Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting

Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) meeting

Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 13:30 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/#apr

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

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Woman: Let's try again. So we've been sharing this with the entire community our progress against our infrastructure -- shared with you guys. We're in the process of consolidating all of our systems and you've heard (Harry) and everybody talk about people processes and tools. So I'm not going to repeat those same things because you're aware of what we're working on.

We moved the complaint submission from intranet to ICANN (unintelligible). This move started with Whois inaccuracy as of 25th of March. It is a same roll-out made meaning.

Today you cannot go and enter on the WDPRS on intranet anymore. You go into this website -- and I'm going to try to click to it and show you -- through this consolidation what we are hoping to accomplish multiple things.

Not only bringing all of the complaint tools under one system but also making it what we call user-friendly more frequently asked questions. And to be able to direct the audience in more English format on how to submit the complaint. So again you go onto the resources website under compliance you see submit a complaint. And this is what we've done with Whois inaccuracy.

We've added health about what is it? What is the complaint about, some FAQs and how to take action will lead you to the forum where you can submit -- what happened? Okay -- where you can submit a complaint.

So in addition to that consolidation all the FAQs and the guidelines we are providing are and will be provided in the six GN languages. We've submitted all the documentation.transalation at team and you will see all of that in the six GN languages.

Submitting a complaint in itself will be in English for now. We have also added improved capability for email and what that means is a follow-up and follow-through not only through the complainant or to the reporter but also a follow-up and follow-through with the contracted party.

In addition we also added what we call a pulse survey. Pulse survey will go to the reporter and to the contracted party. Pulse survey is part of our (unintelligible) plan. If you remember asking this plan, we shared with the -- what is it -- constituency group before. It's the third year we'll focus on improvement and we are now transitioning from year two to year three.

This is the commitments we're going to have by ICANN 47. One of those requests on this list is a request that's -- was brought from this audience is the capability to submit more complaints for a complaint type. It's in the works and we hope to launch that by ICANN 47.

I'm not going to go through all these bullets but again to provide you an update with what we're working towards. By ICANN 48 we hope to have online also not only the current complaint types, additional complaint types that are now - will be available based on the current state of the gTLD. But also add complaint types for registry and for new gTLD complaints.

This slide here is to provide an update to you guys on our transparency have committed to the community to be more transparent on our activity. Everything we're publishing whether it's an annual report or a monthly update will be provided in the six GN languages. So please go through those links. I'm not going to go there. I'm just going to go to the last link here.

If you attended the kick-off ceremony Monday, you would have seen on my ICANN the compliance metric Friday demoed it briefly. I do want to say that it is static; that means we cannot give it to you real-time or real-online until we complete the consolidation of the tools.

We still have systems fragmented. When we consolidate everything onto one tool we're going to hook it up and make it real-time information available for the audience that all ICANN members can access.

We did a demo back in Toronto but the demo was directly from the tool itself. This is more of what we call a web interface for the community. This rep- this compliance report here are generic reports, global reports; global by TLD, global by compliant type and when you hover over it, it tells you the region, the percent of complaints and down below you'll see a table of content by country then all the stuff. This is just one of the reports.

So there are different reports that are provided here under enforcement. For example, I'm just going to click on enforcement notices. You're kept up to date on what - what's happened and it's in alphabetical order. And what were the provisions that were not in compliance. So again this report is static until we consolidate the tool and that will be coming either ICANN 47 or 48; depends on the progress.

Organization-wide we have increased by the 50 head count is still what I shared with you last time. But we have restructured ourselves now to align more and become more - allow us to become more flexible as the new gTLD

rolls out or when any new activity comes our way. So we've structured our team into - into what we call an operational team.

We have a director who oversees operations and performance measurement and I have in that organization I have (Carlos) that I introduced earlier. He's a senior manager overseeing all complaint submissions in that area. By having a central team focused on that processing, turnaround time and quality of the complaints.

Then I have a second set of my team is focused on prevention and enforcement. So operations is focused on complaint submission which is mostly active, you know, really active complaints. We turn them around and we address complaints.

But you have the prevention aspect of compliance and the enforcement of such which is really critical. Prevention is monitoring, doing outreach activities but also audits.

Enforcement is where we enforce the contract issue breaches, breach notices, follow-up and follow-through from that aspect. So again, I'm not going to spend a lot of time because we want to relent this to the 20 minutes.

If you have questions, we will take them at the end. So with that I'm going to turn it to (Jax) to provide you a high-level update on the audit activity.

(Jax Koaja):   Hello everyone, my name is (Jax Koaja) I think we have a few minutes left in this presentation so we're going to be brief on each one of these slides just so we cover the information.

The overview of the phases, on this slide the main takeaway is there are six different phases to the audit plan. This is no different than any publicly traded company.

We apply the same approach to ITM in the audit for the registrars and the registries. The checkmarks indicate where we're at. Just so everyone knows we've issued the audit reports to the first - the - we issued audit reports to the first-year audit parties that we've audited, that's 317 (unintelligible) registrars.

The next one, this slide represents the full scope of year one audit. What you see here is that the audit itself when we randomly selected those registrars it represented 35 different countries worldwide.

In addition to that we've had to translate documentation collected from the registrars in 22 different languages. Twenty-one non-English speaking languages which is critical that's why we had a partner for the audit as to assist us in that process.

In addition to that we've audited a (unintelligible) U.S. TLDs, one Asian and one U.K. TLD. As a result of the request for information phase which is the very first phase when we engage the registrars asking them for information. It resulted in 10 breached notices.

In the end we terminated three of those registrars. The remaining seven provided us the documentation that were required to provide and they moved on to the audit phase and were issued an audit report.

What this slide shows is the top ten areas of deficiencies that were discovered in just Batch 1 and 2. Batch 1 and 2 approximately amounted to about 140 registrars. But what you'll notice on the very - the blue is the - the blue bar is the results of the audit initially when we first audited that batch. And then in the red is what occurred after we remediated and worked with the contracted party to correct those issues. And you'll see that throughout all 10 of the top 10 deficiencies that were discovered.

For the reporting phase, the public reports that we plan to publish are a list of all the registrars and registries that were audited and - in year one. We plan on providing statistics.

The one thing we won't provide are the individual audit reports per registrar. Okay. And then on the reporting phase just so everyone knows just for Batches 1 and 2 as of March 27 -- remember we released Batches 1 and 2 on March 8, on March 27th through remediation efforts so Batch 1 and 2 we're down to about 80% that had no deficiencies after remediation efforts.

And the remaining parties on this pie graph we're working with right now. It represents certain percentages of those that have one to three deficiencies, four to six deficiencies and so on, 79% have remediated thus far as of March 27.

Woman: So with that, I know it feels like we're in a race, 20 minutes is not a long time plus we got started 5 minutes late so I don't want to disappoint Christina to stay on schedule.

Like I said please look at the slide decks, forward any questions you have to us. We're always available. Also, if you want some more information, we're going to take a little longer time on Wednesday, it's an hour and a half.

We're going to go through a brief update upfront about what are we doing about the systems. And then we're going to dive slide by slide and take more questions about the audit. Jonathan?

Jonathan Zuck: Okay, Jonathan Zuck from the Physicians Competitive Technology. I'm real excited about the metric reports you have up there. I'm wondering is there enough metrics in place now that you might be able to put a metric for instance objectives in place for the upcoming program.

I'd love to in the future be able to see comparison of report of metrics and solace metrics down the road and you have an updated analysis you have a sense of what metrics might look like going forward.

Woman: Yes, one year that short we have to - we have one year's work end of two. So what's on the website is only from Toronto until now and we will upload more like I said when we consolidate everything.

Jonathan Zuck: You have an intention to create objective metrics based on (unintelligible). It's like here's where we see the problem, this is where we want to see improvement, so for 2014 this is what we hope the metrics will look like so that we can compare the actual metrics to the goal metrics goals.

Woman: Are you speaking of operational metrics or community-related metrics related to complaints?

Jonathan Zuck: I think mostly operational things. In other words, things to resolve. Many of the things that you're reporting on to reference our goal format. So that we can then look at how those goals and results compare.

Woman: Right and that would happen when we have everything on the same platform. We're already capturing turnaround for ourselves and turnaround time for example for the registrar responses between the difference notices. And then when you consolidate everybody on the same toll then we can really do apples to apples; but yes to answer your question, yes we will.

Christina Rodriguez: I think we probably have time for another couple of questions.

Steven Metalitz: Thank you. Steve Metalitz, and thank you very much for the presentation. And I am looking forward to going through it and hopefully your other presentation.

This is a question -- and I'm not sure it's a compliance question, but you'll tell me. When the board adopted the - its resolutions related to the Whois review team back in November -- and it was a long chart there -- and one of the steps was the board directs the CEO to proactively identify potentially inaccurate gTLD data registration information, explore using automated tools and forward potentially inaccurate records to gTLD registrars and et cetera.

So in other words it was a proactive element not a complaint based on -- was that part of compliance or is that being handled somewhere else?

Woman: It would be part of that group but it is being handled somewhere else.

Steven Metalitz: Do you know where? I mean where would we go for more information about what's planned there?

Woman: I think it's (Chris Gist).

Steven Metalitz: Okay.

Woman: We're partnering with him on that.

Steven Metalitz: Right.

Woman: Because they again as you know they're over the expert working group underway to put more definition, so there are a lot of activities around Whois.

Steven Metalitz: Right.

Woman: So...

Steven Metalitz: But as I understood it that it was a two-pronged approach. There's the expert's group and then there was the enforcement and this comes in that second category.

Woman: So we would be the second part of that...

Steven Metalitz: Right, okay.

Woman: ...resolution.

Steven Metalitz: All right, great. Thank you.

Woman: You're welcome.

Christina Rodriguez : Anyone else? All right.

Woman: Thank you very much. We very much appreciate all of your help. Thank you.

Christina Rodriguez: So next up we have a presentation on the Trademark Clearinghouse URS
                  and, you know, to the extent that there have been additional developments
                  related those arising out of the action on the strawman proposal. Olof, please
                  go ahead. I think you've got some colleagues who might be joining you later.

