

---

LONDON – GAC/ccNSO Joint Session  
Tuesday, June 24, 2014 – 14:00 to 15:00  
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good afternoon, everyone. If you would take your seats, please.

Okay. So let's get started.

I hope everyone had a good lunch. I know it was a quick lunch.

We are now meeting with the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, and we have maybe one or two main agenda items in front of us today for our exchange.

So the first is to talk briefly about the Framework of Interpretation Working Group and where that effort currently stands, and how it relates to the GAC and what we need to do as next steps with regard to the report that's been worked on over recent years, in fact. It's been a long-time effort led by the ccNSO.

And then we will spend some time talking about the IANA stewardship transition issue, which I know is of great interest to not only the GAC but, as well, of course, our country code colleagues.

So at this point, can I hand over to -- Ah, okay. And there's another item to touch upon: the strategic and operational plan here at ICANN. Okay. So three items.

Keith, are you starting? Can I just hand right over to you? Please, go ahead.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you, Chair.

And my name, for the record, is Keith Davidson, and I'm the chair of the FOI Working Group, FOI being the term, the acronym for Framework of Interpretation. And this working group has been a successor to a previous working group that, in six years in total, has been working on clarifying the policies and guidelines relating to delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs, which I know is of much interest to the GAC as it is to ccTLDs.

So it is not empowered to create policy. It is only empowered to interpret and provide color and depth to existing policies.

I reported to you at the GAC meeting in Singapore that we would be finished, the framework, by London and looking for the GAC's endorsement here. However, we were, sadly, unable to do that. And I say "sadly" deliberately because I know that this is the last GAC meeting that Frank March is attending as New Zealand government person, and Frank has been the lead in terms of the GAC participants on this working group. So I would like to record our thanks for Frank's efforts and being the lead within the GAC and relating back from the GAC issues as they've arisen. And it's such a pity that we couldn't have concluded it at this appropriate time. And I'm sure we'll hear back from the GAC as to a replacement for Frank in due course.

But back to the Framework of Interpretation itself. We're producing the final executive summary and we're finding a couple of issues that, as written, were a little ambiguous or not concise. And as we're trying to

---

provide absolute clarity around the policies, rather than confusion around the policies and guidelines, we have labored over finding the right words.

We're still not quite there, but we will be locked in a room here for three hours on Thursday morning. In fact, I may extend the number of hours until we actually conclude and finalize the framework.

So my anticipation is that in no more than a week or two, we will have a final document to submit to the GAC for translation and then your consideration. So we would be happy to do anything intersessionally between now and ICANN Los Angeles, if the GAC were to require it. And I am hopeful we will be able to finalize and that the GAC and the ccNSO can go together to the ICANN Board to recommend the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation at that point.

And with that, I conclude my report.

And will we have questions?

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Keith, for that report.

So are there any questions from the GAC at this point regarding the report? I think it's clear that as the working group continues their efforts to finalize, that the GAC should then be prepared to look at the report and begin to analyze it.

It's really difficult for the GAC to have a sense of how much time the GAC would need and what kinds of issues there may be that require a bit more focus from colleagues in the GAC. But we look forward to

---

receiving the report, and then we will be able to work through its contents and take the necessary time with the aim, as you propose, to join with the ccNSO in finalizing that report to submit to the Board.

Okay. So I see no questions.

All right. So let's move to the next topic, which concerns the Framework of Interpretation -- oh, no. So we did that. It's the IANA stewardship transition issue. And who will take us through that from the ccNSO?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Hi. I'm Byron Holland. I'm the CEO and president of CIRA, the .CA operator in Canada, and I'm also the chair of the ccNSO and it's in that capacity I'll make a few remarks.

As we look at the overall timeline and process as the ccNSO community, we are certainly committed to being a constructive part of the process overall. We are concerned about a couple of issues. One is just primarily the timing, and we have made those comments that some of the timing appears constrained in terms of the ability to provide fulsome comment, but we are certainly working with ICANN staff and management to make sure that the country code community is able to make substantial and substantive input that respects our process and our ability to have a common input.

So the timelines are definitely a challenge on that front. Like many communities, we are also experiencing what I would call some volunteer fatigue.

---

If we look at the coordination committee, how we get people to that committee, what's happening around accountability, which will have some other structure entity around it, there's also cross-community working group on the oversight transition that the ccNSO and GNSO have been catalytic in formulating. And the idea with that one in particular, the genesis was the directly affected parties. So the CC managers, the G registry operators, root zone maintainer, root operators, coming together to make sure, as the directly affected parties of the IANA functions, that we had a strong voice in the inputs into the overall process. And that essentially was the genesis of the cross-community working group.

