

Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting

Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP) meeting

Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 14:00 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/>

Tony Holmes: Sorry do we have anybody on the phone line at all? I'm expecting some to dial in so maybe they'll join us later. So this is the ISP and Connectivity Providers Constituency Meeting. My name is Tony Holmes and I'm currently Chair of the meeting. I just want to have a quick round of introductions so the other members can introduce themselves and they'll also be a list which I believe is circulating already if you attend, if you could just sign up on that for the record, thanks so Tony.

Tony Harris: Oh my name is Tony Harris from the ISP Constituency obviously and I'm from CABASE, the ICT Internet Association.

(Arion Gregor): Hi my name is (Arion Gregor) I am the Chairman of the (LATIX), the Latin American and (Continuum) Internet Exchange Service Agent.

(Allen Jerome): (Allen Jerome) from (Fransitcan).

(Akian Amon): (Akian Amon) from Japanese, Japan Work Information Center.

(Iti Opportuni): (Iti Opportuni) from (JP Inc.) as we're the registry of IP address.

Mark McFadden: Mark McFaddan, past ISP member and future ISP member.

(Oliver Demos): (Oliver Demos) from (EKO) the German Internet and (its ramification).

Man: (Unintelligible) I'm the (EKC) German in the next exchange in Germany,
thank you.

(Olivia Mehall): (Olivia Mehall) from (France) (unintelligible) group.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin Vice Chair of SSAC.

Man: (Unintelligible) from Chair of (FX).

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor member of the ISPCP and from the Midwest Internet
Cooperative Exchange, ISP.

Tony Holmes: Okay I don't think we have a roaming mic in here so if we don't I'm not going
to go longer - is there one? Well rather than call everyone to the table is there
a roaming mic? If not I'm going to get on with the presentation here because I
think we need to move anyway and we're a little late starting.

So the very first thing on our agenda was to have the presentation from the
Security and Stability Advisory Committee and let's get rolling, I'm going to
hand it over to (Patrick), thank you.

(Patrick): Thank you very much, so it feels like home, I'm actually employed by (Nick
Nolt) in (Technachange) in Scandinavia, Sweden. So what we're going to do
is try to work through (380 demipoints).

We do them in order and a few times when we have tried to do this in this
amount of time that we have today we have only managed to do the first two.
So I think it's more important to get through things in detail then try to rush

through things. So the Security Stability Advisory Committee was initiated in 2001, began operation in 2002. It provided guidance for ICANN Board support on (Communication) Advisory Committee, self and general community.

And we can give any kind of recommendations and of course to make the recommendations effective we should think about it being (insurmountable). The charter itself says verbatim to advise document community and board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet naming and address location systems. We have almost 38 members and they are appointed by ICANN Board for three year terms.

We have a couple of committees and working groups and work product that do the actual work and to start with we have a membership committee to take care of applications from individuals that would like to participate in the - that would like to become SSAC members. We have a program committee for the DNS workshop we run every Wednesday of the ICANN meeting. And then we also participate in the Security and Stability Analysis working group. The work parties we have at the moment are the (identified used) metrics (rude) key rollover etc., you can see them on the screen.

But we have a work party that's not implied that we will produce a report but it is the case but when we create reports it's done in the work party. So work products are initiated by some kind of initiation event that is coming either from inside SSAC or by an external party that asks us a question. It can often be the Board of course because we're not advisory committee to the Board, but it can also be other ICANN organizations or other external organizations. We have got a couple of question from the Government Advisory Committee for example that we also responded to.

So for example if it's the case that you have some issues you can just send us the question (if that is). The publications that we have released during 2012 and so forth, 2013 we have on this and next slide divided in three

different categories, the domain name system security interviews where we have three different - let's see four different publications where two of them 57 and 58 are the ones that we would like - we are - are the ones we'll go through today.

Regarding Internet (size) domain names we released one and regarding Whois we released two. So we released about four and six, I hope that we can continue the track we are on at the moment to release around six reports a year. So is there any question on SSAC in general otherwise I'm moving forward directly to SAC57. So this is a device that are on internal name certificates and a internal name certificate is a certificate that is for a string that looks like a domain name where the TLD is not allocated or delegated.