Christina Rodriguez: Excellent and here's Kiran.

Woman: Is that your jacket?

Olof Nordling: Okay, come here darling. Thank you very much Christina and well, this is
                  going to be an experiment because I've got the brains of (Kiran) to my right.
                  But there is a precious little left on the rise. So I may need to take over and
                  try to channel her much like, you know, the Oracle in (unintelligible).

                  So well, we're going to try and for as far as (Kiran)'s voice is with us.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Thank you Olof, (unintelligible) very long. (Unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: Well, okay, so we're going to (unintelligible). Well, let's talk with (unintelligible) and you're well aware of recent developments. Overall I think that it was opened up first of all we shouldn't have to explain much about the structured separation -- you will call it -- of the services regarding Trademark Clearinghouse that it's - there are two providers.

Deloitte as you know is a verification provider and of its services on the 26th of March in order to enable as early as possible for you guys - for trademark holders to register - and start registering the trademarks you want to have protected through the Sunrise and claims filter as the Trademark Clearinghouse.

So they take on the verification part of the service and then we have IBM which takes on the database handling part of the service. And are also two distinct interface customer into phases, two classes of customers if you like.

So trademark holders would typically have the customer interface with a Deloitte activity with Deloitte and register with them and also get the information sent back to them from the claims notices that - that occur.

IBM running the database, they will be the -- have the customer interface so the registry operators provide them with the information needed for the claim's service and also receive the notices relating to claims which will then be channeled by Deloitte to the trademark holders.

I'm just checking if -- how about now am I okay? All right, so far so good. So should perhaps make a little bacon and take up Trademark Clearinghouse specifically right now because you may have plenty or more questions on that.

Christina Rodriguez: Let's go straight into development to have Olof and (Kiran) present whatever additional developments there are and then I'll take questions.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Well, I wanted to go over the strawman's proposal and what's happening with that. Well, history way back in November there was a discussion in Los Angeles about a strawman proposal which was a joint undertaking by the AGC and the BC if I remember right with four distinct proposals.

Here we go, one second here. And three of those have been adopted. One was the requirement to have an early warning about appearing Sunrise, that the registry operator should notify the community - the world 30 days in advance before opening a Sunrise period, that has been accepted and was a part of the implementation requirements.

An extended period for the trademark claims - the IT claims period which was given that 60 days and requests folks to extend that to 90 days and that has also been adopted.

And then the addition of up to 50 names to rid a trademark registration into NCH, 50 names that have been proven to be abusive use of that particular trademark; not giving any particular additional rights though, that has been polled for Sunrise or the like as they should be part of it for the trademark's claims. That was equally accepted.

Of course, this was all without full public comments - the strawman proposal that was sketched out in Los Angeles. And also a request was sent to the GNSO Council for their advice on these particular proposals.

Not implemented was the claims too, the lighter just notifying the for an additional fee for a 6- to 12-month period that the presumptive registrant that he was going to -- so for a little longer keep it on the trademark claims but not the full-fledged trademark claims for an additional fee.

That was the advice from GNSO Council was that called for policy considerations. So that's not been implemented in the immediate at least -- of course it may be in the future.

And there was a fifth proposal that wasn't -- well, technically part of the strawman proposal but had limited preventive registration, maybe not -- I want to get it right here.

Yes, well, this was to have what one could call a supposed - the woman's registration which is just locking a particular name -- domain name for eternity for some kind of price.

And that was also following the advice from GNSO Council. It's something that required policy development and such policy development has been apparently have been asked full and addressed. So for defense registration before but they've been asked again to have a look at this. But it's not going to be implemented at this outset.

You have earned a couple of other developments as well is the right's protection mechanism. As you may be aware there is a Trademark Clearinghouse micro site or web page rather under the new gTLD Micro Site and as of recently that has been populated with some details on the right's protection mechanism. So I don't know how they mapped into the requirements on the registry - the requirements on the registries.

And this is also call for you to feed into that system and give your views from a trademark intellectual property which is a perspective on some of the proposals or actually all of the proposals and agreements as they stand.

In particular, on situations when you don't have Sunrise with a first come, first serve rule. I'd rather have an auction or a lottery or some other kind of approach which makes it completely open during the Sunrise period.

And how this should relate to the trademark claims and in particularly the liberty and the terms for the liberty for a claim's notice, how long should the maximum time be between the claim's notice and actual registration? And the current draw has a maximum of 45 days on that.

So you're welcome to provide input on that and also in particularly on the terms of service related to what the registries are supposed to do. And they have accepted those terms as a side note. I think this will of course be dealt with on the Trademark Clearinghouse session on Thursday.

So you're welcome to provide input there or separately. But more details and hopefully with (Kiran)'s voice being back in full order we're treat her as best we can to enable that because it's going to be boring if I'm channeling in to that session as well. So, so much for that, over to URS.

URS, you may remember that we talked a lot about it in Toronto and I'm so happy to say that I was wrong. It turned out we didn't need to have an in-depth review of the procedure in order to lighten it up in order to make it insurmountable.

It turned out to be launched a request for information and we had a very, very good response on that one. I must say we did some additional outreach in order to get the best possible responses as well. So it wasn't only that we posted it on the website, no we went in email mode and emailed quite a lot of potential candidates.

And out of that process which started in September we -- in November we got to the deadline and well after due elevation and discussions with the candidates and those responding to our apply, we selected the first provider. And that was (unintelligible) it was announced about a month ago which is the National Arbitration Foundation.

Our objective is to have more than one and I'm happy to say that I'm confident that we have at least maybe two more announced during this month actually.

Further work while there were a few tweaks, not tweets, but rather corrections to be made. I mean there were differences like inconsistencies in the procedure where there was an (unintelligible) on the 26th that remains and then somewhere else it's at 15 and the agreement originally was at 15 so we changed that.

We changed a few things that were put in the future terms but this will be developed by then and put in the present tense and there's a few other things; but no material change in the procedure.

But the procedure was revised and the additional rules provided definitions and provide -- well, certain obvious things like it's stated clearly that this is for the new gTLD domains that this would be valid at this point and time may change in the future, needed to be incorporated as well. So that was put in the rules which then supplement the procedure.

Of course, third element like the UDRP would be the provider's supplemental rules and the first provider I'm also confident that will receive the supplemental rules and their fee structure - finalized fee structure posted by the end of this - this month.

What's left to do? Well, quite a few details but quite important things. And of course, the provider and providers will need to get their system up and running and have all the forms because this will be colon spaced as you all know.

And also to have a (unintelligible) and that's foreseen to be done by the first provider for July -- the beginning of July. So we have a demonstration of it as

foreseen for the need to provide -- sorry -- all this channeling took on all of my brain cells, door open -- I meant.

So we will be from a U.S. provider's perspective operational in July then comes the question on the demands on the registries and there are a few details there which also need to be worked out and also tested for each and every registry. And this is in particular of course of the U.S. provider we provide this information page and that needs to be linked too from the name servers.

And the name servers have not been used to exactly do that so there has to be found a good technical solution and preferably the same one for every registry in order to do precisely that.

So I would say that a lot of focus is now shifting from the U.S. provider to getting all the registries in - in operational readiness for taking care of the U.S. Anything else I need to add now?

Christina Rodriguez: I think I suspect quite strongly that this is - these are several topics and there are a number of questions. So if it would be all right, I think we could go to those and I'll take a queue starting with Ann, J. Scott. Okay, we'll go with Ann and J. Scott.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Anne Aikman-Scalese. Is the U.S. (unintelligible) and a member of the IPC. The question about the strawman and the implementation of the abused names you're currently entering for clients our client records into the TMCH.

And they're wondering what point and time we will be able to enter the abused name records to match those trademark registrations and what the anticipated cost may be?

Olof Nordling: I'm channeling you again. Now that needs guidelines first of all about the documentation that needs to be submitted, so it's not immediately available. Timeline is -- at least for me -- very difficult to assess. But I'm looking at (Kiran) here.

But the bad news is that - well, the bad news is that there needs some technical work as well. The good news is that we'll be able to publish a timeline for it all this week.

Oh the cost, that's even more difficult. Do you have any assessment of that? I assume it's the Oracle answer.

Christina Rodriguez: We'll hold you to that and J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott Evans from Yahoo and a member from the IPC and an applicant. So I have a - a question with regards to URS. In the rules that are you putting together are you making sure to clean up some of the problems that we've had with UDRP with regards to domain locking and all that stuff and make sure the rules are very clear for how registries are supposed to behave when they receive this thing?

Because I think we've got some practitioner that can tell you, you give varied results depending on the registries you're dealing with. I know there's a session this week on domain locking but that all applies to the UDRP.

So if -- are we going to fix that problem with URS so we don't end up two years later having a session in some far off place about how to fix the problem we already know is a problem.

So my question is, are you crafting rules that fix the problem that have been identified because if you haven't, you need to take a look at that and you need to get it fixed.

Olof Nordling: I trust we have fixed it as much as we can then again J. Scott could you perhaps -- because -- are you thinking about cyber flight and things like that? Well, that's sort of taking care of in my approaches with (unintelligible). Due to the fact that there's no contrast to the UDRP there is no early warning, there's no notification of your - to the registrant before the prior URS claim to the provider.

After all you find directly with the URS provider - URS provider request registry lock and when it's confirmed that the registry lock has been applied to the URS provider then he/she notifies both the registrar and the registrants.

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) the right direction but I would just ask that you might want to (unintelligible) deal with this on our end on a daily basis before it baked in the beginning so that we don't find ourselves re-creating a problem and I would just ask that we do that.

Sometimes (unintelligible) if we have these experts and ask and just run your solution and to make sure we're actually following the problem.

Olof Nordling: Well, may I ask for your help if you have a device on the - the URS rules as posted because they're posted right now.

