Board Session with ccNSO
16 October 2012

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Ladies and gentlemen, could you take your seats, please? We will get started.

Okay. If we could all take our seats, please. Dr. Crocker has -- Dr. Crocker has gone to buy himself a cup of coffee and is just coming into the room now.

So we'll --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Pardon me? Who is Dr. Crocker?

[Laughter]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Nothing's wrong with Dr. Crocker.

Okay. Lesley.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Sorry. I come with the ccNSO reputation of trying to run on time.

So greetings, everybody, and thank you very much for welcoming us back for this session between the ccNSO and the ICANN board.

As is traditional, we have suggested a series of discussion topics for this session, to make the best use of our time together, and the discussion list is on the screen in front of you.

We'd like to begin with a conversation around the WCIT, which we have been discussing in the ccNSO for a number of months now, and indeed, we have a session on WCIT as part of our schedule for this week.

Keith, you were going to pose the question from the ccNSO.

>>KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, Lesley, and good morning everybody. My name is Keith Davidson, one of the vice chairs of the ccNSO and thanks for having us along, Steve.

We asked a question on the WCIT at ICANN Prague which we didn't really get an accurate answer on, so we're reasking the question, recognizing now we're much closer in the time line towards ITU Dubai's December meeting.

And the question is: Could you please explain how the ICANN board is positioning ICANN relating to the WCIT process, and has the board developed principles for its engagement at, and how will ICANN be collaborating with ccTLDs and other ICANN SOs and ACs, on the topic of ITRs?

>>STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Apologize for coming in late. The value of the transcript has allowed me to catch up quickly so I'll try to answer the question.

I am Dr. Crocker.

[Laughter]

>>STEVE CROCKER: We have a bit of teamwork here I appreciate. Chris has been helping and Bill Graham have been helping organize our approach on a number of subjects.

Gonzalo, you're in position to answer this particular question on the WCIT strategy.

>>GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you. Gonzalo Navarro, chairman of the BGRC.

Keith, we have been working during the last time with staff in order to create the necessary conditions to participate not only in WCIT but in IGF and other international fora that are coming in the next months and in the next years.

What we are doing is to receive -- and we are welcoming all the inputs and the help that we can find in the environment.

We are not going to participate directly in the WCIT, but of course ICANN will have a inter- -- participation and we will be joined to other organizations. And in that regard, all the help and support and ideas that you can bring to the table will be really welcome.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. I -- thank you, Gonzalo.

Just a couple other things, and then also Tarek is here and we might get Tarek to come and sit up -- come and sit up here, Tarek. It will be easier.

We met about this the other day in the global relations committee and we're down to very practical things now. We're talking about having people on the ground in Dubai so that there can be some coordination between the rep- -- the ICANN people who managed to get themselves onto delegations can be coordinated on the ground in Dubai. Maybe have a -- you know, a breakfast every morning, that sort of thing. We're talking about having an office -- people in the office open in Los Angeles the whole time, so that if we need to do stuff we can have people in the office in L.A. actually running around doing -- preparing things and so on.

We're in an intensely practical phase about now, "Okay, so it's coming up, what the hell are we actually going to do on the ground?"

We're pretty clear about the people that we know for sure are coming in delegations. Like Keith, I think -- I don't know if it's you, but someone is in the New Zealand delegation and we've got someone in the Australian delegation and so on. So we're getting down to the sort of nitty-gritty now.

But did you want to follow up before I go to Tarek? Is that -- okay. No? Go to Tarek? So Tarek, do you want to --

>>TAREK KAMEL: Thank you, Chris, for inviting me, and I'm delighted to be here with my new capacity.

Indeed, the new management team at ICANN under Fadi Chehade is taking the WCIT issue very serious. There is -- I said, there's no reason to panic but also there is no reason for complete relaxation, so it's something in between. We need to stay alert as a community.

We have been either attending by ourselves as much as we could some of the regional meetings in Africa and the Arab region, in Europe and in other parts of the world, or commissioned someone on our behalf to attend and to give us a report about what's happening.

We are also in -- doing some contacts directly with the ITU secretariats.