During -- Over the course of time, we have also invited the other SOs and ACs to participate, should they choose. And we know that that invitation has gone to this group as well, to the GAC as well. We do have ALAC and SSAC participation in the Cross-Community Working Group as well, of course, as the GNSO and ccNSO. And that will one of the primary ways that the directly affected parties of the IANA functions ensure that their concerns, voice, constructive suggestions are heard in the process.

But nonetheless, there are a number of entities here which must all be resourced in a meaningful way. And, as I said, like many of the communities here, we're committed to making the timeline, as we understand it, but it will certainly be a challenging endeavor for our community as others.

One connection I wanted to draw before I pass it back over to Heather is the work that the FOI is just concluding, while a separate piece of work

---

that's been many years in the making, when it comes to redelegation and revocation and delegation, of course there is a certain tie-in to the IANA transition issues and accountability, which is something that the ccNSO is particularly sensitive to as these three work streams all come together.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that introduction to this topic.

From the GAC side, we have been focusing, in particular, on identifying in what way the GAC would like to contribute to the Coordination Group. We've taken note of the proposal that we appoint two people from the GAC to participate. And so the GAC is very much wanting to come to agreement internally about what is the nature of the group and the role and what would be the expectations of anyone that the GAC would appoint, and whether we would need a particular contact group or working group of some sort of within the GAC in order to position ourselves to be contributing.

Things that we have taken note of include the fact that, you know, governments will and have, in fact, provided comments directly to that effort, and there may be some issues whether there isn't a GAC view as such, but nevertheless, those appointed GAC participants in the Coordination Group are certainly going to be, at a minimum, a useful way to have information moving between the Coordination Group and the gap, as well as the exchanges we have with groups such as the ccNSO and other parts of ICANN and the broader technical community.

---

So that's quite a bit of complexity to the process in terms of all the different actors that are involved in there. But as I say, we are very much focused on sorting out those process points and then identifying or beginning to identify what might be some of the GAC's views on that. But there won't be a GAC view on every aspect, I suspect, because we do anticipate having a range of views in the GAC.

And, really, the same goes for the enhancing accountability track. Again, we would want to work out what would be the GAC's involvement and what kinds of expertise that we may, in fact, be able to bring to bear on a process like that. And at the same time, also wanting to understand the relationship of those two processes working in parallel.

And so we're very much in that kind of mind set in dealing with those issues. So that's the focus of our efforts this week.

And I think there are some concerns about the timeline, like you have pointed out, and just precisely what we can get done and when and how.

So I hope that's helpful to give you a sense of where we are in the GAC.

So are there any questions or comments coming from GAC colleagues?

We have a number of country codes represented, not just at the front but in attendance in the room. If you had any questions for colleagues in relation to the IANA stewardship transition.

U.K..

---

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks. Just a question about the Cross-Community Working Group. You mentioned the opportunity for the GAC to assist with that in some way.

I wonder if the group is going to prepare some kind of draft paper or something? Maybe at that point, that could be circulated to the GAC, and then we could provide some comments or inputs into that, finalization of that paper.

Is that a sort of methodology that would work?

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: The Cross-Community Working Group on IANA --

>> About a group. I won't go into the details.

My question is really that we have a very similar kind of geographic -- you have a similar kind of geographic diversity, first, and the second one, you have also non-ccTLD managers in the ccNSO. So practically you have the two same things we have in the GAC.

So my question, it could be something for discussion, is in what way is the ccNSO thinking of having representation in this group? And how do you think about representation of non- ccNSO members?

Thank you.



---

BYRON HOLLAND:

So that is a good question, and it is something we are working on right now.

We have been allocated four seats in the coordinating committee, and we are in the process of creating a selection committee to forward the four candidates to the coordination committee.

It's early days in terms of what the selection criteria will be, but they include, and we certainly committed to ICANN that they will include ccNSO members, regional organization members, as well as try to have ccTLD managers who are not members of either the ccNSO or a regional organization to try to capture the full breadth of ccTLD managers within the coordinating committee.

Of course we will also be looking at geography and skill set, and skill set.

So we don't have a final criteria list yet but those are the kind of things that will be part of the selection criteria, and we have the commitment and are committed to making sure that we reach out not just to ccNSO members but involve the ROs and have already been involving the ROs and engaging regional organizations and reaching out to the total list of ccTLD managers.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

A quick follow-up. Do you believe you will be able to submit by the July 2nd deadline for submitting names or....

