ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO – Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils
Monday 22 October 2018 at 1215 CEST

Note: 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.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Heather Forrest: Welcome, everyone, to the meeting of the - joint meeting of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. Welcome to our ccNSO colleagues, always nice to have an opportunity to talk to you. We have a very full agenda in front of us, which was in front of us and now is gone, which is great, Katrina, we've managed to wipe the agenda. So as soon as we have the agenda in front of us we can go ahead and get started.

The first item on the agenda is the CSC Effectiveness Review from the perspective of the GNSO Council; the leads on that are Donna Austin and Philippe Fouquart. I might turn it to them to start with, turn it to Donna to start with and then Katrina, turn it to you for your input on Item 1.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So the CSC Effectiveness Review relates to the customer charter - Customer Standing Committee, I think I would know that by now. The review is a requirement that is in the CSC charter. And the ccNSO and GNSO both recently passed resolutions associated with assigning two representatives each from the ccNSO, Debbie Monahan and Martin Boyle and myself and Philippe - actually I don't think Philippe could make this meeting. So the four of us have been appointed by our respective

organizations to conduct the review and we also identified a template under which we would conduct the review.

So we've started that process and we're being very efficient. We had a meeting today with - it was actually an open meeting but we were lucky enough that the CSC could attend the meeting with us. We've done a first cut of an assessment - our assessment of how we think the CSC is doing in terms of effectiveness.

And we - and we're to some extent piggy-backing on the back of the work that the CSC charter review finished up not so long ago, a few months ago so we're piggy-backing on that and we're making this pretty streamlined because we understand that coming out of the CSC charter review there was nothing that suggested that the CSC was anything other than effective and efficient.

So we're working through a template. We've done an initial assessment. And we think, you know, we're in pretty good shape to finalize the review and have it wrapped up for the respective Councils December, maybe, so yes. So I don't know if anyone wants us to go into any further detail than that but we're happy to do it. I think we've got slides that we can potentially look at but only in the event that people have questions or want to go into further detail. I think we're good, Heather.

Katrina Sataki: Good afternoon. So from our side, Debbie, is there anything else you'd like to add to Donna's perfect summary?

Debbie Monahan: No, which is why I think it's great Donna goes first because she gets the hard work. So I think I'll just say that the template that we've come up with - it just reflects everything that's in the charter so what we said we will review is what the charter - the CSC is meant to do so we're not going any further than that which is why I think the review as Donna said, is quite simple and straightforward because the charter is quite clear as well.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much. And I think that this collaboration sets a very nice precedent that things can be done a very efficient way and there's no need to build or develop some scientific approaches to do simple things. Okay thank you. Next agenda item is the IANA Function Review. So we have - what we've done so far is that we have appointed our members to the team. Maybe you have more information about the progress and next steps?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. So from the GNSO Council side, we have a process underway to select the representatives there, but it's also the case that dovetailing into that is the selection of a co-chair from each of our SOs and that activity will depend on the applications received and how those are reviewed. So that is underway. I understand that it's the case that it's not a review in which the SO/AC leaders confirm the whole slate; it's a matter of we each appoint our individual people and send them off to that. So I think once that is underway - and I believe it's the case, I'm looking at staff - that it's mid-November is the deadline for that, not sure. Okay all right. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So the composition of the IANA Function Review team is representatives from the ccNSO, Registry Stakeholder Group, ALAC and I think it might actually go down into constituency or SGs within the GNSO, so it's not actually a GNSO thing. I think everybody has provided their representatives for the slate but I had some breaking news from Trang that there might be a problem with the RySG membership so we might have a little bit of delay there.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, I have to also note that in our case we do not have three representatives from ccNSO, according to the bylaws we need to appoint two representatives of the ccTLDs that are members of ccNSO and one representative of a ccTLD that is not a member. Unfortunately, despite all of our efforts, our two calls for volunteers, our attempt to reach out to those nonmembers, we did not manage to get a volunteer from a nonmember. So we appointed another member on a temporary basis saying that if a skilled individual from a non-

ccNSO member, ccTLD will come forward we will be - we will replace this individual with this nonmember representative.

Another request was that all three come from different regions and we are happy to report that we meet that requirement. How did you have - well did you have any issues at finding volunteers that match all those criteria that are set in the bylaws?

