

Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting
IGO INGO Meeting
Saturday 13 July 2013 at 15:00 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/>

Jonathan Robinson: For the purposes of those of you in the room, the next and on the audio with our - just prior to starting the recording the next session is going to be on the IGO and INGO PDP.

This is a piece of work that has an extraordinary, possibly disproportionately high profile. It's seen as a very important work by at least some if not throughout the community. So I think it's important to hear from this Working Group where they have got to and what's going on.

Are we ready to start the recording? Right so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) for the purpose of the transcription is the IGO INGO originally scheduled - I'm sorry, yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Originally scheduled at 15:00 to 15:30.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so we're commencing at just around 15:20. Over to you Brian Peck who has admirably assisted Tom Rickert as Chair of the Working Group. Brian Peck is on the staff of ICANN and we'll leave him to present to us. Thanks Brian.

Brian Peck: Okay. Thank you very much Jonathan. Good afternoon. I'd also like to acknowledge of the work of my colleague of Berry Cobb and this Working Group as well in supporting it.

We'd like to give you a brief update on the current status of the Working Group's activities, in addition a briefing of this public session that we'll be holding on Wednesday which is part of the process of soliciting feedback from the community in helping the Working Group hopefully move forward in reaching consensus and then a brief update on what the next steps will be.

So in terms of the current status as you are probably aware the group did issue its initial report on the 14th of June. The public comment period is open until the 17 the end of the day this Wednesday with apply period closing on April - excuse me, August 7.

This initial report includes the number of policy recommendation options that are currently under consideration by the Working Group for the protection of certain names and/or acronyms of international organizations including IGOs, Red Cross, Red Crescent Movement, the IOC and other INGOs other than those two organizations in all the gTLDs.

As you be aware the board has currently adopted special protections for the names of the Red Cross, Red Crescent in IOC as well as IGOs for new gTLDs at least until policy recommendations come forth from the GNSO Working Group.

This initial report is somewhat different from the usual initial report. The initial reports usually include a set of recommendations that are in view of a consensus position.

The Working Group as of the date has not been able to reach consensus. And so it is using this initial report as a mechanism to solicit feedback from the community in hopefully providing some ideas, suggestions or at least guidance to help the Working Group move forward to reach a consensus on sort of policy recommendations after the public comment period is completed.

In order to do that the Working Group has taken two measures or steps. The first is I said using the initial report as a way to solicit feedback from the community.

And in order to do that it has included a form if you will, a set structured form that basically allows or asks for general comments but then also provides a matrix of the number of options that are - the Working Group is considering for protections at both the top level and second level asking, you know, indication of support or non-support for each policy recommendation and a rationale for that position.

It is also asking the community to provide feedback and indicate which of those protections they do favor as support, which organizations of the four sets they would, you know, support providing those protections for specifically against IGOs, the Red Cross Red Crescent, the IOC and other INGOs.

The other measure that the Working Group has undertaken is hosting a public discussion session this coming Wednesday here in Durbin.

The original idea was to facilitate a discussion similar to what we had in Beijing for a policy versus implementation.

During that time of planning we came to the understanding that we would be able to utilize the outside facilitators being used by ICANN in other areas which Marika mentioned to you this morning, XPLANE. And we've been working with XPLANE to put together a new kind of different format for this particular session again with the goal of trying to have as interactive session as possible with the community to help, you know move the Working Group forward in reaching consensus.

The objectives of Wednesday's session which we invite certainly all of you to attend are twofold. One is to raise the awareness of the importance of the issue to the community as well to provide transparency to (go in) deliberations and the contrasting positions to date.

The other objective is to achieve as interactive session as possible with the community focusing on four key issues or questions which the Working Group has determined that are key to helping the Working Group moving forward in hoping - hopefully reaching a consensus position and a set of policy recommendations.

With that in mind XPLANE has come up with a set agenda to try to accomplish those goals. The key difference that making the session a little bit different is as I said we have four basic key issues questions which are going to be set up as stations is you will.

The audience that and the community members that are going to be in attendance on Wednesday will be invited to participate in forming basically four groups.

These four groups will then circulate among the four, you know, position stations and discuss, try to come up with new ideas, brainstorm on each of the four topic areas for a set amount of time for the last part of a session dedicated to a public read out and discussion of the key or main ideas that have been raised during the session.

Each station will be manned or staffed if you will by staff member, you know, very familiar with the issues as well as one of the professional facilities from XPLANE to help move forward the discussions.

The four key questions that the Working Group has determined as key to helping it move forward are should we identify areas of IGOs and NGOs be protected at top or second level?

If protections are provided should there be an acceptance process to allow the relevant organization when - or other authorized third party right holder to register the identifier at the top or second level?