The plan is the following: We are following up the documents that are coming by the ITU summarizing the proposal. Some of them have been annoying to us. Some of them mention ICANN directly, like what happened in the Arab region. But in other regions we see that they are talking about peering issues, they are talking about routing issues, they are talking about cybersecurity issues, which definitely could affect at least the multistakeholder model with which the Internet is operational and successful.

So it's not only a directly ICANN threat, but it might be a threat to the multi- -- successful multistakeholder model that we as a community have been building within the last 15, 20 years. And I think we ought and it is part of our responsibility as a community really to speak out to our governments and lobby them as much as we can in order to make them aware about the issues, because many of the misconceptions that are going around are just wrong. Wrong facts about the way the Internet is being governed and the Internet is being -- being operational.

So it is very useful, please, for everybody from the ccNSO environment and other -- and other players that understands really how the Internet works. Make sure that we -- we educate people and we make them aware of what's going on.

Our plan is the following: As Chris has mentioned -- and I have been discussing this with Fadi -- on a headquarter level we have a team headed by Mandy Carver in Los Angeles that will be coordinating before and during the meeting I want to say a support office or back-end office, following up with people on-site, preparing documents, responding to any questions, preparing any memos that needs to be propagated, giving any information to any delegations that are coming back to us or any lobbyists that are coming back to us and asking, and even reviewing texts, because some text could be very tricky, especially when it comes to international treaties and could open, specifically from cybersecurity issues, an avenue for intervention in the future and for threatening the whole multistakeholder model.

At the same time we are seriously thinking about having two of our in-Europe people, Nigel Hickson and Baher Esmat -- because Baher is from the region -- on-site as much as we can at least attending side meetings and being there and lobbying on our behalf as well.

So that's what we -- what we have in mind, and I think we are not attacking anybody but we are defending our multistakeholder -- our multistakeholder model and making sure that the right facts are being put out at the right direction.

If there are any participants in national delegations, this would be great. We would love to have a little (indiscernible) and a list of contacts to be handed to Mandy Carver and ourselves on national delegates that -- people that will be on national delegations whom I have been in direct contact, too. Thank you.

>>KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, Gonzalo, Chris, and Tarek. That's a very extensive reply. And just following up a little bit, I think the ccNSO have identified that WCIT is part of a set of processes that continue into next year with the policy review by ITU and then WSIS plus 10 coming up.

So this is merely the start of another round of processes rather than something that will finish in December this year. So I think we can fully appreciate what you -- what progress you've made.

Could I suggest the establishment of a mailing list rather than just merely providing mail contact, so that perhaps we could have an ICANN-only discussion forum for delegates who are attending?

And could I just finally say that a ccNSO meeting on this topic at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow with a panel discussion, which is primarily an update from our ccTLD community as to what individual ccTLDs are doing in terms of getting onto their government delegation or how they'll interact with the WCIT process. So thank you.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Gonzalo?

>>GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much. Thank you, Keith.

Just to round out the idea that was presented at the beginning and that was conveyed by Tarek and Chris, the idea of the mailing list is more than important. In many countries, you are the most informed people about what is going on, how is the -- how the model is working, and you are the precise kind of element that we need to interact with governments, so in that regard, your participation is a key element, as in my view, and the mailing list is going to help in a way to keep you and keep us informed about what is going on and to take further steps, if necessary, not only in WCIT but in the next forums. Thank you.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Fadi?

>>FADI CHEHADE: I have asked, and Tarek is happy to help with providing a positioning paper on all the proposals that we can share with all of you. Now, we've been developing that. We'd like to share it as soon as all the proposals are out and available. And this way, at least, you know, the -- and it won't be necessarily ICANN's position, because this is not about ICANN. It will be about how, as a multistakeholder community, we view what these proposals and ITRs can do, can cause, and will share some positioning statements on these.

This way, we at least have some common material that we can look at.

>>STEVE CROCKER: I think we want to close on this rapidly. Bill and then I want to ask about the coordination with your meeting tomorrow.

>>BILL GRAHAM: Thanks, Steve. Just one quick suggestion. ICANN will -- is certainly concerned about these issues, as you know, but I know, Keith, you're aware of the many things that are going on in ISOC. There are a number of business voices very interested in defending the model and defending ICANN, so I'd suggest that to the extent possible, it would be good to establish a much broader list than simply around ICANN, because it's going to be really vitally important for all these different interests to work with their home governments and with everyone else who's on-site. Thanks.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Thank you for those responses, I mean, which were, I would observe, much more full and detailed than in Prague, and reassuringly so.

