opportunity to initiate the discussion about the National (unintelligible) Information Administration, which was addressed to the Internet community recently and as time ticking, we have to give some advice to the NTIA on what kind of items are being included into the agreement between the NTIA and ICANN.

At just the beginning of the discussion, I'd like to say that, recently, there were many zones with signs with (unintelligible). And it was a big marketing complain. We were all involved. We saw this. And there was a practical solution and procedure in place, which involved the representative from many nations to sign the root with the DMS keys.

But practically speaking and we just faced it a year ago, the historical root management in regard to the TLD operations, it's still a black box for many minds. I'll explain. If you have the time, I can just tell the story about the IN delegation of the recent domain.

And there's historically, highly politically objective suggestions flying around, but as a matter of fact, I couldn't much of weighted politically neutral and practical ideas on what to tell what kind of suggestions to give to NTIA. I was doing some research in the Internet (unintelligible) the ICANN community trying to find good ideas.

And we do know from the black box there is a single point of failure and mainly root zone operator and you not mean to say its name, especially in certain countries of the world. Just avoid the question why. And the root zone operator is not a part of the NTIA and ICANN current agreement, and this

means that there's a logical gap between obligations of ICANN and NTIA and practical operations of the root zone in the interest of market stakeholders.

Another interesting issue to discuss is it's particularly related to new gTLDs. It's initiatives to have more and more gTLDs in the root zone. There's concern that current (unintelligible) or better day manual work with root zone is not good when hundreds of new TLDs will (unintelligible). And maybe it'll be a good idea to (unintelligible) technical parameters or any other quality of services in the NTIA agreement -- moving away from statements, because it's pretty much political statement if you read the agreement. There are some particular parts, but it's not very concrete or maybe you just don't know how that works.

And this means no conspiracy and there might be some words about the NTIA agreement. Again, we placed it in May when we applied the delegation of our IDN. And we worked with the black box to be honest with you. That's for the beginning of the discussion.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Andrei. We - so there's not a whole heap we can say to you (I'll try to open it to everyone) else want to respond in and say it. But where we are right now is that we have a first draft of a proposed ccNSO input into the NTIA NOI. We will briefly discuss that first draft tomorrow probably.

The deadline as far as I can remember was the end of March. So during - from now until close to the end of March, we will hopefully refine that document and come to a consensus view so that it can go in as a ccNSO document.

So with the caveat that is not being, you know, discussed in the ccNSO at the moment, but the sort of push of that - of the current draft is to say that given that there is a significant amount of work - that a significant amount of work has been done by the CC delegation re-delegation working group and that there is a new working group coming with the specific purpose of putting color

and depth into the interpretations of 1591 and the GAAP principles that it would be inappropriate to make any significant changes to the way that - certainly not to move it anywhere else, et cetera, but -while that work is being done, because the whole point is that what we're striving to do is to build some clarity around what are, you know, high-level policy documents.

So that's one thing. I think it may also talk about automation and say that we're in favor of automation, you know, where possible and let's please get on with that. But - and - but at that stage, that's about really all I can say.

Does anybody else want to comment on that? Did you want (unintelligible)?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, I mean, it's also interesting to ask you guys what your general feel about the document is in terms of what the intent is. Just to remind everyone, this is the first time that the Department of Commerce has put out a notice of inquiry on the IANA function. That's never happened before. So, the timing may be accidental, it may not be, but it certainly interests me personally to hear about the CC - from the CC about your views on what the intent of the document is. Is it just a fact-finding mission or is there something else?

Chris Disspain: I would counsel against speculation of motive and concentrate on responding to the document. It's a formal process. Something had to happen. It may not necessary be ideal but it is at least an opportunity to put in comment. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: I was just going to add to your comment, Chris, in that we used to have the ccNSO IANA working group and a lot of the discussions in that working were about improving the IANA process, which if you remember, some years back, it took an average of 40 days to make a zone file change, which obviously wasn't kind of scalable or acceptable. And so a lot of our inputs may well take the form of some of the learning we had from that working group to having the IANA process might be managed and measured.