Donna Austin: So the Registry Stakeholder Group had to provide two members and they were supposed to come from different regions and they both come from North America. So Trang will be writing to the Registry Stakeholder Group to ask them to review it, but, you know, it's very difficult to find volunteers when there are so many efforts going on at the moment. So I think you know, I can't speak for the stakeholder group at this point but we will need to review it and see, you know, what our path forward is.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna and Katrina. So Item 3 is New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG initial report, of course on the agenda for our time here in Barcelona. One - our co-chair in that effort is Erika Mann. Erika, I wonder, would you give us a concise update in terms of status? Thanks.

Erika Mann: Yes, certainly. Thank you so much. And I can keep it very short. We had already twice the pleasure to talk to you so I don't think so, I have to explain the whole history again. Where are we? We will have a meeting this week actually after the session we will explain to the broader public where we are. The draft report is already public and you can - you can review it online. We are hopeful that we will receive sufficient at least, you know, replies so that we can review certain points which are still to some degree critical. So I really would urge you all please go and review it.

We have sent it around broadly but if you have the feeling we missed sending it to, you know, enough or if you want us to reach out to some other communities please let us know. There are few points which are important

maybe to consider, so we published it three week ahead of Barcelona, which means we met the deadline. We will conclude the review of the comment period in November, I don't have the date - the exact date in my head but I can find it for you and can send it to you.

And then we will review the comments which we receive and we will then come up with the final report. We will then have our consensus call so we haven't done this ahead of the draft report but we will do it once we have the chance to review the comments and then we will have the consensus call.

Currently I don't expect that we will have many issues which are too problematic but I want to indicate some of them so that you can have - it's a little bit easier for you to review the report. So the recommendation, the most important item is we recommend on what we call a mechanism which is the concept of how the future fund shall be designed. This is what we call a mechanism.

And there are two which are frontrunners, so one is to internalize it and create a new ICANN unit so it becomes part of ICANN Org. The second is still with a separate budget, so keep in mind the budget will be separated. The second one would be a merger with a separate entity. We haven't defined which kind of entity it can be but it shall be a second one ideally of course an entity with some experience in this field, but we haven't defined it because we believe that in case this would be favored by the reviews we receive back from the public and we would make a final recommendation saying this is the most ideal scenario, then we might want to maybe add some more guidance to it. But we haven't done it yet.

And we still have in the Option 3 which would be an ICANN foundation but this is less favored but we do have part of the community which favors this model or still likes the model a lot. I want to be careful so we kept it on and we would love to receive input but it's not the Number 1 or Number 2, but it's still on the list. We excluded to give it to separate entity so to hand over the

fund and the large part of the responsibility to a complete - to a fund - an existing fund. This one wasn't on the list.

So this is one, it's maybe the most important really review. Let us know what you like, make an explanation to it, you know, why you favor a particular model and keep all the, you know, keep in mind that whatever we select it will have huge implications, my God. So this is one.

Then there's another issue I like to draw your attention to when we concluded our work and we were just finished with the draft report, we received a reply from the Board concerning some of the questions we had. So you need to understand to avoid future problems we always had a quite intense discussion with the Board which was very pleasant and Martin and Becky joined this group so we had a very strong cooperation model just to avoid any future problems.

They came back with some replies which I believe are important for you to look at them. They are not reflected in the draft report just because there was a deadline and we wanted to push out the draft report. There was no intention for us to wait any longer. But it's annexed so you can find the letter; the letter is annexed and we make a reference about the letter as well in the draft report.

The most important point in the letter is where I believe we will need your guidance and your comments, it's the question whether ICANN Org or an SO or an AC can participate in the future in the fund. So I'm not explaining what the Board is saying here, just look at it please because it's a topic we will have to consider in the future and it impacts all of you. So these are the updates. Back to you.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Erika. From our side, Peter, any comments?

Peter Vergote: Yes, thank you, Katrina. Well I first want to acknowledge the work that has been done within the CCWG. I think with the publication of the initial report an important milestone has been reached. On our planning, if I'm not mistaken, it's on our agenda for tomorrow for - during the ccNSO Membership Day and I think that our appointed co-chair, Ching, will give us an update on the status and on the - and will highlight the important features of the report.