J. Scott Evans: I get it's posted and we'll look at it and we'll get back to you.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: The IPC will work on that. We have - we certainly have people who can.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Christina Rodriguez: Anyone else? Really? No one in this room has a question about the claim?

Claudio Di Gangi: I have a question. It kind of follows-up on Anne's question -- this is Claudio. So I guess I'm wondering if the guidelines are going to be updated. I think you guys published Version 1.1 in light of the strawman, is there going to be a Version 1.2 when that gets published?

And an associated question, there's a rule in the guide book that marks that are not in the opposition period that are not eligible for inclusion in the Clearinghouse and that's not reflected in the current version of the guidelines.

So those types of issues, you know, would need to get updated because as mark holders as sending in marks that are submitting marks that are still in the opposition period that shouldn't be. So those types of issues and I'm just kind of wondering is there a plan of action for that?

Olof Nordling: Well, there's a Version 1.1 and one would always expect a Version 1.2, wouldn't one? But I'm waiting here for the Oracle answer. Yes, yes, yes, the guidelines will be updated with a strawman. So meaning you can expect a 1.2 yes.

Claudio Di Gangi: And you've taken note about the issue about marked opposition period?

Olof Nordling: That's the second question. I'm asking the Oracle.

Christina Rodriguez: All right I'm going to put myself in the queue. Okay, (Nmic). I'm going to go first. There is a discrepancy that I've noticed with regards to the Sunrise rules and I am just kind of fragging this for you.

You know at one point there was a date cut-off eligibility requirement for Sunrise registration and that is still in the requirement for the Sunrise eligibility dispute resolution procedure in terms of a basis on which you can bring a Sunrise dispute namely that - the trademark registration in question had not issues on a reported date of the registry agreement and was not applied for on/or before ICANN announced the applications received.

But that date criteria doesn't appear anywhere else, so, you know, I'm sure that was an unintentional oversight. But I just want to flag that for you so if you're going to have that for a basis for Sunrise dispute eligibility procedure which was kind of the intent of the IRTs to carry out.   It has to be carried back into the initial eligibility rules.

Go ahead Olof or you're waiting for the Oracle?

Olof Nordling: The Oracle is typing and I'm reading now. So the date is there as a basis for a Sunrise dispute. And there's a question from the Oracle -- oh what happened now, there's a lot of smoke.

Oh yes, here it comes. The smoke has cleared. Is it really the goal that the trademark register in the last few years would not be eligible for Sunrise registrations? That sounds a bit odd to me even if that's immediate.

Christina Rodriguez: Well, I think the intent is for the IRQ was to address the problem of people securing trademark registrations in jurisdiction or in a city where they obtain quickly. It's really just a means of gaining the system.

Obviously, that was -- oh my goodness -- almost four years ago now. So, you know, I think that was clearly the initial intent and I know that it had my recollection is that it did carry through - through various iterations of the guide book.

But if the question back is, is still the view of the IPC we're happy to take that back and get back to you to the extent that there's been any change in view. Okay, J. Scott's got one for you.

J. Scott Evans: What we would say to you (Kiran) is -- what we would say to you (Kiran) is that some iteration of that is going to need - need to be put into play. I think the way it's written now because things have dragged on so long creates too

big a pool of exclusion and so we need to look at that and narrow it down. But some sort of condition definitely like that has to be there.

Christina Rodriguez: It is narrow because it would -- the registration would have to had issued and it had to been applied for on/or after or on/or before June - June 13, 2012. We'll get back to you.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I think that's, you know, something bolds out 18 months from now that window is huge so we may need to do some adjustments for the fact that these are going on a rolling basis and that language may need to be tweaked.

Olof Nordling: I don't suppose that's based on the experience be the adopted EU on Sunrise once upon a time.

(Background talking)

Nick Wood: Sorry, my question is about the -- thank you. My question is about the - the Clearinghouse and some of the costs of it because this business is built upon volume and it's built upon discounts.

And a number of brand applicants are applying for registrants for their own internal use. And the IBM element of the cost which is $5,000 to connect seems steep really for a number of our clients, a number of our brands.

Would you comment on that? It's a lot of fee per applicant as opposed to the registrant.

Olof Nordling: My immediate comment on that, once upon -- I was a competitor of IBM. I remember the IBM rule was we discussed anything except price but I'm not sure about what the answer is on this from the brains of this exercise.

Well, there are no categories in that respect but the registries are not categorized which will be a preset requirement for making that a differentiation in price.

Yes, and the fees are designed to be equitable and to cover the cost of service, not surprisingly. But - well, take the point. It has different effects, yes.

Nick Wood: But you know when I say equitable in a registry running from a brand running a registry for its own purposes it's not - it's going to have very small amount of usage of the Clearinghouse whereas the so-called open registry will have much more use.

Olof Nordling: I can't object to that. But all right, and you'll see that as a strong but reasonably support...

((Crosstalk))

Nick Wood: We can have a private discussion about it because at some point we're trying to protect. This is not about trying to apply for just one registry. There were some brands who were applying for many registries and for those discussions I will consider it being a fee per applicant regardless of the number of registries that are applying for.

Olof Nordling: And I guess Nick certainly would like to have a discussion on it. But I'm not the right discussion partner with that regard at least not yet; but it is the way it is right now and we have a fixed portion for everybody and the transaction fee based on cost. So that's the answer for the time being not that a discussion could certainly take place.

Man: There's a question for more participation for (Michael Grand). His question is, are you aware of the rules that are in process at the Trademark Clearinghouse?

I ask because we had worked required court trademarks and now we're seeing confirmation filings. Is this a known issue? Is it being resolved?

Olof Nordling: Good question, these are, of course, early days. From the ICANN side they haven't heard of any issues of that nature. But then again it seems that Deloitte is here present so maybe they -- in what shape and form is Deloitte in? Oh yes, (Harago Young), would you like to respond to that?

The answer is no but...

(Harago Young):   Well, I'll try to answer to give you my best. I'm not saying that we would have any issues at all. I don't think we have major issues and if there were things that came up, we try to resolve them as soon as possible.

The specific issue you referred to I think a full appearance on the second was resolved in 24 hours. Like any system I think there will always be something that could come up and they're really try to act as fast as possible.

And they can always contact us directly if it doesn't work. And I think I have a lot of examples already of people that we've helped. At best I could also come back with your question, yes to understand we need to get the specification fine tune and final and then we will do our best to implement as soon as possible.

Obviously, I can tell you what I would like to do rather it's all feasible I think as (Kiran) mentioned as soon as we get these specifications final I think we will do our best to come out with a - with a date.

I also understand and we will and that I can guarantee we will have to do something that will actively turnaround for the system that we're in already period; that's not ideal because most likely we have to have something already in advance.

But anyone who is in there already that was satisfied if you want to add your cases on top of it, we will have to do that retroactively and we will - we will do that. But you have to give a couple of days to work that out specifically because we don't have the final requirements at this moment.

But we'll do our best in the next two weeks to come out with a plan to communicate on that plan to come out with pricing also there. We'd like to do it as an advantage as we can. It's to our own benefit that people are able to add those on top of it the value of the Clearinghouse becomes clear.

So it's definitely going to be something like a validation price for each case not we're more thinking into the direction of the label that you have already. Something in that direction probably is going to be -- allow us just to work this out first in detail. As soon as we have the detail -- and I promise we will - we'll give you a fine tuned plan. (Young)'s question sorry, Deloitte.

Olof Nordling: I guess that's confirmation a nod from Deloitte. A little hiccup that you mentioned was rather consistent with the experience that he was relating.

Christina Rodriguez: I think we have time for one more question. (Unintelligible). All right. Well, thank you very, very much Olof and Oracle. We very much appreciate all of your hard work on this and (Kiran) will be -- I guess we will get to the point where (Kiran) will have cough drops, but until then you probably won't be able to accept them.

Olof Nordling: Thanks - thanks for having us.

Christina Rodriguez: And we have a few minutes unless the folks who are hear from the NomCom comment on any further expectations.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Christina Rodriguez: Absolutely.

J. Scott Evans: I'm not sure what the NomCom representative were going to say to you but
                   as your IPC NomCom representative I would like to say to you we need some
                   candidates for these slots and we need solid candidate for these jobs.

                   To the board of directors we need people who have senior management
                   experience on boards running large organizations of large budgets. We need
                   people to serve on the ccNSO. We need people to serve on the GNSO.

                   So you need - we need to get out there and get some people to submit
                   themselves to this process so that we will have a good pool of candidates to
                   choose from and, you know, (Mark) served on this before.

                   We have to place the people based on the pool that we have.

Man: I was just going to say I think beyond the existing ICANN community some of
                   the people who've come in within the last few years were - were new to
                   ICANN but they had great experience in the commercial and business world
                   and working on boards.

                   And ICANN has grown to a point where it needs that kind of experience.

J. Scott Evans: And this is our opportunity to bring in that business expertise and that mature
                   rationale that we keep claiming that we want to see from this only
                   organization.

                   And so we need to do the foot work to make sure that we're giving candidate
                   that can bring that to the table. So I strongly encourage you to send people
                   my way and let me know and I'll be glad to talk with them on the telephone
                   about this.

                   There's information on the NomCom website that sets out what the roles and
                   responsibility it is. It's a small siphoned pay, so it is now a paid position. But it

sets out what the expectation is on hours are and all of those siphoned is for the Board of Directors only.

For the other positions I think you're - your travel is paid and you get a per diem for food during the meetings. But only the board gets the - some sort of payment like an annual payment. So -- but we need candidate and we don't have a pool of candidate.

I can tell you that right now we are shorter on number of candidates than we've ever been at this particular process, so we should -- generally we get a rush of candidates right before the deadline shutdown, right. But when we're tracking numbers from where we've been in the past we're way behind. So we need candidate.

Christina Rodriguez: J. Scott to the extent that you know off the top of your head, are there geographic regio- are there regional slots for the board? What's the -- I believe there's three board seats but I'm not for sure.

J. Scott Evans: There are three board seats. I can get that to the list. It's not coming off the top of my head whereas last year I knew immediately we had to have Latin America.