I think the point from the ccNSO was viewing this, rather than a meeting-by-meeting thing, as the need for a long-term vision and strategy for dealing with a whole series of meetings that are coming up over the next coming years, and we're reassured to hear that there's some progress on that.

I'm going to move us on to our next question area, please, which was on outreach and activities particularly to involve developing countries.

My colleague, Vika, from Africa was going to speak to that point.

>>VIKA MPISANE: Thank you, Lesley. My name is Vika Mpisane from ZA. My question is a question probably from some of the councillors or people in the ccNSO where it substantially follows up, I think, from some of the (indiscernible) that Tarek made in his last statements on outreach.

There was, I think a year or so ago, a talk of a summit on developing countries that took place sometime in one of the ICANN meetings talking about ICANN and how it will engage developing countries. And there are new initiatives -- I don't know if they are new or they follow up on that -- that we are seeing coming from the Africa region. As you well know, Fadi, the Africa strategy that has been proposed for ICANN. There is, as well, some movement and some documents, one is seen from the Latin American/Caribbean region.

Now, what probably prompts the question there is, just to get to know are these initiatives coordinated by ICANN? Are they going to be built or have they already been built into the ICANN strategy priorities going forward?

And to what extent is ICANN intending to work with ccTLDs on this?

And probably the last question becomes even more important because there have been times where one thinks there have been serious missed opportunities by ICANN. I refer, probably unfairly, to the new gTLDs issue which, when ICANN was making -- basically creating awareness in different areas and regions, never came to Africa. And in spite of an invitation by ZADNA to come to one of our one very key events in South Africa and talk about new gTLDs. So that's why there is this question. Are these -- for example, these outreach that we see, outreach initiatives, going to be involved in these TLDs?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Vika, can I just -- I just want to make sure that I'm clear.

What you're asking is to make sure that outreach efforts into specifically Africa and Latin America, but effectively everywhere, are coordinated with -- are coordinated with the relevant ccTLDs. Is that -- that's basically it, isn't it?

>>VIKA MPISANE: That is it.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

>>VIKA MPISANE: Probably with your permission, Lesley --

[Speakers overlapping]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Fine.

>>VIKA MPISANE: -- doing in Africa with Africa strategy, to a certain extent --

[Speakers overlapping]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I understand.

>>VIKA MPISANE: It doesn't specifically talk of the cc or the ccTLD organization though it does mention working with the local stakeholders.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Got it.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Sally and then Bruce.

>>SALLY COSTERTON: I think the straightforward answer to that is yes. I can't see why we wouldn't do that. We have a developing Africa strategy. We have a slightly earlier stage Latin America strategy. We will have further strategies for other parts of the world and Tarek and my view is very strongly is that we will coordinate this inside ICANN, yes, but with the input of the community at every stage. And to my mind, it would be an absolute necessity to engage with local ccTLDs to help us. This is a very important part of the process. So it's very definitely intended to be a community-based process. And I'm looking at Tarek because I'm -- to me this seems straightforward, but maybe I've missed something.

>>TAREK KAMEL: I just want to confirm the following. I have asked two questions, whether these regional strategies, Africa, Latin America or other parts of the world that Fadi has asked us to prepare, will be part of the overall ICANN strategy. The answer is definitely yes. They have to be entrenched completely within the strategic plan of ICANN. And the Mauritius retreat that prepared the African strategic plan was important. We need to make sure we are in alignment of the strategic plan of Africa. So we are not doing separate regional plans that are not in alignment with the overall ICANN strategic plan.

The second, ccTLDs are definitely part of the strategic plan of Africa and Latin America. You are the ones on-site that are there, whether DNSSEC, empowering DNSSEC or security with security measures or empowering the ccTLD with capacity-building and many other programs related to the ccTLD empowerment. They are included in the strategic, and we will make sure we will implement them with the right players in each country.

>>FADI CHEHADE: Here's my commitment. They're pulling the plans together for the regions into a single plan that I will review. My commitment is that before this plan gets put into action, we'll share it with all of you. And not just share it, we'll share it and take your feedback and adjust the plan because without the CCs, the plan, in my opinion, is limping. It is just not going to get very far.