As Erika mentioned, I think now very important period is currently underway, the gathering of public comments. There are still lots of points where feedback of the community is important, although there is a clear preference for two out of four mechanism that has been studied, if it would turn out that there is rejection of the initial thinking, thoughts of the CCWG or even massive support for example, the idea of having a foundation of course these are elements, this is feedback that needs to be taken into account by the working group.

So I think from our point - from our step at the ccNSO, I think it's very important that we encourage people to go read the initial report and to take part in the public comment period so that the working group and ICANN staff have sufficient information to take the further steps.

I think concerning the recommendations, I think it's very important if you choose between Model A and Model B is that we get sufficient feedback on how the relation could be between that ICANN-specific department for handling the funds and the interaction with - in the context of Mechanism B, the relation with that specific partner and who is going to be responsible for who and what is going to be the extent of freedom of that partner to effectively start allocating funds.

Another important question where we are looking for feedback from the community, is whether ICANN Org or the constituent parts of ICANN Org can themselves benefit from fund allocations. And I think this is particularly important because we have been discussing since a couple of ICANN

meetings now that we see volunteer fatigue, we have been discussing within the ccNSO how can we increase the level of participation.

Obviously if ICANN Org or its constituent parts would have extra resources to do such a thing that could fall within the scope of the mission of where the auction proceeds could be used for. So I think that specific feedback on that point would be very welcome. That's it for me. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much, Peter. Any other comments or questions? So if not let's move to the next agenda item and that's about ICANN's budget process and upcoming strategic planning process. Here I'd like to invite colleague, councilor, Giovanni, who is the chair of our Strategic and Operational Planning Committee, they are reviewing all the documents as already mentioned several times during our previous meetings. So, Giovanni, the floor is yours.

Giovanni Seppia: Thank you, Katrina. Yes indeed we have started to look into the strategy plan process of ICANN for the next five years. I understand that almost all the constituencies and communities have started to be consulted by the MSSI team. We had a presentation yesterday from the MSSI team about the next steps. And what we are currently doing is to identify the ccNSO priorities to feed into the process.

What ICANN has done so far via the MSSI team is to identify the trends that the different communities are expressed in the most relevant trends for the future. And we have had discussion during the Panama meeting and during the Panama meeting we had this - the expression, what could be the different trends of security, geopolitical finance level from the ccNSO members who attended that session.

So now the process is that the ICANN team in charge of producing the strategy plan for the next five years is putting together all these trends and also analyzing those trends against the priorities that the Board has started to

define for the next five year strategy plan cycle. We also explain that the strategy plan, five years, will be followed by the five years' operating plan and budget and that for the first time the strategy plan will be a fully costed strategy plan which is quite important because this is one of the comments that the Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group - now Committee - of the ccNSO pointed as one relevant element to be included for future strategy plans.

So we have this dialogue open with ICANN. There are going to be public comments; the first public comment period open as soon as the first draft of the strategy plan is put forward to the attention of all of us, all the ICANN community. And I think it would be important is to try to have a cooperation what was an idea that we launched some time ago between the GNSO and ccNSO about, you know, feeding into the process our comments, our priorities, some of them may be, you know, close to each other, maybe similar.

I had an email exchange with Philippe Fouquart in late August and I invited him for a possible meeting during the Barcelona - ICANN Barcelona. And I'm still available in the next days if there is, you know, the wish to have a preliminary chat. I'll be happy to have this chat. He said that during the email exchange he said to me that indeed our committee, you know, has quite an experience in providing feedback on the strategy and operating plan of ICANN so we'll be happy to share what we have done and what we plan to do.

The entire process is also a bit different from the past because apparently ICANN is thinking to have a possible second comment round as soon as they collect the feedback and they integrate the feedback of the community into the draft strategy plan, so as soon as that is done and as soon as the Board has reviewed the redrafted first draft, there might be a second comment period, so that has to be seen.