I don't know that, but I will promise -- you can ask. Here are the two - the NomCom folks and they can probably provide that. It's not coming from off of the top of my head. But I'm just telling you we need candidates and here I'm going to let the - the emissaries from our group.

Man: In the meantime - in the meantime I could just state that there are no limitations in that regard. There's no geographic limitations for the time... So there's no exclusion so - so to speak for the board candidates. But I'll hand it over to (unintelligible).

Man: Good evening, good afternoon. My name is (unintelligible). I'm the chair of the NomCom this year and we come to you basically with three - three messages.

First of all, we want your help and I think that was - that was actually what our committee member already was saying, you know, before we arrived. We need your help getting new candidates because without a good candidate pool we don't really do anything; that is one.

And that means that we ask you to apply or tell your acquaintances who you think that they would be good candidates to apply for available positions which are of course as you know, three for the board, two for GNSO. There's an opening in both houses now and three for ALAC and one for ccNSO. So this is the first thing.

The second is that we want to erase and delete the impression that NomCom is blackbox. It's like the - those bunch of recording notes who send out to elect the pope and then, you know, white smoke comes out and poof and, you know, a new pope is elected.

It may have been so and there are reasons because confidentially about names of the candidates is a must. It has to be - has to be strict and it will remain so. But at the same time this confidential requirement should be no excuse for - for making mystery out of the whole thing and it may have happened before.

So at our kick-off meeting to start meeting in Toronto we decided that we follow the line that process is open as much as possible and data that is to say the names on the candidates is confidential, secret.

We have been -- we have started implementing this - this strategy of this policy by issuing report cards. Immediately after every meeting to the communities or constituencies stakeholder groups who are represented in the

NomCom by the members who come from those constituencies or stakeholder groups.

I hope that it has worked well in - in your case. Of course, the initiator of this idea was Stephane Van Gelder. And from our point of view it's been a very good process.

The other thing is that NomCom this time is holding two open meetings. It was actually -- the first one was yesterday meeting of the outreach subcommittee of NomCom chaired by (Jerrold) and the second will be today at 5 o'clock in Room 5 BC and that is the meeting of the whole nominating committee. I believe that these are historical firsts.

And the third point is that we're asking your ideas and your help, your advice on the people on the types of people who you should be considering for a - for these various open - open positions. I think I'll stop here. I'd like the chair to continue.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Thanks very much. For those of you who may not know me my name's Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm currently the chair elect for this year which means providing I survive with you due to the great expectation I manage to chair the nominating committee next year.

A couple of points I'd like to make to you all and that I've made in other rooms today. One of which is, please don't think just about GNSO and board appointments. Feel free to - to use your outreach ability and spot talent that you think will contribute to ICANN as a whole with appropriately motivated to change our volunteers who could service any of the IC or NSO appointments as well.

I think all too often we only think about our own communities and you might very well be at our cocktail party next week. And so, you know, ALAC could

probably get sorted out with (unintelligible) that's something that we used to do a lot of.

Yes, it's sort of like you should think of is that somebody who should be encouraged to do the stake and obvious of interest. (Adam)'s going to take you verbally through with a couple of URLs in a little while.

We have - we had a disaster. Let me share with you. A whole paperwork luckily not confidential (Hank Evans) has gone missing. It's all the business cards we had which are really handy because you could all have them. Yes, have half a dozen and you'd be good here use this as a second market, strike hold. We don't know. We know they left America. They never made it here and if they did make it here, who knows who we might get to apply. Maybe that's a good outreach mechanism I have no idea.

I regret that that's the case. What I don't regret is that the two amazing force I've been planning though it has a few - few book marks with her. So we'll leave some of those at the table as we leave and at least you can use those as resources.

Because that's something I want to make clear too. You as part of the ICANN community are part of the outreach program. It's not just a bunch of paper you send to serve in NomCom as your representatives.

You need the rolodex contacts, right and that brings me to another point. Some churn occurs most years on people who are terminated and who already served long enough on NomCom.

When you're thinking about sending someone from GNSO in your various houses for our purposes next year think about how things have changed and what type of organizational skills and experience, particularly, for the ICANN board position that we're now asking for.

You know, you haven't managed 100 plus people. We really don't want to look at you, you know. How many zeros does it lay into the bottom line and you order risks and capabilities are important that all know is the case.

So you need to same trust people who've got the keys to the C-Suite place, right, that's the level they need to be reaching at. So think - so everyone needs that but we need a few people at that level to do the outreach effectively.

So tap someone on the shoulder if you know them and I'll stop there, thank you. And (John) for you, sorry.

(John): I get to say something nice. J. Scott is an exceptional member of the nominating committee, so thank you very much. And I hope -- and both have the -- it's a good example because not all the nominating committee members do have knowledge and experience of dealing with the CEO type of people that we want to bring into ICANN. He does but he'll be termed limited soon. It might not be next year but so the repl- exactly.

So we need somebody with that kind of experience otherwise, you know, it's very difficult to evaluate this statement of interest in the CV's we receive. I have the pleasure of now trying to describe a web page which is a boring thing to try and do. But I'll try to nominating committee like most of the ICANN committees have its own website and it follows the usual formula of the committee name ICANN.org.

We're nomcom.icann.org and there's a couple of things on there - on the site itself you will see we had inputs from the board, board governor's committee, from the community generally and also from the ccNSO's specifically about a type of skills and characteristics that we should be considering in the candidates, particular candidates at the director level.

This comes partly from a requirement of the ATRT review but it's also something that we've extended out and try to do outreach in the community generally.

So this is something if you want to take a look at those and tell us where you think there may be got. What other skills, what other backgrounds should we be seeing both at director but also in the GNSO, ccNSO and highlight, that would be very helpful.

So those -- there's no stunts, there's no screens (Antonio). (Antonio) is trying to describe websites and the other thing you can do is Nomcom.icann.org/apply the word apply will take you to the statement of interest form, the application for. So you can complete that and you will then be a candidate pool. So that's a very simple way to find your way to the application form.

Something that is very important to us is also the ability to recommend candidates and nomcom.icann.org/suggest will give a page where you can complete a form where you can recommend somebody as a candidate.

You can either do that with your name attached which is very helpful or anonymously to, you know, you can imagine if somebody actually recommended you, you actually feel a little bit of encouragement that someone from this community thinks that you have the chops, the skill, the ability to actually join one of these committees. So it's a very helpful mechanism for us to have this recommendation process.

And we always joke that, you know, friends can recommend friends for anything in ICANN, it's not that painful, perhaps. But now -- so this is these two opportunities. One is to - to apply yourself the other is to make a recommendation. So if you could do that, that's helpful.

And also to look at the type of characteristics what do you think we should be looking for in these candidates that's - that's helpful to us as well and communicate by J. Scott or to any of the nominated committee members that you know around. Thank you.

Christina Rodriguez: Actually I have two questions and I apologize because I think I have seen something about this on one of the score cards; but if you could just -- and I do like the score cards. I think they are very helpful.

In the GNSO the way the council's structured you have nominating committee appointee, one assigned to each house and then one who kind of is not. And the folks who are assigned to a house, those are voting seats and in the past the council has frankly gotten itself into contortions figuring out who goes where, who gets to vote and who doesn't. Is that something that the NomCom is now going to be taking on part of its (appointment) process?

Man: Yes. In other words, the appointing - there are two vacancies. One in each house and we see it as our task to make the selection knowing that this person is going to - this house, this person, is going to that house.

Christina Rodriguez: Okay, thank you very much. And I think one thing that would be helpful just to get a sense - and you can ask J. Scott later, but from the perspective of - from NomCom leadership, just to have a general sense of kind of the time commitment that for members of the IPC might be interested in representing the IPC on a NomCom, what type of time commitment we're talking about generally? I realize that obviously that goes up significantly when you're in the homestretch but to have some sense of that I think would be helpful.

Man: It's a good question because, you know, the nominating committee is divided into two sort of calendar halves from the point of the annual general meeting when the committee is formed, which was in November last year, until May the 1st, we are basically a recruitment committee.

What we're doing is looking for candidates so how much effort an individual wishes to put into that is really up to the individual, but it's not so much work. And during that period, there's a monthly teleconference and you're also asked to come to these two ICANN meetings.

What happens after May the 1st is that we become the selection committee and that is increasingly intense work. It might begin with a call every two weeks, evaluating candidates, talking through them. You also have to read the statements of interest which - and multiple pages.

Each candidate has three or four references which you have to read, so it starts to become quite hard work. Towards the end, just before the (Durbin) meeting, you're probably having a call once a week and it it'll be a couple of hours with the reading.

So it increases over time. How much you do is like any committee. It's up to the individual but it's not the easiest of jobs. And then there is the (Durbin) meeting which will be almost every day of the week, plus the selection meeting which is two days afterwards. So it's not the easiest of committees but it builds up to it so it doesn't - that's like boiling a frog in water. You don't really notice. It's okay.

Christina Rodriguez: All right, thank you. Does anyone have any questions?

Man: I have a question. So once you receive the applications from the candidates, to what extent does the NomCom look at diversity issues in selecting the different positions in terms of geographical diversity or gender diversity? Does that come into play? And also in terms of the background of the candidates, it seems - I mean, are you looking for people for information technology sectors or...

Man: Thank you. They are very - let's say, we take the requirements as they are in the bylaws. The geographic framework is a lot of - it's (like right) because it

says that there can be no more than five persons on the board, working members from the board, from any one region.

But each region must have at least one voting member on the board. So within those limits, it's up to us to make the selections. There's nothing in the bylaws in this sense about gender balance, but of course, we have to take them into account.

However, in our work from now on, first we concentrate - we focus on individuals. That is, we try to find from the - whatever the number of total candidates, total number of candidates is, we try to find let's say the 20 best then go to the further evaluation with OB which is a professional firm in this thing.

