

Transcription ICANN London
Update CWG on Use of Country Codes and Territory Names
Framework of Operating Principles Cross Community
Saturday 21 June 2014

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/#jun>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Are we good to go? Have we started the recording already? All right so just to reintroduce that and make sure we've got that on record this is the session on cross community working groups, CWG principles and CWG Use of Country Codes and Territory Names.

John, I think you're going to lead us into the - are we starting with whom?

Ching Chiao: I will start only with the use of country and territory names.

Jonathan Robinson: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: That's great. So we'll start with you, Ching, then on the - I've just go principles up on the slides here. Are you...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay fine, thank you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. And so very quick update on the Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country Codes and Territory Names which the Council approved the charter to form a cross community working group with the ccNSO last time.

And myself and Heather Forest and - as co-chairs to the working group. So between the Singapore meeting and now we have two conference calls to set up the principle of, I mean, so the administratives of the working group. And we are actually still calling for the volunteers.

Actually this working group, as you probably know, is derived from a very good base, I mean, the starting from the ccNSO its own, I mean, on the territory - I'm sorry, the country codes and territory names. So, so far we still are seeking, I mean, to incorporate more volunteers and there will be a face to face meeting on next Thursday on the am.

So probably actually, Marika, you would like to add some more if I'm missing - miss anything?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to add indeed they're just getting started and really trying to get everyone on the same page in relation to the previous work that was done by the study group. And the next step is really to focus on developing a work plan and trying to set out the next milestones for the group.

And maybe just to note that I think, you know, there's still - volunteers are still welcome. I did note that on the last call I think the participation from ccNSO participants was - it was really high but we were slightly lacking on the GNSO side so it would be good if, you know, if people are interested in this topic to sign up and join that effort.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Any other questions or comments? Gabriella.

Gabriella Szlak: Just a comment. This is Gabriella Szlak for the transcript. Just to remind everyone that I'm the liaison of the group - of the working group so just that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So that's the Council liaison to the working group.

Gabriella Szlak: Yeah, thank you, Council liaison.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or questions on the work of the Country and Territory Names Working Group? All right, let's move over then to John Berard on the CWG Operating Principles.

John Berard: Thank you, Jonathan. This is John Berard with the Business Constituency. I serve with Becky Burr of the ccNSO as co-chair of the Cross Community Working Group on Framework of Cross Community Working Group Operating Principles.

I note - I probably shouldn't admit it, I did check Twitter occasionally today and I've already seen criticism of participants at the meeting already about the use of acronyms. But if there were ever an activity that demanded an acronym it would be the Cross Community Working Group on the Framework of Cross Community Working Group Principles. So I would propose CWG squared perhaps as the acronym.

Whoever has their finger on the slides if you would strike. I wanted to begin really with a - the problem statement. Sometimes I think we get so deep into the weeds of some of these working groups we forget the problem that initiated them at the start.

And the problem here is the accelerated use of cross community working groups at a time when there are very few rules surrounding exactly how to initiate them, how to conduct them and more importantly how to accept their conclusions.

One of the things that we have done is to assess the more notable cross community working groups of the past and recent past for how they have worked well and otherwise, and some of them are listed there. And our goal is to create a set of principles that can guide the development of a working group through its entire lifecycle from initiation to adoption of the principles.

The one thing that has happened I think that has proven us correct is the - regarding the accelerated use of cross community working groups. We see in fact most recently the Internet Governance Cross Community Working Group. What we see in the charter of that group is already the adoption of some of the things that we have been sketching such as the specific SO and AC support for a consistent charter.

The certified participation in a cross community working group, that while everyone can participate there needs to be - there ought to be designated members who, if it came to a vote, would be those that would have the opportunity to cast them.

That there be specific participation limits. In fact we have been thinking about suggesting that if a stakeholder group or constituency or SO or AC chooses not to participate we may want a specific commitment to that effect so that after - when the conclusion is drawn someone can't step forward and say, hey, we didn't really have a voice; we want to know beforehand who's playing and who has chosen not to.

That there - that those members who are the designated participants should not preclude observers from participating. And more importantly that consensus not be a fly's eye of variations but really - and now taking a page out of the ccNSO book - it's either consensus or it's not. And as Becky said at one of the meetings, "Are you willing to drive into a ditch to prevent this from happening?" as a practical guide.

And so rather than full consensus, no consensus, full no consensus, consensus with a C, consensus with an S, the instinct here is to move to it either has consensus or not. So these are the - this is the frame that we are working with right now.

One of the points that I wanted to make, if I made any point this morning, is that I don't believe we've seen enough participation from the constituencies and stakeholder groups of the GNSO in this activity.