But again, there is, you know, the full availability to, you know, work together in submitting those comments and also an important element because we are going to have a sort of busy season in terms of comments as the - it is very likely that the public comment about the first draft of the strategy plan it will be very close to the public comment on fiscal year '20 operating plan and budget of ICANN. So you know, for those of the ccNSO SOPC members that we now that there is going to be some work ahead of us. And I'm happy to take any question or, you know, see how we can further work together. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Giovanni. And I will say that I personally tend to find the summaries that you and your colleagues in the ccNSO are able to provide to be the most useful and concise and helpful in terms of the process. We very much look to you and your excellent efforts in your committee.

For our part, I'll add of course, you know, very little to add in relation to the trends exercise except to say that likewise, the GNSO Council undertook that exercise in Panama. It's also the case that the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies that make up the GNSO may have done that exercise as well as much of our budgetary comment and strategic planning comment process comes from that stakeholder group or constituency level to recognize the individual concerns of those groups.

So our mandate here within the GNSO Council has been strictly limited to matters that would affect the policy development process which the GNSO Council is the manager of. So one of the areas that we are still finding our feet in is the delineation between where Council comments and where an SG or C comments.

I'll also add that our equivalent in function, but by no means in experience, our equivalent committee, the Standing Committee on Budget and Operations, or SCBO, is up for the renewal of its charter and a chance to be made a permanent standing committee in the GNSO Council. That comes to a vote before the Council on Wednesday. So the chair of that effort is Ayden

Férdeline, my colleague down at the end of the table. And Ayden, I would suggest a link between yourself as well as Philippe and Giovanni would be most helpful.

In terms of the more broadly strategic planning process, so you've heard us no doubt mention a number of times throughout the year that we had the opportunity for a pilot in January of this year, strategic planning process, that enabled us to sit down and look at GNSO priorities in the macro context and our sort of internal context. That led to the development of a full listing of all of the various efforts that we currently have underway, how to efficiently and effectively allocate resources to those.

We will, again, hold a strategic planning session in late January of 2019. The one concern that I have raised on a number of occasions in the context of the SO/AC leaders' meeting is how do we - and it dovetails into your comment about the difficult or challenging comment season that we're commenting on two things at once effectively. In an ideal world I think it would be helpful for any sort of strategic planning activity that happens within our respective SOs as to the strategic planning session to be much more timely in respect of those processes.

It actually seems that we are tacking our strategic planning process onto the backend of that process rather than the other way around and I think that's a comment we'll continue to make. Any comments, questions, concerns in relation to FY budget and strategic planning?

All right, seeing none let's move on then to Item 5, specific reviews and operating standards and opportunity for us to get together, exchange views on this. I will note that prior to discussion this morning there was an update provided by the SSR2 Review Team. I attended that session and found it rather useful to understand that the group is essentially back on track with its work. I did take the opportunity to ask the question how had that pause by the Board impacted the group's work or had it impacted the group's work?

The answer was an undeniable "yes." They've effectively been standing still for a year and that of course has an obvious impact on timeline but it also has a - had an impact on membership. They have lost members along the way because it's simply not possible for volunteers to consistently sustain that effort over a number of years.

It has also had an impact on momentum. It appears that that pause happened at a pretty unfortunate time for the group. And while the group has found its feet again after the involvement of a facilitator, and appears to be functioning rather well, they are somewhat concerned about the lack of momentum. I did ask for some lessons learned from the group while we had an opportunity to hear them. And one of the key pieces of information that I thought would be useful to us as supporting organizations is this idea of clearer channels of communication between the Board, the review team and the SOs and ACs.

It took SSR2 Review Team members by surprise, that pause, that apparently hadn't been predicated by any sort of discussion from the Board. And they said, why couldn't we have just had a discussion about this rather than pull the plug and tell us publicly? And I could only express from a GNSO perspective, it took us by surprise too. It's certainly not the case that we had any specific intelligence that we weren't able to share with them, so that was my impression from this morning's session. Katrina, turn it to you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes well thank you very much. Certainly it did take us by surprise but I believe, yes, there are lessons that had to be learned from the situation. And I think all the parties need to learn those lessons; the Board included. So what can we do in the future to avoid situations like that? Yes, probably clearer procedures, clearer channels of communication and actually talking to each other very often can help in solving issues that have been spotted.