And only when we come to the final selections, which is (in Durbin), in this case, then we have to say, "Well, we can't have, you know, like three persons which are exactly the same, you know, geographic background and gender and profession," and so on and so forth. But first of all, we would try to follow the rule that we - we try to find the very best.

Man: I've been on a few nominating committees, and what tends to happen is that you, you know, all things being equal, then you start to look at other characteristics and that sort of thing.

And I think also, in terms of geographic diversity, as (Yurial) just said, we don't have any bylaws mandated requirements this year, but we are thinking about different aspects. For example, Africa is always underrepresented in many of the councils and the board, Sub Sahara and Africa perhaps. We've also noted Eastern Europe

But this is the sort of thing to chat with J. Scott about. You know, if you have a particular issue, then that's something he can do, is bring your thoughts on these sort of diversity - and of course, gender diversity is extremely important

and we should be reflecting the global society or public interest in some ways.

You may disagree with that. In that case, take it through him and (slap me) down. I'm a non-voting member so it doesn't matter anyway. But I think we do try and consider things broadly. Thank you.

Christina Rodriguez: Any other questions? Okay, thank you very much for your time. We very much appreciate it.

Man: Thank you for letting me speak. Thank you.

Christina Rodriguez: Okay, so we were - we will be hearing next, a presentation on the - I want to make sure that I have it correctly - the replacement of the Whois protocol. But things are moving a little behind schedule so while we're waiting, I did want to raise an issue.

I have gotten a request from a member of the IPC to discuss an SCI matter that would, I think, be better handled in a closed session. We will have the time to address that, so I guess the question that I have for the IPC members is, is that something that you want to address today? In which case, we would go into a closed session once we have our next presentation and talk about some of the GNSO council issues.

Or whether or not you would prefer to have a separate interim call address this. So I guess, just for a show of hands from IPC members for folks who would like to deal with this today and go into a closed session. All right ten hands. IPC members who do not want to deal with this today and do not want to go into a closed session.

All right, so it looks like the majority is - I don't know. Okay, well, it is 3:00 in the morning for the people remotely. They might be asleep. All right, so I would anticipate that probably for the last 10 to 15 minutes of the session we

are going to then go into a closed session at which point, unfortunately we will have to ask those of you who are not active IPC members in good standing to relocate.

But it's an issue that wouldn't be very interesting to you anyway. So next we're going - and just kind of I guess, if we can take this time just for (Heather) and Brian to kind of key up very quickly to just list out the subject matter or the motions on the GNSO council that will be kind of the subject of our session after the technical briefing.

Brian Winterfeldt: Sure, thank you Christina. Brian Winterfeldt, GNSO counselor. Just want to give you a quick update on what we're going to talk about later this afternoon. We had a very lively working weekend. I'm going to prepare - (some read on the IPP) list shortly to kind of catch up all up to date on all the excitement that you might've missed on Saturday and Sunday.

Hopefully you were not here or out seeing the Great Wall or something better than what we were doing. But we have a couple motions that are on the table. The first motion that we have on the table that we'll talk about is for the translation and transliteration of the contact information.

A final issue report on this topic was submitted to the council and a recommendation for a PDP on this issue was put forward. That is actually going to be delayed pending the results of the working group on the gTLD directory services.

So we can talk about that a little bit more this afternoon when we have our in depth discussion. The next motion on the table relates to the trademark clearinghouse straw man proposal that was put forward by Maria Farrell of the MCUC.

The motion basically expresses disappointment and concern with the recent decision of ICANN's implement elements of the trademark clearinghouse

straw man solution. So we'll talk about the merits of that concern and what IPC's reaction is going to be to that.

We also have a motion on policy concerns regarding a registrar accreditation agreement that was put forward by Wendy Seltzer, also of the NCUC. And the final motion essentially characterizes the proposed 2013 RAA or the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, as an obstacle to the new gTLD program and recommends severing the requirement that it be adopted by all registrars for participation in with the new gTLDs. So those are the motions that will be coming up and we can talk about them in more detail this afternoon.

Christina Rodriguez: All right, thank you and I see our next presenter is here, so welcome.

Olaf Kolkman: There's a technician here who doesn't know how to connect a laptop. I just bought this last week and I never monkeyed around with it. So my name is Olaf Kolkman. I can do this without the screen. I work for NLnet Labs. That's my day job, but I'm here as the working group chair, co-chair IETF WEIRDS working group.

The IETF is the standard organization for Internet standards. I believe most of you know that. That would work. Oh, yes. Web Extensible Internet Registration Data Service - the context of this, if I could - yes, the context of this is what we usually refer to as Whois. As you know, Whois, is basically typing something in or in Web browser, a domain name or an IP address or other Internet resource information like routing.

Whois is not a typical protocol for domain names. It's used for Internet resources in general. You type something in, you do a query and you get something back. In this case, it's a (risk rate) around domain and you see the registration data coming back.

So what you type in and how you do that is fairly complex. It depends on what you want to have, all right. It's different for names. It's different for

numbers. The location you query to is different. You have to know where to look and what to type in.

From the registration data perspective, and what you get back, the how is fairly structured. Depending on which registry you talk to, the data comes back in a different way and people who are interested in this information, want to automate this, may need to write screen scrapers to parse the data field and put intelligence to that.

What is returned is policy and contents depended. Different registries, different policies about data that is being returned to specific (parkies). For instance, there might be requirements that the general public doesn't get to see privacy sensitive information while law enforcement might need to see that type of data.

So this is (unintelligible) and how are we trying to standardize the how part? So make that how part more structured and standardize it. So what is returned? Take that in really well defined fields so that people who query this data know what they can get back and use machines to parse the data.

It enables the what to be context and regulatory specific. There is a famous paper by David Clark from 2012. It's called, "The (unintelligible) in cyberspace." If you had not read it, it's - I think, it's mandatory for protocol developers and probably not so much for trademark lawyers.

But for the people who are on both sides of the table, it's an interesting lead because it basically says if you write a technical protocol, you want to write the protocol in such a way that the policy (tussle) can play out, so basically, the protocol should be an enabler to make choices within the whole policy space.

And that's essentially what we try and set out within the IETF. We try to make a protocol that doesn't prescribe any policy. So business charter effects, but

the charter affects is basically about creating a how that allows for various decisions about the what.

We want to standardize a single data, so we want to make sure that we capture addresses, names, contact information, other things that people might want to know and give names to fields and so on and so forth.

Then deliver those objects so that the information in objects that are encapsulated over (a resting) service, over HTTP. That's technical for basically saying we want to be able to have an Hitachi Web server and serve this data, write this simple interface and give it.

And that comes back to the next one. We want to produce a simple, easy to implement protocol. By making a (restful), which is an internal (part) in technology, it allows you to use (unintelligible) and that allows you to implement these types of services within days or weeks rather than months or years.

Another thing that we want is the possibility of giving - of having different services based on client authentication. This is, for instance, for the law enforcement use case and the general privacy case. As I said, we use (restful). I'm not going to go into the details but it's basically, you basically use a verb with an object. You ask, I want to get an object and then you get the object representation in a certain data structure, which is called (Jason).

And the way you specify those objects is basically as URLs, like on the bottom, so the two examples there are can you give me the (abuse content) for the operator of the IP network 192.0.2.0 or can you give me the registrant contact for the example that dot com domain?

So this is the way you would specify this type of query. And obviously in the Web page, that will be sort of (way in) which we can start this query. So a bunch of deliverables - we're working hard to produce this protocol because

it's very useful in context in the new gTLDs but it's also useful for other types of registries.

And, in fact, the IP registries are using prototypes, currently in production and have more traffic of the prototypes than of their ordinary US services. So we're at - I wouldn't say prototypes but the early versions of the specifications and they're committed to change the specifications based on standards as they learn more.

So that's a fairly aggressive set of milestones. The first document is having its working group's last call. It's a (term of art) for trying to see if all of the issues are closed within the working group. If that is the case, if not all the issues are closed, the remaining issues need to be resolved first and we need to figure out if that is the case. I don't know.

Oh, I'm catching up now. So, this is the - we're having something working by December 2013. There are some major questions. Internationalization, the way we structure (emphasis) on federated authentication and search, I'm going to skip over the (de cart) or the way we structure address information.

Basically, if you give back an answer, it needs to contain an address. Sometimes addresses are stored as - in the registry database in a very structured way so that you know what a name is, what a street address, what the code is, what the phone number is.

And sometimes and address is just a lot of data. So we want to facilitate both of those if possible. And if you have structured data, that's a common problem. So we want to solve that for the whole IETF so a working group has been created for that with very short delivery timeline, three months.

So it's an immediate issue from an IETF perspective. It's just doing work. Internationalization - internationalization is obviously important. We have looked at - or Steve Sheng, ICANN staff, has looked at the protocol and

compared the protocol features with the internationalized registration data working final report, which is an ICANN document.

And this is basically its finding. On the left-hand side, you see a column with the fields that need to be represented. And on the middle side you see whether those fields need to be internationalized. And on the right-hand side, you see the output standard that we're looking at.

Now, this is all technical specifications and references. But the good thing about this table is that we cannot see any issues with respect to internationalization at this moment. It seems that we fit those requirements from that report.

Search - search is a difficult thing. The way we're specifying WEIRDS, the way that we want to base (that to) work is by query response. You ask a precise question and you get an answer.

If you ask an imprecise question, you don't get an answer. Obviously that is something that people often do not want. They want to have some, you know, some search capability. Now, searches are, in general, a very difficult database of things that are hard to standardize.

What do you match? Do you match the beginning of the string? Do you match the end? Do you match the middle? Do you use wildcards or regular expressions to do the searching? Do you use I want to search for the name and an address and is it code? Is it smaller than 12? Things like that.

It can become very complicated to standardize that. And we haven't seen much need. What we've seen in the operational world currently is that people match on the prefix of existing fields. So everything that starts with AB or everything that starts with - everything below example dot com, or something like that.

And that seems to be the direction. We haven't determined consensus yet. But it seems to be the direction that the working group is producing its first based specification for search.