So we will work with you. We don't believe we should be doing things that are not coordinated with you. We appreciate your support on them.

But, we are -- we have the same goal, which is to enable your communities. So we have absolutely every interest in making sure these things are aligned with you. So that's my commitment.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Bruce? Bruce?

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, one of my thoughts just looking at that question, "concrete activities to improve outreach," there is almost a step before that, which is what are we doing outreach about. And I think that's something that it would be really great to get feedback from the ccTLDs in each region to say for your region or even your country, what are the topics that you believe is important for ICANN to communicate to your region. Because I don't -- I think it is hard to do a one size fits all. And sometimes we've developed material that might be more appropriate in North America or Germany or whatever. But let's say we're talking about some aspect of outreach of the trademark clearinghouse or something. That's probably -- I'm guessing, may not be a big topic in Senegal as to what the rules are for the trademark clearinghouse.

So I think what would be really useful before you even start planning your outreach, which is obviously what Tarek and Sally are going to do, but actually getting the feedback from you saying what are the key messages for your region that you want ICANN to communicate. And then we can build a plan around communicating those messages or that information. So I think that's just the step before outreach, is what are we going to be doing outreach about.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Listen, we could talk about this for the rest of today, I think. There is a queue of people, and I'm very wary of disappointing you all but we also have some other topics that we are going to need to cover.

We hear and appreciate your commitment, Fadi. I think in return there is a ccNSO commitment to dialogue on this area and helping you to develop a strategy that incorporates the strength that we have on the ground as well in delivering that strategy.

Let's move on, I'm afraid.

>>STEVE CROCKER: I apologize. I just want to add a brief word. Let me just recognize that the question that you are asking this time are similar to questions that have been asked in the past. And I hope it is completely obvious that the answers are qualitatively different this time. And we're eager to move ahead and coordinate, both supportive of and benefit from, the enormous presence and activity of the entire CC community.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Good. Great to hear it. We have our any next question area, which is also another favorite from the ccNSO community. We'd like to just briefly

update you and receive any questions or comments on two things that always seem to be on our dance card: ICANN finances and ccTLD contributions towards ICANN finances and also the ICANN strategic and operating plans. And let me hand over to Byron and Roelof who chair those respective working groups.

 >>BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Lesley. You'll recall when we last met in Prague, we'd had a bit of a stumble in terms of our work in getting towards a new financial contribution model. I am cautiously optimistic that the work of the finance group in conjunction with Xavier is working towards a new path. And just to give a very quick overview of where we're going with it, it did give us time to reflect and pause on are we -- are we finding the best way forward? It had really been based on where the philosophical underpinning had really been around a fee-for-service model. I think we've had the opportunity to really re-evaluate is that purely the best path forward? And in conversations over the course of the summer in the finance working group with others in the community, with Xavier, we've taken a more holistic view of it in terms of what is the value exchanged between the CC community and ICANN? And that's a two-way street.

 Clearly, ICANN provides a lot of value to the CC community but we would also, I think, be able to make a compelling argument that the CC community delivers a lot of value to ICANN. And the conversation we've just had about CCs being the feet on the street in all the regions around the world, close to the governments of the countries that they're in, et cetera, is just one indication of the kinds of value that the CC community brings.

 So we're trying to come -- trying to find a path forward here looking at what is the value that the CC community brings to ICANN and ICANN brings to the CC community and then breaking it down in terms of what is easily quantifiable and it has a very clearly defined cost and what should the CCs contribute towards that. That would be an easily quantifiable one.

 But what is the value of feet on the street to deliver messages that are important and relevant to ICANN back into the communities? That's tougher to identify. It is tougher to monetize the value of that. But that's the path that we're going down.

 We've been working quite closely with Xavier, had some constructive dialogue and conversations already this week. And I believe that he's -- he's committed to being able to produce some preliminary numbers on both sides of that equation. So that's where we find ourselves right now.

 As I said, I think we had a stumble in Prague but perhaps there was a silver lining to that cloud in that it's allowed us to re-evaluate the path we were on and I think potentially find a much better path.

The goal is to come to some rough conclusions for presentation to our community by Beijing, so we'll be roughly a meeting behind as a result. But that's the timeline associated with it as well.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Byron. Roelof, the SOP and ICANN strategy.