Nevertheless, if we speak about specific reviews in general, well we agree with the assessment that there are too many of them too often and it requires a lot of volunteer effort to get them moving. So what are your views? Should we push the bylaw change forward and try to make them not (staggering) at they are the moment and I suppose that - oh okay, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. I don't necessarily want to answer the question but I want to ask you a question so - if I can? The GNSO Council recently finalized the GNSO review and from start to finish it was four years. So one would say that's not particularly efficient. But I'm just interested because the ccNSO has just recently kicked off theirs so I'm just wondering what you know, what the process that you've been through for that and what your expected timeframe and things are?

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much for the question, Donna. Yes, our review has been just started. We - we have working party in place, working party group of people that will talk to our independent reviewers and provide initial feedback on their feedback, answer their questions and hopefully will have a very good collaboration. My understanding is that this is probably for the first time an attempt to finish it within a year. We certainly hope that this is going to happen.

About implementation, yes, we'll see; apparently it depends on the recommendations. But yes, we've just started, now we're in the phase of face to face interviews with the community members. And yes, so far the cooperation has been good. The independent reviewer takes our concerns and our suggestions seriously and they try to really look into issues and provide a very good basis for real help to make sure that this review helps us not to do something that just destroys everything. Well at least that's the impression so far. I hope that collaboration will thrive and continue.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Thank you. I had the opportunity to work together with Donna and a third person, I miss her name, on the comments that staff asked for about

specific reviews and operating standards. And oh sorry, I'm very sorry. And I think we should take this session very seriously.

For me personally, this is a personal opinion, what we are doing at the GNSO in terms of our famous - now famous PDP 3.0 is internalizing the organizational review and I think we are on the right path. It's very efficient. In three days - together with a strategic plan for the whole year and a terrible list or horrible list, I don't know what the name is, it's a good example how to internalize the organizational review.

And I hope - I look forward to the second meeting that we are going to have on that because the savings are incredible in terms of money, time and the biggest, not saving, but profit is the way to spread the knowledge because we are doing it ourselves; we are spreading the knowledge immediately and together.

On the other hand for the specific reviews, two comments, I mean, we should speak to the one year schedule in the case of the specific reviews. And having been through two specific reviews myself, I think we should be spending more money for independent advice or independent resources or even more independent members in terms of being a little bit further away from the day to day running of ICANN for the specific reviews. So what I see it's totally - right now it looks totally the other way around; we're spending too much time of the day to day volunteers in the specific reviews, that's a waste.

And we're spending a lot of money on the organizational reviews that could be done in a more modern managerial way would be more profitable for us and would save us money and volunteer fatigue. So I think it's worthwhile not today but spend more time on this Number 5, we didn't have much time to discuss our recommendations to staff which is already strange why we are making comments for staff.

Within the GNSO, as I said, it was mostly the work of three people, but I think it's very necessary that we don't let these decisions go away from us. And the most worrisome one, and maybe I'm totally off track, so Donna can ask me to shut up right now, is to allow ATRT 3 to decide about general rules for the other three specific review teams. I think that doesn't make any sense at all in terms of this period of specific reviews. Maybe I misunderstood your message but that worries me a lot.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Carlos. I think you might have misunderstood my message. I think where the latest documents that came out from ICANN there was a suggestion that the specific review - that one of the things that the ATRT 3 could look at was the specific reviews. And there seems to be a hook in the bylaws to enable the ATRT 3 to do that.

I don't necessarily have any great concern with that; it probably makes sense and might be actually a good use of resources because there will be a community group that looks at it from a holistic perspective, but, you know, it needs to be balanced against the other things that the ATRT 3 should be looking at as well. So it was unclear in the recommendation whether the ATRT 3 would solely just focus on that or whether it would be much broader.

And I think previously the GNSO Council's perspective of any suggestions that the scope of a review team be predetermined is off base; it really is for the review team to decide what the scope of their work is.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, okay it was on our view that the scope should have been defined in advance because then it will be easier to find the suitable candidates with the right skill set but apparently we were in minority and we just accept whatever has been decided by other communities. So let's hope that it will work.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Afternoon everybody and sorry for being terribly late. My calendar had a minor issue and which meant things just didn't appear on it. On the reviews, the - the Registrar Stakeholder Group did submit comments on that

separate to anything that Council may or may not have done and the position we were taking is very similar to what Carlos was talking about where instead of spending crazy amounts of money and taking years with volunteers to leverage more professional consultants to do some of these reviews.