In the IETF, we talk about both consensus and running code. Sometimes that running code is lacking when we do specs but not in this case. There are, as I mentioned already, several Internet, number of registries that run this as a registration data access protocol.

I'm consciously using the word registration data access protocol instead of Whois and I would urge the room to do the same, move away from using the word Whois because it's complicated and gives misunderstanding, so this is the access protocol.

Anyway, there's a bunch of organizations who have written servers to disclose their backend databases to things they're currently exposed by a Whois. And that seems to work and provide the same results which is a good thing.

IETF is an open organization. Everybody's welcome to be on in the consensus process. Work is done on a mailing list. Determination of consensus is done on a mailing list. We have face-to-face meetings. We have to (unintelligible) which is a pre-working group word.

And pre-working groups meetings by now, it's not obligatory to be there. We don't make decisions in physical meetings. We'll always make them on the mailing list.

So I urge you to, if you have an interest in this work, to participate. It is technical work, I should say, but it can be (rewarding). If you want to know more, these are the coordinates. And I'm sure that - I'm sure - I was about to say that I'm sure that these slide sets will magically appear somewhere. And with that, I'll leave it for questions.

Christina Rodriguez: Take a queue.

Olaf Kolkman: It's going to be a small one, I predict.

Christina Rodriguez: Very (solid up here). All right, oh (Paul).

(Paul):   Does this new data collection device have the ability to identify bad addresses if they're put in and reject them? We see a lot of things at Whois that are just clearly nonsense addresses and I know that we like to point to ICANN compliance.

                     We like to point to the registries or who everybody and nobody has responsibility to have accurate data. Can the system be built to reject clearly inaccurate data? If there is no 250 Main Street in this zip code, can we reject it technologically so that we're not having to chase down bad (guys at) addresses that don't exist?

Olaf Kolkman: If I get your question correctly, then what you're describing is getting the data into the backend databases and rejecting at that point. Is that correct?

(Paul):   Yes, rejecting at input when it's clearly wrong.

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, okay, so rejecting at input at the backend side of the database is not what this protocol is about. It is about once the data is in your backend database, in your registry database, it's how you expose it to the world.

                     Of course, there can be syntax checks on input of the query but if the data has entered (into) the database, this is not a protocol to get it out or in. It's just exposing what it's currently is in a different way.

Christina Rodriguez: Just to pick up on (Paul)'s question, maybe looking at it from a different perspective, would it be possible technologically that regar- even if it is

accepted for input, that the rules would be designed in such a way that simply just would not display, that there would be some kind of a default in that display where, you know, for example, it is a street that, you know, it's a street address that's composed solely of numbers.

Olaf Kolkman: That is all part of the principle. And I'm thinking hard because - at heart I'm an engineering, problem solver, but I would say (fairly globally) no. If it is the case that the registry, the data provider has not made the determination whether it's valid or invalid, at the client side, you might be able to do that type of logic.

But as an engineer, I need advice against the type of (login), if - you could also have false positives if you say I'm going to match everything that starts with a number is probably not an address. You might make the convention that something is a Dutch address where the street number is at the end instead of the US street address where the number is at the beginning.

So if you make those assumptions it's going to be hard, so I think that if it's about registration data, the content is something that is the policy of that person to maintain the database and make that available.

And obviously, once you have the automation in place, as a consumer of the data, you can do all kinds of checks. And you're mobile (engine or a PPA) to build that type of functionality where you say, "Okay, these are all zeros, this is obviously not a correct telephone number," for instance.

(Paul): Yes, the problem, of course, is that the registries will have - especially the open registries - will have no economic interest in building any sort of verification system like that. It'll just cut down on the more second level registration, so not to press the issue, but it sounds like this next evolution of Whois and to this new thing is, it seems like a better way to search that data.

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, if that - to put it simply, it - what goes in, comes out. Yes.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I have two questions. One is - and this relates to a previous slide. You had a timeline in there which, with various reports or very steps, deliverables. I'm trying to see how this fits in with what is in, for example, there's a draft change to the registrar agreement.

And it says, "Following a publication by the IETF of a proposed standard, draft standard or Internet standard any revisions there to, and then it goes on from there, and then certain things happen a certain number of days after that. How does that relate to this timeline? Where does the publication of a proposed standard, a draft standard or Internet standard come in?

Olaf Kolkman: So roughly what happens is at the moment, the working group is finished and you already see we overstepped our first milestones by at least ten days. At the moment, the written work is finished. The document is done. It will be submitted to the IHD, so that is a higher body in the IETF which will be reviewed and we'll do weeks (idea) of last call.

After that, the document is submitted to the RFC editors which will turn the specification, which is an Internet (raw) form into an RFC. That usually takes about four weeks. So at the moment that we submit a document, and we're not quite sure if that first document, for instance, is completely issueless, because the moment the document is - leaves the working group, it will take at least two months before it becomes a standard - at least.

This is - of course, it's a hard problem. There's only so much capacity of people who are willing and able to do this work and we're trying to maintain a schedule. That's all I can say. It comes to the timeline and the interaction with ICANN expectations.

Steve Metalitz: I'm just trying to make sure people have a sense of when this might become operational, if you will, within the ICANN context. My other question had to do - you had a slide there concerning data elements and internationalization,

and it just - it raises, in my mind, the question of are - is this work proceeding on the assumption that the data elements in the new registry, in a new directory service, will be the same ones that exist now in Whois? Or is it agnostic on that question? Could more elements be added? How does that fit into the work that you're doing in your group?

Olaf Kolkman: So the data model is something that we're still working on. We want to be able to represent most commonly used data elements today. That doesn't mean that once those data elements are standardized and published, we can't extend the data elements.

So if new data - the point is that if you design a protocol, you want to make it forward compatible, so to speak, so if new data elements are invented, so to speak, if new constituencies or stakeholders or what have you, people - all are involved in the process come in, like your auditors or so, a lot of this element would be needed, that could be added at some point, standardized.

Steve Metalitz: So is that - is it fair to say that's sort of on the policy side of the...

Olaf Kolkman: Whatever goes into there is always on the policy side. And if there is a need to standardize whatever the policy creates, then - and if there's a body of people who want to standardize that, that is future work.

Steve Metalitz: So if we wanted another - let's just say if we wanted a different data element that doesn't currently exist in Whois, that would be - and we wanted that to apply to gTLD registries and registrars, that would be an ICANN decision, not an IETF.

Olaf Kolkman: That's obviously not an ICANN - that's obviously not an IETF decision. The way that it is standardized, so you know, what - if it has a certain number of (unintelligible) or what have you, that refers to another standard or that needs to have a specific structure, obviously that is a IETF thing.

Bringing it to the IETF is also a process that involves the people who are interested in actually doing the work. So if there's only one group of people using it in a (cross) environment, then you probably don't need to standardize it.

If it's for the whole gTLD and ccTLD community, then that type of extension would naturally find its way to the IETF. So this is not - the work is done, the door is closed. There's obviously opportunity to maintain protocols.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much. I think this has been a very useful presentation and this is something that I think many of us here in the room should be paying more attention to perhaps. So we appreciate your giving us the...

Olaf Kolkman: There is the (unintelligible).

Christina Rodriguez: All right, thank you very much and I guess if someone can arrange to have the Power Point emailed to me and then I can distribute it for (unintelligible). Okay, okay, I'll do it. That's okay. So thank you very much.

You know, we're at discussing the GNSO council motions, then we're going to move into the issue for which I think we're going to - well, AOB and then we'll move into the issue for which we're going to close the meeting. So I guess, (Brian) and (Peder), if you wanted to go ahead and kick off the discussion.

Man: Are we going back (to Windows), Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: Yes.

Man: Sorry. Okay. Great. So we had a little preview before that presentation that we just had. It should had a lot of you thinking and there's going to be a lot of intense, interesting debate and discussion. So going back over the first

motion again, that is for the initiation of a PDP on the translation and transliteration of the contact information.

My read on that is that it is something that is good and that we do want to support and it obviously makes sense that we're delaying this beginning of the process to allow the current expert group on gTLD directory services to complete their recommendations before initiating it. Does anyone have any thoughts then? Steve?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. If I could just make a comment on that, this goes out of the work of the Internet - of the IRD working group, okay. And it ties into, you know, we had a slide just now about internationalization of this data and that this protocol would accommodate it.

So I think it's - I agree that this is important and it's the question of whether in the IDN environment where a lot of this directory data, what we used to call Whois or still do I guess, would be a non-(askey) character. Is there any obligation to put it into (askey) or into another language and so who has to do that?

So it clearly fits, you know, it's part of the larger question of changing Whois or moving on to the next iteration of Whois. And my only question really was - I mean, it's pretty obvious that nothing can happen on this until after the expert working group reports, so I wasn't sure quite why there was - unless it's just kind of bureaucratic box checking, why we're started a PDP which we know we can't actually implement until something else happens. So that was my only question about it.

Man: And to answer your question, Steve, it is bureaucratic box checking and it specifically states in the motion that this PDP is going to be delayed until the expert working group can take this work. So there's no reason, I think, to oppose it and it seems like from a timing standpoint, they've already identified the concern you have with this.

Steve Metalitz: I'll just make one other comment on this, then. Sorry. Up until 24 hours ago, I would've been concerned that this would slow up action on the report of the expert working group because people would say rather than move quickly forward on it, they would say, "Oh my gosh, there's a PDP already underway within the GNSO. We have to go through that process first." And, you know, you and I both know this argument has been made before many times.

The reason I don't think it's a concern anymore is I think we've lost that battle in advance. The ICANN has backed down from any requirement that the expert working group be implemented to some board action and I think they view it, at this point, if I'm not mistaken, they're viewing it solely as input to another PDP which they say will be an, "Expedited PDP," quote, unquote. So I think that's inevitable anyway so I don't see necessarily the downside. I mean, this can also be expedited as well, I guess.

Man: Great. Thank you Steve. Does anyone else have any feedback or questions about the motion, to people forwarding the motion? I see nodding heads. Great. Thank you so much. So can we move on to the next motion? Are you ready?