And the reason why it's possible to get such certificates from a CA is that enterprises often internally are using non-allocated TLDs for their internal operation. And the Applicant Guidebook because of these things do have a black list of constraints which applicant cannot apply for. It's also the case that SSAC has already written a report earlier that is SAC45 that talks about this issue and that there are some TLDs that already - sorry that there are some strings that Enterprise use internally.

But if we apply that advice on specific certificates the risk is that an entity might go to a CA request authority for a domain name that is in the TLD that does not yet exist. ICANN is allocating the TLD and then suddenly the certificate is valid for a domain name that does exist but the domain name holder is not the legitimate domain name holder but instead the moment they request the CA. So this is something that we found was pretty scary so what we did was that we advised ICANN to take immediate stops to - steps to mitigate the risks that include that we ask - requested ICANN to come up with also a disclosure policy that should be used for this advice.

The background - the findings in this report is that first of all we're looking at the data from the SSL Observatory which we saw that at least 157 different

CAs are selling these internal name certificates. We also draw the conclusion that the exact number internal name certificate that (end and) apply for new gTLDs is not currently known because it doesn't - CAs are not voluntarily disclosing the list and the SSL Observatory they have only probed.

Even though they have probed the complete IP before address space for certificates it's still the case that the only ones they have seen are the ones which are actually accessible over the public Internet, so everything that is behind firewalls they have not been detected. So we - so SSAC drew - drive the conclu- drew the conclusion in the report that the numbers we've got, for example 157 and the number of certificates that you can find in the report is an absolute low order markets - the real number in the world is much, much higher.

But we also find that enterprises do use internal name certificates for a variety of reasons, so this is not something that people have been using just because they go crazy or they try to commit some crime or they have tried to use this from (availability) or something - not at all. This actually is something that enterprisers do which then once again to some degree matches the finding that we have in SAC45 from 2010. So this finding as I said earlier, this practice allows for a person not related to an applied for TLD to get the certificate for a domain name within that TLD with little or no validation.

And when the TLD is done later allocated and delegated it is easy to launch (and a middle attack) for SSLs by presenting this certificate that was required before the TLD was delegation. We also found that CA browser forum which come up with a policy that CAs first of all of course the members of the CA browser forum but to some degree also of course other CAs are following. They were aware of this practice but they have - but their request to its member was to stop this practice by October 2016 and SSAC draw the conclusion in the report that this three year window was too large.

And because of that we - in the report our recommendation is that ICANN security team should immediately develop and execute risk mitigation plan. So this - it was also the case that we found at SSAC that if we release this report there's a quite high risk that people will rush and get their certificates and with a three year window it would be kind of easy for someone to do another service attack on the whole gTLD process. So we decided to hand this not over to the Board like we normally do - or and release the report, we decided to give it to the ICANN security team directly.

What they did was that they without publishing the report they sort of in parallel they alerted the CA browser forum chair person on January 23, 2013. They also briefed the forum at its annual meeting on 5th of February 2013 so we were a little bit lucky that they had held their yearly meeting in beginning of February - it was not an extra meeting they just happened to have it there, sometimes we are to be lucky. They issued valid 96 new gTLDs, it was brought forward and passed on February 20, so they acted really quick.

And that ballot say that CAs will stop its same certificate but end and apply for new gTLD (string) within 30 days where ICANN sign the contract registry operator and CAs will revoke any existing certificates within 120 days so ICANN signed the contract for the registry operator. Now when they shortened this time period from three years to 30 and 120 days we felt and the security team and SSAC worked together and draw the conclusion that when this session - decision was taken on February 20 we decided to release a report which happened early March.

So that's where we are and as a lot of people understand just passing a ballot in a standard organization that doesn't even have all CAs as members it doesn't really resolve the problem, there is also of course some action that has happened here and there in browsers and the CAs actually have to live up to this ballot, etc. But that's still - that's an implementation issue but that of course could be monitored but this is where the work for SSAC and ICANN security team ended.

Tony Holmes: Thanks (Patrick), I've got a couple of questions but is there anybody else that has anything for (Patrick)? Okay some of my thinking here is probably because I don't understand this issue enough (Patrick) but you mentioned there are very (nuances and thing) certificates, can you tell a bit more about other uses and what they are?