---

BYRON HOLLAND: It is a goal, but it is a very short period of time to do everything that I just said we are trying to do. In fact, we -- just before the lunch break, we had a panel that Theresa Swinehart was on, and I posed that very question, which was if we don't meet the July 2nd date, how much of a problem is that, really. And the answer was -- it wasn't a crisp answer, but it was a "do it as fast as you can" because the goal, of course, is to get that Coordination Group up and running with ideally a face-to-face by mid-July.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. Thank you.

Next I have Germany.

GERMANY: Yes. Thank you.

I think we share quite a lot of fundamental positions in respect of ccNSO function transition.

First of all, I think one of the reasons -- one of the issues, the core issues from our point of view, at least from German point of view, is we would like to -- that the questions regarding country codes, top-level domains, should remain a question of national -- or regional sovereignty and not a question for the global community. And so far, this is one of the core issues that we want to -- the situation to remain also in future conditions.

What I wanted to ask you is not only regarding the question of who will participate in these different groups. The question is will your nominees

---

be able to represent other ccTLDs? Will they speak on behalf of all ccTLD registries or will there be afterwards a discussion within the ccNSO on these issues, and a common ccNSO position will be developed?

BYRON HOLLAND:

So again, those are the types of questions that we're wrestling with right now.

Because of the nature of the ccNSO, it's highly unlikely that we would be positioning those members as representing all CCs, because as local entities, one can't speak on behalf of another jurisdiction ccTLD operator. What I would say is they would be representative of our general views, not representing us, which I know is a nuance, but a very important one for us and our community.

The other -- The other element is what happens in association with those four folks? And because there are multiple work streams, as I opened this conversation with, we also believe that within the ccNSO, there will be a coordination -- and I'm also loathe to use the same word, but there will be a coordinating group inside the ccNSO that attempts to make that sure all of the various work streams are happening in the most effective way possible. So there will be a sharing of information there and a coordination of information and views happening at that level, too. I wouldn't call it a work group yet because it hasn't been defined, but that is the general structure that we're looking at, to make sure that information -- this is not just information one way or another but it's a flow of information from the coordinating committee back into

---

the community as well as a flow of information from the members that are sitting on the coordinating committee.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Are there any other requests to speak?

Okay. All right. So I think this has been useful to identify some common issues.

Norway, did you have something?

NORWAY:

Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Just a quick comment to what Byron just said. I think also we have the same sort of discussion within the GAC as well, sort of about the representation and so on. So I think we have similar sort of types of issues to discuss and learn on how you will solve them, sort of having representatives from ccNSO participating and how to convey, et cetera, views, and so on, and feedback.

So I think we have similar challenges.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Maybe I could ask for GAC input on your thoughts on the timeline regarding the July 2nd date. It doesn't sound like you're going to meet that one. Possibly?

---

How are you viewing the selection? I would put the same kinds of questions back. How do you feel you're going to be able to contribute to the coordinating committee and when will you be able to have your candidates identified?

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Well, ideally we would have at least the process questions addressed at this meeting. We will have another discussion in the GAC tomorrow morning based on the earlier exchange that we had this week and hopefully conclude at least on some aspects of that.

It gets difficult for us to sort out those issues intersessionally if we don't have a basis established here when we're meeting face to face. So that's our aim. Like you, it's our intention to come up with our process questions addressed.

So at this point, I think we can move to our last item for our exchange today, and that was the strategic and operational plan. And Roelof, is that you leading that discussion?

ROELOF MEIJER:

Yes.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

So I will hand over to you.

ROELOF MEIJER:

Thank you, Heather. We recently filed comments of our working group on two plans, the strategic plan 2016-2020 and the operational plan and

budget for FY2015. And we started off in both cases by complimenting ICANN with the quality of the two plans. We've come a long way. It seems finally the input from the community, not only from our working group but from all of the communities is paying off.

The strategic plan is much clearer in its presentation. It's easy to read, and there are now metrics, although there is still room for improvement there, and the operational plan is a very distinct and clear link from objectives to projects and to the budgets located to specific projects.

With regard to the strategic plan, we made several comments. I'll just pick what we find the two most important ones. We were again hindered by ICANN -- by ICANN's own process and non-adherence to its own deadlines, which made two comments periods for the two plans coincide. Gave us a lot of work. Limited the length of the comments period. This has been a problem for several years now. So we've urged ICANN to solve that now once and for all.

The second comment that I would inform you of is that we find that there are two important developments that should get attention in the strategic plan and are presently not getting that attention. And one is the IANA stewardship transition. And the other one is the global trend in domain name sales. And I should say the reduction in growth rates there.