Great. So we have two really interesting motions put forward both by the members of the non-commercial user constituency. The first one is something that is very near and dear, I think, to the hearts of (financial) constituency. That is the motion by Maria Farrell with regard to the trademark clearing house straw man solution.

The motion, as I mentioned earlier, basically expresses the (unintelligible) and the decisions of ICANN to implement elements of the trademark clearinghouse straw man solution. It was characterized in the motion by Maria essentially at a circumvention of the multi stakeholder model and the bottom of the policy development process. We heard a lot of that over the working weekend. (Jason), did you want to add something?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: We vehemently opposed this motion. I've already opposed it on the list. I know we did actually have a lot of support on the list, too, obviously pose the motion. Go ahead, Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: I'm just curious as to the extent that there's been any traffic and I think I may have missed the discussion in the GNSO council working session. Given that the vast majority of members of the registry stakeholder group are providing backend services to dot brands, I'm curious if you can share with us what their position is on this motion.

Man: Thank you Christina. We did have a lively discussion over the weekend at the GNSO council with regard to this motion. In addition to discussion this motion specifically, we did meet with the ICANN board of directors at the council and we also then had an individual meeting with (Fadi) afterwards.

                    Essentially this was brought up. And the registry stakeholder group most vocal was Jeff Neuman but basically in support of this motion and there seems to be a lot of people on the contracted party side of the house and the non-commercial stakeholder group, which is essentially the NCUC. They're the only ones who have a seat at the council. The (PMOC) does not.

                    We're are all sort of up in arms and believe that the straw man proposal, you know, is an affront to the council itself, had (threats with the) power, and the basically gave (Fadi) a very hard time.

                    So, it's a long answer to your question, Christina, but it's basically - the contracted parties, I think, share the concerns that are being expressed by the NCUC in this motion. We were able to state our objection at the IPC on the list with the IPC, in addition, live and in person.

I also stated my objection to this motion. I also, in front of (Fadi), personally thanked him for his support, for the straw man work. We know that it was extremely narrowly tailored and it was supposed to be focused on implementation.

Later on, we're going to discuss the panel that's going to be tomorrow morning on policy (verse) implementation. I think this is a very good example of how, frankly, that can be abused.

It's interesting when Jeff Neuman continued to talk about this, he kept using this as a really good example of how the IPC, essentially use policy (verse) implementation to try and gain the system, which I don't really understand because in my mind, you know, we could say, you know, basically any single improvement or implementation that the trademark clearinghouse would characterize as policy by the NCUC and the contracted parties. So it seems to me like this situation does highlight the problems in the opposite way that Jeff Neuman kept asserting at the council.

Christina Rodriguez: I have a follow up question. Has the motion - is this the first time the motion has been introduced? In other words, if we chose to do so, could we request that it be deferred?

Man: This is the first time that the motion has been. We definitely could defer it. I think we actually probably should and it'll give us all time to...

Christina Rodriguez: Well, my suggestion would be that we actually defer to our closed session, a discussion as to whether or not we want to request a deferral or not.

Man: Absolutely ,we can do that. All right, did I say too much already? I'm trying to keep things interesting. It's kind of hot and it's been a long day and...

Christina Rodriguez: Actually, does anyone else have questions? Any other IPC members or contentious (leads to the core) session? All right.

Man: All right, so on to the next one. This is another very interesting motion put forward by another one of my colleagues on the council from the non-commercial users constituency, Wendy Seltzer, this time.

This motion is with regard to the registrar accreditation agreement. Basically, Wendy is opposing the requirement that the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement be a requirement for any registrars that are sort of seeing new gTLD registries.

I can tell you right now, not only - I see J. Scott giving a big thumbs down already. Not only do I think it's a big thumbs down, but we were in a meeting this morning with (Fadi) talking about the registry agreement and he thinks we told a - that is not even on the table. Let's take that away and he said it is not happening.

So we actually have the support from the top to maintain that. And they are actually being very, I think, practical about the requirements of the registrars coming to the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement. They are going to give phase in period for the more technical and difficult portion of the requirements that have been added but carefully negotiated over the past year and a half, improved registrar accreditation contracts.

So for registrars who sign up and who sign on, there will be an implementation window, I think, at the beginning of 2014. Yes, eight months from signing, so there's going to be a little bit of a reprieve for folks who were concerned in the registrar community. So do we have any comments? Do we all agree that we're voting two thumbs down? Is everyone in agreement about that? Christina, question?

Christina Rodriguez: Yes, now, is this the motion - my understanding that was submitted untimely so that if we wanted to, we could've requested the deferral?

Man: So...

Christina Rodriguez: I'm not saying that we want to. I'm just making sure that I'm clear as to which motion was the one that was (linked).

Man: Did you want to answer that?

Man: They have two. We have two that is (linked).

Christina Rodriguez: Oh, okay.

Man: I think there're two separate questions. If the motion is late, it can't be on the agenda. If a motion - well, then, I'm thinking point of order would be (more) to say that it shouldn't be on the agenda. Second, if it is on the agenda, then it can be deferred.

Man: So a couple things. So number one, we actually never got a deliberate answer about whether or not the motion was technically late. Jonathan Robinson, the chair of the GNSO council, flagged the motion as potentially having come in late.

                    He then proceeded to say, "Well, we're really, you know, very collegial here. We're going to be fair. It's about, you know, we're not going to get caught up in process." And Christina and I actually went and had a sidebar with Jonathan because some of you might remember that there've been process issues with some of our (initial) property constituency counselors in which they were raked over the coals very - in a very public way.

                    So it's just very interesting that now that the very people that did that to me, have a (technical) of which potentially with regard to process and suddenly

we're about holding hands a lighting fires and making S'mores and being really good colleagues.

So Christina and I went to Jonathan Robinson on one of the breaks, actually during the working session on Sunday and we pulled him aside and said, "We are not happy about this. This doesn't sit well with me. It doesn't sit well with Christina. We have a really huge concern. You know, we want to know why suddenly, you know, procedure isn't important and suddenly we're all colleagues. We work really well together and respect each other."

And Jonathan basically told us that, you know, he thought that it would make us look back as J. Scott said, if we pushed this as a point of order and if we were insistent, as Steve suggested, that we push that the motion be taken off the table.

He brought up the fact that we could just simple defer it and that essentially that would have sort of the same effect and so we would make a big issue out of something and it wouldn't really be to our benefit.

We then basically said to him, "Well, okay, we sort of stepped aside and not make an issue out of this, as you suggest, you know, we would like your assurance that if something comes up like this on our side of the house again, that we're going to have your backing and support," because frankly I didn't feel - I mean, I feel like he went out of his way in this instance with Wendy to say, you know, "Let's not make a point out of this."

But when, frankly, it was me in the crossfire, I feel like he was, like, "Oh, I'm not really sure what to do and I'm a new chair of the council and we do need to think about all these rules very carefully." So I am very interested, actually, in hearing about - and I don't know if this is a discussion we need to defer to our closed session - but I do - I would like to hear what people think about how we should move forward with this.

Christina Rodriguez: I mean, one option would be to raise the point of order and say that, although it exists, that you're electing not to raise the point of order and given that (Fadi) has communicated very clearly as I understand it, that this is non-negotiable, frankly I think we come out looking like the good guys if we allow them the vote publicly and then vote against.

Man: Yes, I agree too, Christina. I can't help but feel like we are always in this sort of, you know, we're nice and we lose and if we're not nice we (wouldn't lose).

Christina Rodriguez: We're not nice. They just haven't (unintelligible).

Man: What did you say?

Christina Rodriguez: I think we have a queue. So, I see (Mark). Anyone else? All right, (Mark), the floor is yours but I think you will need to speak into a microphone simply for purposes of recording. And these mikes are awful, so no wonder no one would hear Olaf.

(Mark Trackenburg): (Mark Trackenburg) with (unintelligible) and a member of the IPC. I'm just wondering what the downside is, and looking like a bad guy here? I mean, we're the bad guys anyway.

So we said that we can just kill the motion because it's late and untimely, you know, we're really putting ourselves in a much worse position to the extent that we act like the, quote, "Good guys." What credit are we going to get for that? They're just going to rake us over the coals later, so I'm not necessarily saying we should do this, but what, if any, is the downside?

Christina Rodriguez: My personal view, and I definitely want to get input from (Pedder) and (Brian) on this - my personal view is that (Fadi) went out on a limb for the straw man. This is an issue that he clearly feels very strongly about, that if we elect to kind of defer and basically play the good guy, we will vote no.

It will be a very clear, I think our - I think it would be kind of the best that we can do right now to kind of signal our support for his intentions here. And J. Scott wants to talk.

J. Scott Evans: It's with Jonathan Robinson, the chair, that you're going to get the - that's where you're buying yourself some (critical) capital that you can spend later. And I think that's the importance of not getting in this because I just - I really do think that - and Steve, I think, disagrees but...

Man: Yes, to respond to your question, I guess, you know, will we ever get to use that political capital, because if not, then, who cares if we have it? It's just, you know, it's theoretical.

Man: (I mean, if we get some) political capital we can actually use, then that's kind of a different situation, but that ultimately - or essentially rather - was my question. You know, what, if any, benefit is there?

Man: I think that's a good point. I mean, I definitely share your frustration, (Mark), and I feel like, again, you know we're, like, always the good guys and then - and it does seem like a kind of thankless role. But I do think in this case, Christina, I really did pull (Jonathan) aside.

We made a very strong point on this issue, and I think we will be able to remind him of this the next time this sort of issue happens on our side of the house. So I do think that there will be a benefit to us. I don't think that there is, you know, a huge upside necessarily in jumping up and down about this right now.

And the other thing that we don't even know for sure is technically whether it actually was late or not because there's some debate about exactly when a motion is due and what exact deadline is and, you know, I'm not sure there's going to be a lot of value in pushing that point right now.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I may be missing something here but if this book was a head we would lose. It's almost certain to me. And I don't see how it serves our views - and this is one of the eight points that we raised with the BC as changes that needed to be done, when it has been taken up by the CEO.