I think the balance of course is between, you know, where is it appropriate to do that versus where it is appropriate to use volunteers and how do you kind of get that match right? But in terms of actually getting stuff done in a timely fashion and professionally in some instances it makes more sense just to simply outsource it and be done with it.

In terms of the overall costs associated with that, which of course impact on pretty much the rest of the list, from conversations with ICANN senior staff over the last 12-18 months, reviews has repeatedly been identified as the big cost sink and I mean, the kind of catch 22 that they end up with where we are obliged under X to do Review Y, and Review Z, even though we still haven't got round to implementing - and it's this kind of hamster on a wheel type thing, if you can visualize that. But it's bad but so the Registrars were kind of pretty much aligned on that. Anything that helps cut costs, good.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Two comments here, one on scope, it was also the case that when I asked the SSR2 Review Team members this morning what could be done differently, what lessons had they learned, the one thing they said was, or one of the things they said was it would be very helpful to determine scope in advance. So that might be something that we take back from our appointees to that review team and think about how that impacts if at all the previous positions that we've had.

Secondly, just by way of a sanity check reminder for all of us, although I will say that the ccNSO and the GNSO are not the problem children in this regard, in relation to ATRT 3 it is the case that the plan is for the slate to be confirmed next month and the GNSO is working to reappoint or appoint new members to make up for some unfortunate losses that we've had and we'll be

in a position to do that. Our Standing Selection Committee is working on that as we speak.

It is unfortunately the case that not all of the other SOs and ACs are as far along in the process. Perhaps it snuck up on them. So we'll have to keep an eye on that. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: And thank you very much, Heather. When we first had our first round of call - for volunteers we got one volunteer who is still ready and willing to serve on this team. And on Wednesday we - during our Council meeting we're going to discuss whether we issue another call for volunteer in hope to get more people on board. But happy to say that we have one very solid experienced volunteer. Demi.

Demi Getschko: After 3 - I took part in the 2 also and I think there are some work to be done yet and of course I am open to suggestions, I was some representative the voice of the community of the ccNSO Supporting Organization. I'm open to suggestions.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. So let's move forward to an emoji study group, so my understanding that you wanted to know where we are and what we do. As you remember, or those who do not remember, the Board asked us to look into the issue of emoji domain names at the second level domain names. And because several ccTLDs actually do that, they do allow emojis being registered and some people are very strong supporters of the idea of having those emoji. And our study group is looking into the issue and tries to just - without judging, without recommending anything, just try to weigh all possible and summarize all those arguments from both sides.

May I ask Alejandra on the Council who is our representative on that study group to give us more information?

Alejandra Reynoso: Yes, thank you, Katrina. Well, the study group had a slowly start on June but it has second call in July and from then on it had a biweekly call meeting, six so far. The scope of the study group has been repeated several times because sometimes it's a little bit confusing that we are only looking at emojis at second level domain names.

And besides the fact that there is one reference to the second level domain names at the application of the IDN ccTLDs, it's still not part of the study group and any questions that arise regarding that subject will be the first to the IDN Working Group. So far the study group has come up with a list of around 15 ccTLDs that were at least - that had at least one emoji domain name that we could find. Some members of the study group were asked to provide information and background on how they deal with emojis and dotWS did submit a document.

We also found out that dotFM has policies published in their website. And well the comments around the document that dotWS submitted was that it still violates the IDNA 2008 standards and it - because it addresses the concerns raised in the document that SSAC provided for example, like skin tone modification.

During the face to face meeting that we had on Saturday it was asked to the audiences if anyone was using emojis because we had several people in the room besides the members of the working group - the study group, sorry. And there was one person from dot(IS) that made a comment that they had a proposal to introduce emojis at the second level because apparently there's been a request for this. But they did a study and they decided not to do that.

And from that comment we - well the study group will try to find more studies like this that why are not implementing emojis even though people requests for them. And the next steps are gathering more recommendation from the ccTLDs, contacting them and request them to provide their reasoning behind providing emojis. Also we will ask them if they have read the document from

SSAC or provide them with the document and ask them to give us the review on that.