>>ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, thank you, Lesley. Yeah, as the SOP working group, we had a session last Sunday on the draft strategic plan for 2013-2016. We had Xavier, Kurt, Carole and Jessica there. I won't go through the whole meeting, but we have a strong recommendation for you. And that is not to proceed with the work on the 2013-2016 plan. For two reasons.

The first reason being that there's not much sense really in following the process just for the sake of the process, if you're not going to do anything really useful with the outcome. You have a 2012-2015 plan. And what we hear from ICANN staff is that somewhere in the course of next year, there's going to be a new strategic planning procedure and a new way of forming a plan. So, that is the first reason why we recommend this.

And the second reason is that I think you would send out a strange signal if you at this phase come up with a plan that goes into 2016. The community might think that there's nothing that's going to change on the side of the strategy.

As a working group, we will do two things. We put this in writing as a recommendation. We will not come up with any other comments on the present draft plan. And what we will also do is we will provide you input for this new strategic planning procedure by forming a high level document of the comments that we've previously submitted.

>>STEVE CROCKER: I think that's very healthy.

Bruce?

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, thank you for that feedback. I guess to give a little bit of context from the board in this area, we did have a workshop in Los Angeles recently. And we were talking about the topic of strategic planning. And one of the things from a board perspective is that we felt that we needed to have -- in the last couple of years, we've been tied up in what I would call operational issues rather than strategic issues. And the plan hasn't had a lot of attention at least from the board for probably a couple of years. So it has been really what I call iterating, just a few tweaks here and there. We haven't sort of just taken a step back and said, Let's just review what our mission is and what our overall purpose is and some of the high-level strategic concepts and before jumping back down to the detail. That's a healthy thing to do every few years.

So I think we're still in the early stages of working out the best way of doing that. Certainly the board wants to dedicate some time for itself to just step back and just have that as a sole focus. Often when we have our board meetings, we get pulled into the operational issues of the day rather than stepping back a bit and looking into the future.

Having said that, I think it still is useful to get feedback from you with respect to the current iteration of the plan. But I agree, if you can keep that at the level that you just described and, say -- almost sort of rehash of some of your earlier comments of previous years, but keeping it at the high level. In other words, what are the real big strategic initiatives ICANN should be focusing on and, particularly, perhaps how to measure because that's the other thing that's very weak at ICANN, is how to actually measure progress on anything we do.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Bruce.

Roelof?

>>ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, Bruce. I think this is exactly why we will keep it at the high level. Because if we would react to the present draft version of the plan, you would get 98% of our comments on the previous version of the plan.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Which takes us on to one of our major points. We're strategic plan monitors, and we have consistently provided feedback we're not convinced is heard. Now, we're not expecting all of our feedback to be -- we're not expecting to see the redline with all of our feedback incorporated. We're not that naive. But, certainly, the ccNSO has contributed quite a high degree of comment and interest in this issue because we think it's important for ICANN and for the community. And we're not feeling that we're heard. And very much in the new process, we would like to see community input heard and maybe obviously incorporated in the plan or knowing why it's not. I think that dialogue would be immensely beneficial.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Lesley, thanks. And I agree. I mean, our work on the strategic plan as CCs, you know, it's been going on for -- oh, I've forgotten how long it is that we've been -- leading the contributions in the strategic planning area and finance area, and I think it's absolutely right that the new -- part of the new process is going to be -- it's not just about coming up with the end products but how do we get to the end product. And so the whole process needs to be looked at and to make sure that -- as you say, it's not that you necessarily get everything you want but at least you feel you've been heard before the laminated document is produced.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. So while I'm pushing an open door I think there's also the issue of combining both finance and strategy to look at whether the draft plan is affordable or deliverable with the resources that one has or indeed whether there might be more that could be possible given resources, so very much the ccNSO has been talking around putting those two elements together, and obviously we're

happy to provide experience and expertise in doing just that in our own organizations.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Bruce.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Just another quick response to your comment, Lesley, about feeling that you're heard. We did actually have a session yesterday which was talking about, you know, how the Board receives advice and how the Board communicates, and it wasn't really well attended and I understand that. But just to sort of pass on some of the messages that we heard in that session, were fairly similar to what you said in that we have a little bit of a situation where groups spend a lot of time on a topic and they write up a document and the document gets thrown into the process and they never feel that they have a chance to have a dialogue about that document at all. And therefore they don't feel they're heard when the -- when the final outcome comes out and they can't see any connection between their document that they spent hours on and the final document. So I think that's feedback we're taking onboard and one of the ways is to work out what is the best way to have that dialogue. And maybe just going back to some of the techniques we had in previous years, but I know you have a very dedicated group within the ccNSO that looks at strategic and budget planning, probably more developed there than any of the other groups at ICANN.