That may be deliberate or it may just be an oversight. And I would encourage the Council members to discuss participation with their constituency and stakeholder group at the meetings on Tuesday even though our meeting, our public meeting here in London is at 1:30 on Monday.

Mary Wong, who has been leading the staff work for us on this, and I had a conversation this morning. In looking at the Internet Governance charter it's possible that the issue may be deciding itself ahead of our work. But I still believe that it is essentially important for a cross community of interest to conclude a process by which cross community working groups can be deployed as I think that they will only become more important as the issues get broader.

So I'll take any questions that anybody might have. I promise to answer those I can and deflect those I don't want to and say I don't know when I don't. So, Avri, you're first.

Avri Doria: I have one quick question and it's come up in the Internet Governance Cross Community work and while I'm supposed to be in this one I think even perhaps liaisoning I missed the meeting.

Is how do we both include voting especially non-normalized voting in a consensus based group? I am troubled by the juxtaposition of those two notions. Both in the Internet Governance cross community work that makes the current charter sort of unacceptable in a sense and your mention of consensus is consensus are you willing to drive in a ditch? Yet, we may have voting.

And I don't see how those - especially non-normalized voting I don't see how those go together.

John Berard: I'll answer that before moving to Jonathan. I don't have a hot clue, Avri. That's really the work of the group, you know, what are the issues and how should

we attack them. I hope that we'll be able to get to that. I mean, I hope to be able to understand what non-normalized voting actually means.

Jonathan Robinson: In case Bret wanted to respond directly or? I guess I had one just request really was that perhaps it would be a good idea to send to the Council the list of participants in the working group so that we can then use that to communicate with our groups and say, look, we either have a representative just checking that they're participating actively or we don't have a representative, that would be useful.

And I suppose one other slightly person point, John, I thought the fly's eye of variations was a very colorful metaphor but a reminder that we not only have to worry about acronyms but we have to be careful about metaphors that don't always...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I'm often criticized for that so I wanted to get it out early so we can get it out of the way. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Bret.

Bret Fausett: Thanks. Bret Fausett from the Registry Stakeholder Group for the record. I have a question about the outcomes. So are we going to treat cross community working groups the same we treat our own working groups in that once the recommendations or the consensus policy has been arrived at it would come back to the Council for formal ratification? Is that the way it would happen?

And then if we wanted to get something adopted through a cross community working group would it have to be ratified both by, for example, the GNSO and the ccNSO separately? Is that the way it works?

John Berard: Bret, this is John. Yes, that is the instinct and the - it puts incredible pressure on being able to get a consistent charter at the front end so that when the results are sent back to each of the participating SOs ACs there is a - there's a consistency to the vote that they take in approving or not the findings of the cross community working group. So, yes, we're not seeking to take control away from we're just trying to align the efforts of each of the SOs and ACs.

Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I just wanted to answer the question on normalized versus non-normalized voting. Since in these things we're having a concept of you can have two to four members, let's say. And so then if you do regular voting you have some of the SOAC with - the SOs and ACs with four votes and you have some with two votes.

And unless there is a normalized one vote per SO AC or some other formula then you have an imbalance and then what you're really effectively is everybody has to stack the group with the full number or else when it comes to voting you have a lesser vote. And so that's the reason for normalizing. And since you had said needed an explanation of what I meant I wanted to explain.

John Berard: Thank you, Avri. Anyone else? Who is that down there? Mary.

Mary Wong: Yes, your accomplice in this. I just wanted to go back to some points that John made. One is in terms of events kind of accelerating around this group and if you map that against the lack of participation or full participation it's an interesting observation that we've come up with this in group.

The other thing I wanted to note was that the group's done some interesting initial work. And, Avri, your question put me in mind of this that in mapping the lifecycle of a typical working group from initiation to operation to decision making to termination the group as we said in these slides, found

inconsistencies and really just a lack of standardization across the efforts to date, which is not surprising.

Ad even at the initial work stage of this group just in mapping the charters of the selected prior efforts it's been a very challenging task in terms of identifying what the problem statement is and coming up with the charter. And as John said, if we look at one of the recent examples we do see some of that in practice.

So the question here I think that we're raising really is participation we would need more participation in order to make the work concrete. There is a lot of interesting stuff that we've managed to collect. But events may overtake the work.

John Berard: Thank you, Mary. In fact one of the new bits we may add to the vocabulary of ICANN is active non-participation. Anyway I think we've used up all of our time. Are there any other questions? Don't want to forestall discussion. Otherwise I'll turn it back to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much, John. We can stop the recording on that session now.