(Patrick): Well the classic example is that some setup of for example Mike said the changeover recommend them, that is what many companies are doing - that they are sitting up an internal gTLD that is called a (Cork) and then people use - mail to (Cork) to get to company server.

And to be able to get a secure connection that one you have to buy a certificate to mail to (Cork). And that's why CAs actually sell that because mail to (Cork) - it's okay to sell a certificate for that because the top level domain (Cork) doesn't exist. But now suddenly (Cork) will exist, okay so that is - and this is also so what they are describing in SAC45 in 2010 that this kind of internal use of a top level domain is something that will - that might create problems.

If you have that kind of name space conditions that an organization is using a top level domain internally but actually do exist also in the public Internet it's similar to you who are much more used to IP address space. It would be as - we don't have any private address space and domain names okay, so it would be as people started to use each other's address space because we each have private address space.

Tony Holmes: And so good analogy, I certainly understand that - thanks. The other question I had is that you mentioned browser forum but not every CA has to be a member, is that correct - of this browser forum?

(Patrick): Yes it's a membership organization like not all ISPs are members of this group.

Tony Holmes: So isn't the real risk then that you've hit part of the problem but a bit that you haven't hit you don't know how big that is so how that's going to roll through - is that a fair comment?

(Patrick): Oh absolutely but you have to remember that the whole CA business would not exist if it was not the case that CAs access all of them try to do a good job.

If it was the case that it was possible to get the certificates for domain name that was not yours in that case the whole CA business would not exist, right. Because - so regardless of whether - so CAs claim is actually a business where people actually really try to do the job because you have a collective responsibility to not give out fake CA certificates.

Tony Holmes: Right, okay because the point you made about the timing and you wanted to get back to the stage where you mitigated the risk a bit before you announce it you still got that element of risk anyway, it's still (mapping).

(Patrick): Oh absolutely, absolutely - this is just a recommendation for their members and I don't know the statutes of the organization what happens for example if you don't implement it. But that's why I'm very, very explicit in saying that this is where we are, this is when at this point in time SSAC security team and us decided to release reports (then).

Tony Holmes: Okay so from an SSAC perspective if we get to a stage where we've launched a new detailed (days) and you do get problems from this still, what could SSAC do then?

(Patrick): We are not and will not and don't want to be the Internet police.

Tony Holmes: Okay, Mark?

Mark McFadden: Can I have you go back to the slide that has findings - the third finding - or maybe it's the fourth finding, maybe I lied. Or maybe I can't count - there's a finding about - there was - you were able to do a study or rely on a study that I think was a couple years old about how many of these names and what names were out in public and one of the things - though I can't remember...

(Patrick): I don't have it in the slides but it's in the report.

Mark McFadden: Yes and then I remember it and it's this Number 2, it's the phrase that goes, the - in the end the exact number of internal name certificates that end and applied for blah, blah, blah, unless CAs voluntarily disclose the list have you under NDA or under any kind of discussion talked to them about voluntarily disclosing that list?

(Patrick): We started to talk to them but at the same time we also looked at the data that we had and we discovered that the amount of NDA and direct - around that kind of NDA was absolutely not needed because the data we had was enough for us to draw the conclusion to come up with this recommendation. So yes we started to talk about that but we got such a resistance we understood that we had to include some of the lawyers and all those kind of things - it wouldn't give us anymore data.

Mark McFadden: That makes perfect sense to me, so let me ask you sort of a orthogonal question that one of the things that you obviously thought about as you looked at this problem was that one of the things that many corporations do is have a private name space of their own that could easily collide with new gTLDs, there's no way to know what the population of that would be.

For instance if I were in charge of Guardian Life Insurance as an example, one of the things I might do is actually have a server - I might have a zone for Guardian in my own internal network but I never let that leak out to the public, right in that I actually force any client in my internal network to actually look at that.

It's a different kind of problem but its sort of - it's the sort of problem that made me think about this - IS - customers of ISPs obviously do that sort of thing and obviously the word and the strength Guardian is one of the words applied for. I can imagine that we have in our future as ISPs customers who have private name spaces that they've run that are going to collide right now with these TLDs - is that something that has come up in your discussions?

(Patrick): Please read SAC45 that is describing exactly this, it was raised in September 2010.

Mark McFadden: Okay thanks.

(Patrick): The - to continue (unintelligible) so the answer is yes...

