

CROSS COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

ROUND 1

DEF: Cross community platform: between other SOs and ACs or between CCs?

It can also depend on which SO and AC, ties with the GNSO can be strong as interests can be the same between ccTLDs and gTLDs: protecting consumer interest, collaboration with the registrants.

UNIFORMITY? ccTLDs need to explained clearly across ICANN.

And there is high turnover in the GAC, so education needs to be ongoing, taking part in the capacity development workshops for instance. But it could be that education needs to happen between CCs and their governments rather than via ICANN.

SOLUTION: Need built in regular training, 30 min sessions. ICANN can be intimidating (acronyms), solid knowledge transfer is key, as well as mentoring when possible. . **Create identification links with communal issues**, problem solving, Having information about goals of a community, gantt chart of project milestones.

ROUND 2

Cross community here: within ICANN.

GAC: Capacity building often done at the national level. At ICANN level, 2-day capacity building workshop is done without CCs.

The ccNSO should be encouraging their CCs to work with their governments directly.

Being a regular feature of the GAC Capacity building would be good for the ccNSO. It

has been done with AFNIC who were very satisfied. As ccTLD registries we should be having regular contact with gTLD registries , not necessarily within ICANN. Registry voices should be louder within ICANN. **ccNSO & GNSO collaboration isn't of much value, but ccTLD and gTLD registries should have a stronger connection as they share the same environmental factors with little or no competition.** It's something which cannot be done at the regional level, only at an ICANN context, without using ICANN resources.

Existing information needs to be reviewed and corrected when warranted (ICANN website: talking about registrants as only gTLD users).

It can be difficult for newcomers to understand the role of each community and how they can contribute, main representation for non EN countries happens in the GAC and GAC only (Portuguese speaking countries). Multilingualism and lack of, is a hindrance to cross community involvement, with clarity on sensitive topics.

ccNSO engagement as the ccNSO could make sense with At-Large, as they are often participating in a national capacity.

ROUND 3

Would be useful to be able to provide what "chapter" the ccNSO is in (ready to begin the second round) and give a sense of continuity.

Pbs of the GNSO: some CCs have already solved them, showcasing solutions could be an engagement technique. Often the GAC doesn't have awareness of ccNSO topics, unless tier own CC runs into issues (auda).

Joint meetings are good but nowhere near enough. Having a GAC member engaging with their respective regional organisation or ccTLD, would that help? When GAC members have a

good working relationship with their CC managers, it's mutually beneficial.

Taking part in the GAC Capacity Building workshop, as a standing item would be good, just to explain the differences between the CCs.

If you know about the different stakeholders' positions, you take better decisions.

ccNSO needs to push their involvement across the board, are there enough resources to do so?

It's hard for GAC & ccNSO to find common topics to exchange on. Informational videos could be a good way forward.