Again, the study group is not going to judge anyone or say you are doing a bad job or a good job; it's just gathering of information like research. And then it's been discussed the outline of the report that hopefully will be able to be - there will be some information about it in Kobe. And all the documentation of the study group is in the archives of the mailing list and on the wiki of the ccNSO so if there are any concerns about what has been discussed please do go and follow that. And of course if you have any questions I'm here. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much. Thank you all. Any questions. Okay if not let's move to the last agenda item, and here I'll give a little bit of history. You may know that in 2008 I think we started working on IDN ccTLD policy and at some point decided to develop a fast track policy to allow IDN ccTLDs to be registered and to use it as a test bed, experimental policy to see how it works. And then use the findings study from this experiment, so to speak, use it again to develop this overall IDN ccTLD policy.

And I must say that we've learned a lot from that work especially about confusing similarity. Probably some of you may have heard about our struggles - Giovanni now is an expert in confusing similarity, he keeps confusing everyone. And but why we're bringing this up here is that in our response to the report that was published by Work Track 1-4, we indicated that we believe that a common approach to evaluation of confusing similarity for new gTLDs and for IDN ccTLDs would be really helpful to make sure that the principles are the same and we do not end up with some strange decisions that cannot be explained.

So what we offered, we offered to create a study group to look into the issue and to see how we can collaborate, how it can coordinate our policies for IDN

TLDs both gTLDs and ccTLDs. Giovanni, anything you'd like to add from your past experience?

Giovanni Seppia: Thank you, Katrina. One of the leading functions of ICANN should be policy coordination and what we have detected is that indeed there is an inconsistency because of the historical development of the two environments on how confusing similarity is assessed in the G-space and the CC-IDN space. So as I said it's just because historical development of the two environments. But I think now as we have, as you said, gained quite some experience as the new gTLD round also was an experience at that level, I think could be the right moment to have, you know, a common approach and assure consistency because at the end of the day the end users, the registrants of gTLDs and ccTLDs are, you know, the same consumers. So at some point it doesn't make sense to have different approaches for consumers of CCs and consumers of Gs. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. So this was - we wanted to bring this up and see that you think. Hiro, you want to say something?

Hiro Hotta: Thank you, Katrina. I agree with that you need some study group to that. Conceptually if IDN ccTLD A is similar to gTLD B, it may be true that gTLD B is similar to IDN ccTLD A. I used may as it may not be obvious, for example if I resemble my father, my father doesn't resemble me. So anyway, concerning this reciprocity - similarity in IDN ccTLD prominent policy and operation and gTLD policy and operation have been be seemingly - at least seemingly harmonized to some extent even if they are not completely coordinated, at least information sharing be beneficial to both of us especially when security concerns are raised from outside of us. We have better in the same position in evaluating such concerns. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much, Hiro. Yes.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group, but I will state this on behalf of Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. One of the preliminary results of this working group was to possibly suggest for the next round for IDN gTLDs composed of a single Unicode character which is somewhat different from what the fast track for ccTLDs required of at least two characters. So at least for some specific script known as the CJK scripts, used in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etcetera, it's very likely that it might move forward.

So if does indeed come true it's - we are some months away from the final report. If that comes true ccNSO might want to look into the possibility of IDN ccTLDs also made of single character from the scripts, for instance, the IDN ccTLD for China today is kind of like Republic of China or Country of China instead of just China. So might something for ccNSO to look into.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much. We've run out of time. So but this was intended as a - wanted to test the grounds and see if you also agree with us that some common approach, common principles of the evaluation of confusing similarities should be in place. Yes, please, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Just to note that I think what would be very helpful since the Subsequent Procedures PDP is looking at the issue of confusing similarity now that Giovanni is an expert on the topic, it would be very helpful I think if you could feed any study, any substance that you have from your own investigations into that process, a study group or so on. I think it would be very useful to feed that into the PDP not only to prevent the PDP from duplicating those efforts but to engender that sharing that you're envisioning here.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much for the suggestion. I think we will take it on board. With that, thank you very much for having us. Thank you very much for very interesting and useful discussion on these issues. See you next time. Oh no, won't see you next time.

END