And I'm aware that one of the requested areas for comment was about performance metrics. And the timing - well, I'm not going to speculate on the reasons for timing, but it might be very useful to have some good performance metrics at the stage when we're considering adding considerably to the IANA workflow because of the gTLDs and all that that might involve.

Byron: Thanks, thanks, Lesley. And I'd just add one other thing, which is, for those of you that were in the main room this morning, you had heard Larry Strickling and I think that whilst the - I mean, Larry's a very straightforward guy and he calls it the way that he says it. And, you know, that was a - some specific comments - constructively critical comments, but also very, very supportive petition from the U.S. government on the ICANN model, and I would take that at face value, because Larry doesn't mess around.

Chris Disspain: Thanks. Andrei and then John.

Andrei Kinderis: The quick notice, yes. The parameters are very important. Again, if one application goes for sometimes, which you don't know, because you don't get exact day, there's no parameters when you apply for a new TLD or do some changes. And it's very important to - not to miss a second about it, I believe. And yes, he does understand this thing. That's true.

Chris Disspain: Which is Lesley's metrics plan, right? I mean, you want to put some metrics in place. John?

John Berard: John Berard with the business constituency -- a question of a left technical nature perhaps. We - both councils been asked to comment to the board on consumer trust, innovation, and competition. Have you guys had progress in that regard?

Chris Disspain: No. A resolution was passed at the last ICANN meeting. I recall about this. No one talked to us about it. No one mentioned it was going to happen. It just happened. Quite frankly, that's not the best way of doing things.

The best way of doing things is to come to us and say, "We'd like you to do something. Can you do it?" We don't - currently don't have the time. And to be honest, you know, we deal with it in our own territories. Again, it's something that we deal with on an everyday basis. But this has been seen as a sort of, you know, very much a G-focused question.

And, you know, we just haven't - we haven't dealt with it at all. We haven't had any time to do that. I mean, for us to do it, we'd have to first all agree that we want to do it, which is not necessarily the case (unintelligible).

Any further comments?

Man: Well, just giving the insight to respond directly to that, Stéphane, I hope I'm on the point here, but I mean, we talked civilly about it with (unintelligible) and yesterday we heard that it was urgently but it's no longer urgent. Well, there was - to be fair, there was more rational behind it than that.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Man: We pushed back on it given - so we had a similar experience given workload and other things going on and pushed back.

Chris Disspain: Yes.

Man: And then, in effect, missed the deadline and now it has become less urgent.

Chris Disspain: Less urgent. Look, I mean, it's (unintelligible) input - it's input on, you know, consumer protection and all that sort of thing, right? And presumably, that's

being sorted specifically in respect to gTLDs, because it's certainly going - you know, certainly not going to be sorted in respect to ccTLDs.

And maybe the best way to do that is simply to ask the four main constituencies - the four main ccNSOs to just see if they can lob a couple people into a group and talk about it. I mean, we have significant experience in our own territories, so we're happy to help. But the concept that we need to go off our own and comment up with advice to the board or input to the board on that, it makes no sense.

Man: All the urgency was for this budget draft, correct? This - yes, for this strategic plan, and since we missed that deadline, it's no longer urgent.

Stéphane van Gelder: Anything further? Chris, should we adjourn early?

Chris Disspain: What - yeah, I mean, it'll give us ten minutes to walk to get lost and find the next room, I suppose. Yes, are there any other comments?

Okay, I just want to finish by saying thank you all very much. This is my last meeting as chair of the ccNSO. On Wednesday afternoon, Lesley Cowley will become the chair of the ccNSO and you won't be seeing me in this capacity more, but I've had a ball, so thanks very much, indeed, everyone.

Stéphane van Gelder: And I'll just finish by saying it's been a pleasure and it will be a pleasure again.

END