With regard to the letter, we also made a comment in the operational plan and budget. Because, on one hand, there is a 27% increase in the operational costs, which is quite significant. And, on the other hand, there is on the revenue side a fairly optimistic prognosis of new gTLD domain sales. 33 million new domain names in the new gTLD space in

---

the year 2015 or the fiscal year 2015. We feel that both the global domain name sale trends as well as the performance of the new gTLD so far do not really give ground to such an optimistic prognosis. But we also -- and that's the main point is that we warn against the risk that costs increase faster, much faster than the revenues.

Yeah. For the two plans, those are our main comments. We -- of course we filed them, so they're perfectly available. We also sent copies of our comments to all SO and AC chairs. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Roelof. Are there any questions about the strategic and operational plan? The ccNSO has been able to be attentive to those processes in a way that the GAC has not been able to. Nevertheless, it is the major organizational tool for the organization as a whole. This is something that we certainly could pay more attention to, if there is interest.

I don't see any questions, comments. Nothing.

Okay. All right.

So it sounds like there has been an improvement in the way that the plans are prepared and presented. And so that is good to hear, certainly.

Ah, please. Go ahead.

---

>> Good morning. I'm going to speak in French. I'm a member of the regulatory authority of Senegal. And I would like to thank and congratulate this organization. Lots of governments had a say in this respect, with respect to the action plan. And we have to think on an alternative solution if, regardless the efforts, we cannot reach this transition process within the deadline set. So we have to think about an alternative to that so as to know how to handled these transitions, if we cannot meet the deadlines agreed.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Senegal.

Denmark, please.

DENMARK: Thank you very much. We're happy that the ccNSO is very attentive to this issue. This is also something that -- I mean, that the GAC has been mentioning I think several times about the financial accountability of ICANN. And for what I know, I mean, this was also one of the ATRT2 recommendations. And, as far as I understand, ICANN is working on this. Do you know? Thank you.

ROELOF MEIJER: Are you asking if I have any insight into how ICANN is doing on this specific ATRT2?

Well, what I know is that we will be getting more frequent financial reporting once every quarter. And I've been at the session where there was a first presentation on how the reporting was going to be



---

structured in Buenos Aires that was. So that's what I know. And also, if you look at the financial plan or the operational plan and budget, there's much more information. It's clearer presented. So there's a lot more transparency there than there was before.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay.

Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have a question, but it is about half an hour. I hesitate whether I raise it or not, whether it relates to the ccNSO or not. And that is something about .TEL, use of numeric digits .TEL, which could coincident with the E.164 of country code or countries. That is the letter sent to ICANN two times. And for the time being no reply was received whether I could raise it with the board or whether the colleagues on the podium, they have some information about this telenic announcement 13th of October 2013 saying that the registry operator for communication focused .TEL top-level domain today announced that all numeric .TEL domain strings of eight digits or longer will be made available in October.

I continue to (indiscernible) strings such as 00442074676450 and so on forth could make this from 1500 hour GMT on Tuesday 15 October. Whether colleagues have any information about that or I have to raise it with the board. Two letters have been sent to the ICANN, one to Fadi Chehade, the other to another person. And, for the time being, there is to be a conflict with the national or international numbering of the

---

countries from this sort of the use of the TLD. And questions were raised specifically whether there is any validation of registration of digital strings when they are similar to national only number, national telephone number, international E.164 numbers.

Sorry if my question does not relates to you or this is someone else, but that is important.

The issue was discussed in the ITU council. And all member states were concerned about this sort of announcement and the action of the ICANN. Whether you consider yourself part of that or it does not relate to your domain of activities, that is something I would like to hear. Thank you.

ROELOF MEIJER:

This is not on behalf of the ccNSO, but I don't think it really relates to the ccNSO itself. But maybe, just as an illustration, several years ago we started to allow fully numeric domain name registrations under .NL. And we got a number of telephone numbers that were registered. And it didn't cause any problem. That's not a massive number of telephone numbers, of course. But there's not -- for DNS there's not a very distinct difference between a random number and a random number coinciding with a registered telephone number or a number being registered because it is a telephone number.

But specific to .TEL, I can't tell you.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: I think Roelof has provided an interesting example. But, as far as the ccNSO itself goes, this subject is definitely not within its remit.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. So I think we can conclude a bit earlier than planned. And, with that, thank you to everyone for coming to present this afternoon. And I think we will be in touch further about the framework of interpretation working group effort and as well on the IANA stewardship matter. So thank you again.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: For the GAC, just stay seated where you are. And we will move into our next agenda item, which is number 17. And this is to prepare for our exchange with the board. So I'll just take a few moments to allow our presenters to leave.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]