I think having a smaller group that the staff and Board could meet with and have that dialogue is probably the way forward. Certainly we can't do it in this kind of a forum. We have an hour and you're trying to cover 20 topics, as are we, but I think we need a dedicated period of time with a smaller group, maybe one or two of you, and really work on the dialogue of how you produced your document.

>>FADI CHEHADE: I think as a general comment, not related to this particular subject, I that I lot of people, including I'm hearing now from Lesley, feel that they're not heard at ICANN. Is that a fair comment?

>>LESLEY COWLEY: I'm heard. I'm not sure if it's necessarily always reacted to.

>>FADI CHEHADE: Exactly.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: The ccNSO is heard.

>>FADI CHEHADE: And so that's precisely the point, that the hearing as I described yesterday what engagement really means, is a very, very small part of engagement. If it's not followed up and the listening leads to engagement and leads to understanding and leads to taking what we heard and making it part of what we do and then feedbacking all of this to you properly, then frankly, it feels like you haven't been heard. And so one of the things that I just want to emphasize on this process and any process moving forward, that we now have two executives that just weren't there two months ago at the head of ICANN whose sole job is to engage. Specifically

Sally is here to engage with you, with the CC community, and make sure that what we hear from you is listened to, there's feedback to it, et cetera. That needs to start happening on a broader level, much better. And I'm hoping that in the months ahead we actually see a substantive change in the engagement quality.

On the strategic process, again, I defer to the Board that will largely -- of which I'm part, but to Bruce and the team to actually lead this, but I am of the opinion that we right now have a muddled operational end strategic plan, we do not have a clear separation of a strategic plan from an operational plan. The current so-called strategic plan is largely operational. That's not healthy. We should separate these things. We should have a strategic plan that we all participate and make our strategic plan. And then out of that we have an operational plan. And we will be doing this in the proper way. This is not rocket science. People do this at companies from Pepsi to the local, you know, copy center around your block, they develop strategies, from strategies they develop plans, and we have very experienced people on the Board and on the leadership team now and we will be supporting each other starting early next year to move down that logical, normal, healthy process. And we not only will listen to you, I want to be clear on this. I had the privilege of dining with many ccTLD leaders in Europe recently. What remarkable insight, what remarkable input you all have, what amazing experiences. I mean, just this week, Lesley, I had a chance to meet with Keith and his team just to learn about dot NZ and I already asked them if they would be willing to help us at ICANN with various things we were stumbling on that they have done very well. And they are meeting with my team, and this is the kind of engagement and learning, the respect we have for what you've done and what you do every day. Running amazing operations locally has to translate into engagement at a deep level, and I'm committed to that and will change that discourse so we become real partners.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Excellent. We'll hold you to that, I'm sure. We have done some agenda editing. I'm very mindful we're spending a lot of time on ccNSO discussion topics and we haven't even started the Board list. But Steve and I between us have had a quick prune and reduced through two question areas. Firstly, the Board have asked the ccNSO for feedback on the call for input on the impact of the new gTLD program on ICANN structures and processes and a discussion about how to move forward, and we thought briefly about this at a preparation meeting we had and I think Becky, you had been volunteered to comment.

>>BECKY BURR: Thank you. Becky Burr from dot US. I'm excited to say dot US so I'm going to say it again. We wanted to say, first of all, that the ccNSO believes that there are going to be -- that there may be changes in processes and many other things as a result of the new gTLD process but generally our view is that probably should not impact the ccNSO or the way in which the ccNSO operates. We do think that with the increase in activity there's going to be increasing press on everybody's time. We all are too busy here anyway and so we would just suggest, and I'm sure nobody needs reminding, but maybe encourage you and support, provide support

for priorities and making clear planning and not trying to do more than we all can bear.