Should an organization's acronyms be protected to the top or second level?
As you know, this is a key issue for IGOs.

And what should be the objective set of criteria to determine whether an organization should receive special protections?

So each of these topics as I said will have a dedicated station staff member and facilitator to facilitate discussions and brainstorming among the community members.

In addition to discussion in the read out of the ideas to come up with in the discussion on Wednesday that follow-up that will be provided to help assist the Working Group is XPLANE will provide photos or summary of the notes collected as a digital archive.

In addition we'll be taking back the notes from the session for the subsequent working sessions after the Durbin meeting.

In terms of remaining work again the purpose of the public comment period is to gain feedback guidance from the community which hopefully then will be

reviewed by the Working Group to come up with a consensus position on a set of policy recommendations.

There needs to be consideration of the exception procedures. If there will be any how will they be implemented, consideration of how to implement any adoptive protection recommendations to be applied to existing gTLDs.

And then the issuance of a draft final report again this being a little bit different process. The draft report normally goes to the GNSO council for consideration. In this case because the public has not seen a set of policy recommendations with the consensus position there will be a draft final report that's first issued for public comment. And then that will be reviewed before finally be submitting the final report for the GNSO for its consideration.

That's a brief update of the current status the Working Group activities as well as the format being used for this public session on Wednesday. And be happy to answer any questions or take any comments at this time. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Brian. Useful to hear that the work where you've got to date and also some of the innovations that have been brought into the process.

Comments, questions? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. I guess one of my questions is, you know, this has been a topic that's been around for a while and there's a reason there's a number of different recommendations and not yet consensus in the group.

Do we - has the group thought about what it's going to do if during this comment or during this session at this meeting and during other comments that it really just finds that the comments it gets is it just a - or the group is a microcosm of the larger comments it's going to get which is all over the place on different types of things?

Does the group have a plan or is there anything that council could do or should do to help the group come to some sort of consensus on anything or this is just - I'll stop the question there.

Jonathan Robinson: The group is certainly aware of the possibility of that it would be very difficult to reach consensus. I think that was one of the reasons why that - the consensus that was reached based on that possibility was a need using this initial report in a little bit different model of trying to see what is the sense of the community on this issue?

I mean the group as you know has been working for a long time and their positions are well known. But sometimes working so insular they're, you know, maybe have not seen or gotten better pulse of where the community is on this.

So their - the hope is that both through the public comment process and especially having these professional facilitators, mediators if you will, you know, kind of organize and host this session on Wednesday there is at least at this point still a hope that, you know, there will be an opportunity to find either a greater sense of where the community is on this issue and/or coming up with maybe some new ideas or new approaches from which there can be some common ground.

I mean there - as you say there is that possibility. I think there is still also, on certain issues I think there is a growing sense of consensus. I think those four issues that we just listed are the areas where they still need to try to move forward.

You know, for example acronyms and then you see the board and the GAC are struggling on that issue. And so I think, you know, you know in other areas, you know, protections for example on the Red Cross Red Crescent

IOC, you know, I think those type of areas there's - there's, you know, I think a good possibility of likelihood that consensus could be reached on that.

It's just some of these remaining issues where there's still some difficulty and that's again, hopefully this week they'll get some direction on how to move forward on that.

Jeff Neuman: So do we have a readout at the wrap-up session on this? Is this something good to get just a readout and (unintelligible)? Because if - even after the session this week of people are still on these issues all over the place then we need to figure out...

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point with respect to the wrap-up session.

So just so if those of you don't know and (Lars) over in the corner from ICANN Policy Staff is helping to capture some of the key things that have come out including what will end up on the wrap-up session.

So to Jeff's point it's pretty helpful to (Lars) and to myself and the Vice Chairs if you feel that something should be brought up during the course of these discussions today and tomorrow or at any other point that you can flag that for potential discussion wrap-up sessions. So that's helpful. Thanks Jeff.

Brian did you want to respond any further to that or no?

Brian Peck: No I think that's a great suggestion. I'd be happy to provide a very brief readout of especially Wednesday session for the wrap up session on Thursday and, you know, hope they give some prognosis on how it will move forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Any other comments or questions for Brian on the work of this INGO NGO group? It's certainly something I'll flag with you in one of the later

sessions. I mean the GAC certainly wants to hear from us in our interaction with them as to the kind of progress update.

As you know, this is a high profile in the GAC for obviously reasons and so we will come back to it a little later.

All right, thanks very much again Brian and we'll close this session off. We're going to run one more session before the scheduled break. And that's to hear from Edmon on the work of the JIG and the resultant proposed letter.

So I'll call Edmon Chung up and if we can close the recording on this session and be prepared to open the new one within a couple of - within a minute or so.

END