And I think he deserves our support for that. And when we are procedurally in the right, because we certainly can raise the question of whether it's timely. If that's ruled against us, then we can also ask to defer it. I just don't see - we will gain nothing, in my view, if no one - no one believes that he NCUC will refrain from turning the same thing on us if the tables were turned.

And I don't know what the chairman of the GNSO council would do in that situation. So I guess my feeling is this is something where we should be taking a public stand against it and that doesn't - in my mind, that's not - when we have many other options that'll be more effective than voting no in a losing cause, let's use those other options.

Christina Rodriguez: Here's the question I had. It seems to me when we count the votes, the motion's going to pass, whether we vote no on it tomorrow or whether we vote no on it at the next GNSO council meeting.

So I guess I'm wondering, unless there's some other calculus that, Steve, you might've had in mind that if it - the motion's going to pass regardless of when we vote no, that - do we perhaps gain more by, A, allowing it to go ahead now, and B, voting no on it and then leaving it where it frankly is public?

Man: Well, one, we don't know when the registry agreement will be concluded, so it can become moot. And we vote - I mean, all the GNSO council meetings are public. Our votes would be publicly recorded. Is this the theater or are we talking about, well, it is theater but I think the theatrical thing to do would be to take every - take advantage of every step that's available.

So it's pretty obvious that if we say the motion is out of order, that we're against it. Does anybody think there would be any doubt about that message? So that - all I'm saying is let's play to win.

Woman: (Unintelligible) member, and my question about these motions is the use in GNSO council of a motion to reverse a policy decision of the ICANN board, I - that strikes me as really odd. Now, what we ought to be going on record about maybe even more so than the question of, is the motion late, et cetera, there's a policy process where GNSO makes policy but the ICANN board then determines implementation and it almost seems like these motions are really, you know, is there going to be a trend where we suddenly try to reverse the...

Christina Rodriguez: There's no policy at play here.

Man: The board hasn't acted.

Christina Rodriguez: The board hasn't acted and there's no policy recommendation either way on it.

Woman: Well, both in the case of the straw man, right, and in the case of the registry agreement, there's ICANN taking action which are we then saying that, you know, that it's fine for GNSO to suddenly pass the motion saying don't do this.

It just seems like an odd process. It seems like that's, you know, trying to refute decisions that have been made in implementation in this manner is not really what is supposed to be happening in the GNSO, right? That's the question I'm raising.

(Ellen Jenson): (Ellen Jenson).

Man: (Ellen), you can go ahead.

(Ellen Jenson):   I am not, by any means, as well versed as you are on the timing and the exact processes of the GNSO and what's the best way to handle it. But it does strike me the one thing I am hearing that could be a bridge between what Steve is saying and what Christina was saying is we want to send (Fadi) the message that we appreciate that he's moved towards us.

And I think that there is a way to support - to express that by delay. One of the messages that I got loud and clear from both what (Fadi) had said in his blogs and again, at the opening ceremony and at the session, is okay, I'm learning. I didn't do the right process. I apologize.

I apologize. What do you want from me? Let's move forward. I apologize. What do you want from me? I think one advantage of the delay that shows (Fadi)'s support is the farther you get emotionally away from something that might have been deemed incorrect - oops, it shouldn't have been this way versus that way, bides some time for the people who later bring it up again to look like they're whining rather than not moving forward so, in fact, that may meet both agendas.

Man: Can I - so can I respond to that a little bit? So number one, (Ellen), I think that's an excellent point. We definitely were able to, in the meeting with (Fadi) of the council, express our direct thanks to him and appreciation for the work that he did around the straw man proposal and we also expressed to the IPT our support for the fact that it was implementation and, therefore, there was nothing incorrect in the straw man implementation.

So I do think that (Fadi) knows and he actually came up to me personally and we had cocktails with the board last night and he personally came up to me and thanked me for what I said in that meeting and told me how much it meant to him.

So I think that he knows that we do appreciate what he did. And just following on what you said, I think you know, we could choose to make an issue about whether or not the motion was late and ask someone to verify that for us or not. We could also just defer the motion which would have, you know, the more effect.

Man: That's exactly what they did in Costa Rica. Let's just defer the damn thing, right?

Man: And we can just use their justification that they used in Costa Rica with regard to the RCRC and say, "You know what? This came in when everybody was on a plane. We have a five, 7000 member organization that's got to look at this and decide on this. We're deferring."

We don't - take all the emotion out of it. Use their rationale that they used in Costa Rica for deferring and just get it off the table. And I'm fine with that and I agree with (Ellen) that the further you get away, I think it shows him support. It gives us time to tell him that one of the reasons we did that was to show support and I think that we should also talk to some of the purveyors of our backend services and tell them to get their asses in line.

Christina Rodriguez: Well, it's hard to follow something like that. But, you know, the other thing that I guess what I'm thinking in terms of the deferral is that I think it does give us a greater opportunity to go back to membership and say here's kind of how the RA RAA issue came up.

Here's another angle on it. There's this motion that's pending. We got it deferred so that we could have a chance to talk about it in the broader context and make sure that we're getting kind of complete input. So I guess I'm now in the deferral camp.

Man: And the one thing I want to add is that we did find out from our discussions with (Fadi) this morning that most of the registrars - of the big registrars now

with the 2013 RAA and they're going to be signing it probably on the 23rd, so this is probably not as big of an issue as it was even probably a few days ago.

Man: Christina, a question about the deferral, however, is you know, there's a way of deferring where you just say we defer it and it's a mystery why or to make some kind of public statement why and give some public support to (Fadi)'s decision. Is that something we should do or should it just be a mystery silent deferral?

Man: Yes, I think we can say we need time to consider it and I also think we can basically say that we are not going to make an issue out of the fact that it may potentially have been late, so we can sort of put that on the record and get credit for that and pat ourselves on the back and then simply defer it for needing time to go back to our constituencies.

Man: Well, but my question goes beyond - do you use this as an opportunity to make some statement supporting our position and supporting what (Fadi) did as the right thing to do? That's a suggestion, I guess, that that would be a good thing to do.

Man: (Joseph), I'm not sure that we can only delay it. I mean, (there's a first vote) on if it's - got it on time. But we need to be prepared to discuss the issues as well, like with you.

Christina Rodriguez: Well, I mean, I think - it's my understanding that it's well within the view of the two of you to say that this is an issue that has - that our constituency did not have an adequate opportunity as a whole to discuss it before the meeting that there've been some important developments in the past two days, that you know there's a signi- and quite frankly, we think we're best served by having additional time to consult and this is a better way to go. We can talk about it more in our closed session.

Man: (Mark), did you want - this is going to be the last session that we're going to take - or statement.

(Mark):   You know, I think the defer, to say that we want to take it back to our constituencies to make sure, it just sounds silly. We want to consider whether or not we should get what we've asked for? I mean, I just don't know that I see the point in that. And I guess, you know, I'm not clear and I've asked six people if they were clear on how exactly deferring supports (Fadi). I mean, you don't think that we asked (Fadi) before.

                  You know, we helped him get them, and now when they're being challenged, we're not doing anything. I mean, instead we can defer and not say anything. I think that would be best. I understand, you know, using that period to say something but...

Man: So there're actually two motions on the table here and I think we're maybe completing the two. There's one that you're referring to that we are deferred to complete the session starting the closed session and that's the one with regard to the straw man proposal.

                  The one that we're talking about right now is about the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement and whether or not it's going to be a maintenance of the requirement that for registrars to service the new gTLD registries that they are signed on to the 2013 updated agreement.

                  And (Wendy)'s motion basically - the current execution is that they will need to be signed on to the 2013 agreement as a registrar in order to service the registry. The motion that (Wendy) has is to put that to the side and to allow the people who are not signed up for the new agreement to participate.

Man: But I think even for that one, it's pretty clear what our position is. There's nothing to bring back to discuss and see if there's any differing opinions. I mean, you definitely (unintelligible), so.

Man: Well, I think in that case you want to potentially delay it because there are a lot of pieces in motion right now and it's unclear where the contracted parties are. And there seems to be a lot of shifting going on because there seems to be a lot of support and momentum building around the 2013 agreement and an inclination that the large registrars are actually going to sign onto it. So there's a good chance that if we defer it, we have a better chance of winning. If we vote tomorrow, it might pass. If we wait, it may go down.

Christina Rodriguez: All right, so are we done, (Brian)?

(Brian):   Yes, just one more quick plug. The GNSO public council meeting is tomorrow from 3:15 to 6:30 in Grand Hall A. I would love to see many, many of your smiling faces in support of (Heather) and I in the audience. It's always very exciting and we'd love to see you there.

                Also, one last plug since we don't have time to really discuss it, there is a panel tomorrow morning that I'm speaking on on behalf of the IPC for the policy versus implementation issue. I have sent around to the list the four questions that the panel's going to be centered around and I sketched out sort of rough answers that I put together.

                I've heard from a few of you about what your thoughts are but not nearly as many and I know I would really value and appreciate it if you could take five or ten minutes at some point between cocktails tonight or before you go to bed to take a look at that and please just email me your feedback in support for what I've said or any suggestions as to what I sketched out. Thank you so much.

Christina Rodriguez: All right, thanks. I think we're now going to move into closed session so we'll just kind of temporarily - I don't want to say adjourn - go ahead.

Man: I just wanted to announce the (members) - we're going to go into closed session that were recently admitted into the IPC on our last call we had right before Beijing in case any of them are here - (Hanes and Goonz), (Valdez), (QBC), Istanbul (Pan) and Trademark Consultancy. These are all Category 1A members. (Brad Newburg) and (Shawn West) as Category 1B members. So congratulations to those firms and companies and we'll be in touch to get you on our list. Thanks.

Christina Rodriguez: All right, given that we're moving in a closed session, if folks could just kind of - who are staying, could move up a little bit, that would be great. Thank you.

END