 We also understand that, you know, there are ccTLD operators that also operate gTLDs and vice versa. That system has worked pretty well and the distinctions have been clear and we have not found problems with operating these two and sort of noting where tensions in interests might be, being public and transparent about them. We very much would like to encourage that we all remain vigilant to maintain the distinction between CCs and gTLDs. They really are very distinct entities. I've been sort of in every seat except the ones you guys are in in this organization and they -- and CC -- no, thank you. And CCs really are very different and incredibly vibrant source of diversity and contribution to this organization. So we will certainly, in our activities, be -- continue to be vigilant, be more vigilant about sort of where the interests of CCs and Gs may be intentioned and being clear and transparent about that, but we also continue -- will continue to be vigilant and hope that you will continue to recognize the sort of distinction and value that the CCs bring as a really separate part of the community. And I don't mean separate part of the community. I meant distinct, unique part of the community.

 >>STEVE CROCKER: We have run into a time limit so we're going to take a minute. I want to ask you a question and turn to Bertrand and then we'll close. In other discussions the question has been raised, going directly to the heart of the point that you've made, of what is the distinction between the CC community and the GNS -- the G community aside from the contractual one, that are these divisions that were set up sometime ago still relevant or have they blurred and in thinking about going forward in the future, is the stress and changes that are likely to come in the system to be contained solely within the existing structure of a GNSO or is it time to take a broader look. Let me ask you just to respond very briefly to that and then we'll come over to Bertrand.

 >>LESLEY COWLEY: So the biggest distinction, and I think the critical one, is that CCs are answerable to their local communities. Not all CCs operate as sort of, you know, community. There are commercial CCs but in the end all of the CCs answer to the community and there are lots of exceptions and, you know, things happened in different times and under different rules. But as a general matter, the issues that arise in CCs are issues that are generally and wherever possible to be resolved by the local community within the local rule of law. And that's a very big difference. You can serve your local community in lots and lots of different ways, so I don't want to diminish that, but the sort of direct answering back to the local community is an important difference.

 >>STEVE CROCKER: Bertrand.

 >>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, just briefly. As you'll remember, we initiated this call for input in Prague. Thank you very much for the -- for the feedback and for having contributed, highlighting in particular what Becky is

mentioning regarding the distinction between the CCs and the Gs. I won't get into the substance. I wanted to make a quick update in terms of process. We expected -- or we anticipated to organize a full community discussion on this topic here in Toronto. For pure scheduling constraints it has been decided to postpone this to Beijing and what will happen tomorrow morning is a gathering of the chairs of the SOs, ACs and constituencies, including ccNSO and thank you for accepting to participate, to discuss basically two points and I don't want to open it now, but just as an update. One point is precisely how to do a timely discussion on this topic. That is not too early, neither too late, and that is involving appropriately the community without overburdening it at a time where there are many other issues that are really on top of the agenda. So methodologically how does the community want to address this evolutionary topic.

 And the second thing is, there will be -- there is a planned review for the GNSO next year. There is also the ATRT 2 that is on the horizon and one of the questions we would like to ask is, how does that fit, articulate, with this general debate, how to avoid duplication and at the same time get the best synergies. So thank you very much and we hope that the ccNSO will be fully engaged in this discussion.

 >>STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. We are committed, the Board is committed as part of the process here, to note what's been said, to respond in a somewhat formal fashion by saying what we've heard and what we plan to do and then report later what we actually did against that and we'll -- you'll see that process in action on Thursday. It's not what we want to -- we're unhappy about being in the position where you're saying we've commented and we don't see the impact of those comments pro or con, we don't see a closed loop there. The natural thing for me to say is, I don't want to hear that again, but there's two different ways in which that could happen and I don't mean that if it's happening you shouldn't say it. I just want it not to be happening. So please do comment proactively on how you think the process is working. We're committed to making a significant change so that that's not what you're going the say next time.

 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Excellent. And rest assured, we would say it if we needed to.

 >>STEVE CROCKER: Oh, I know that.

 >>LESLEY COWLEY: We've run out of time. Thank you very much, everybody, and we look forward to continuing dialogue.

 [Applause]