Mark McFadden: Yes.

(Patrick): ...okay, so what is really - what has happened so far is that when you use your computer in the environment that you talk about you are sort of as you said forced to use a known risk over which knows about - knows where to direct a query and it will resolve to something that is known.

If it is the case that this device that is normally used in your own risk over happen to be outside or whatever parameter is sort of making this, what will happen today is that you'll get no such domain or similar that. And even if you are on the outside and you use the BPM as long as the DMS clears goes through the BPM tunnel and in it might see if the records all run the right thing will happen.

Now the bad thing with having the same TLD on the inside or outside is that with the inside you cannot reach the correct domain name on the outside because of conditions of course. But it's also the case that if your thing happened to be on the outside you don't get (an extra) domain anymore you

actually do get a hit and that is specifically interesting if it is the case that you ride a commuter with a BPM tunnel and you happen to have a split tunnel or your BPM tunnels go up and down, you might actually get different responses depending on what DMS query you are using.

So the conflict in the result is at least from my personal perspective and please go back and read SAC45, is much worse than that you get a match in some cases and nothing in some other cases.

Mark McFadden: Right and my point was going to be for the ISP community, I think that is a greater risk to the ISP community than the internal name certificates which is much more of an ICANN issue.

(Patrick): Well just like Mike has said you're going to be open mic yesterday and as all of you know if the Internet doesn't work for the user they quite often call you right?

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Yes so just on that trip I wonder if there's something we should be doing as the ICANN constituency to raise awareness of that? Yes please (Tim).

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor, I'm bringing somebody up to the table on a event and I've already forgotten your name, but we had a conversation about this and I'll let you introduce yourself and tell the collective group your scheme if you would.

(Amy Mosuare): Yes absolutely, my name is (Amy Mosuare) I'm a privacy and data security attorney but I know how much attorney's are valued in groups like this. I'm not completely on the dark side, for seven years before my law practice I was a privacy and data security auditor.

I have groups that I host the Chief Information Security Officers Executive Network is one that I think would be particularly helpful here where we should be doing vetting with CSOs regarding the depth and breadth of this problem and whether or not this problem is a go or no go for new gTLDs and I think we could do that type of vetting quickly if we used internal closed organizations to make the communication.

For me personally my contacts are primarily in North America with the CSO network and also Infoguard which is an organization run out of by the FBI which has another closed network in which we could use CSOs to help vet these problems and really understand kind of the problem at the enterprise level. I would be interested in others who have CSO contact beyond North America so we could help publicize this issue and vet this issue outside of the United States as well.

Tony Holmes: That's really helpful, I mean around this table there are certainly ISPs that should be able to help with those contacts from other parts of the world. I don't know whether Mike has got your details but it would be very helpful to us to have those and for - so Mark and (Patrick) did you want to comment Mark?

Mark McFadden: Yes I was just going to say that also network operations groups whether it's (Nanoff or Ripe) are good places to go ahead and get that information out.

Tony Holmes: Good, good so good comment, (Patrick) - oh sorry.

Man: So when this all started was earlier today when we met and one of the things that occurred to me is that this isn't a really good problem for ICANN to solve.

This is really more of a kind of community organizing awareness raising kind of thing where we as the ISP community and as you say Mark, you know, some of the network operator communities, the Enterprise CSO community, you know, we need to sort of do some sort of awareness rallying campaign

around this to start understanding the depth and breadth of the problem and then also start to get the word out on what to do about it if there is anything we can do about it.

And then maybe come back to ICANN and say, well we've got a lot of instances of situations where this is going to be an issue. I mean give people some data here to inform some decisions about maybe not releasing certain strings into the group. So that's kind of where this is headed and I'm really glad you could come and your timing (speaks for itself).

(Amy Mosuare): And thank you for allowing me to have a moment of your time. The one thing I would just love to leave people with is I work with (people) on a daily basis doing data breach work and so many of them are completely unaware of the ICANN structure. So I really think that this issue will slap people in the face and they'll be completely caught off guard unless we have an aggressive public awareness campaign that's really done in secure channels so we're not really publicizing a threat factor.

Tony Holmes: I think that's really helpful, in the past we've struggled with some of these things we haven't the right audience to reach out to, this time it sounds as if we've got those. I mean it's something we should follow-up on and maybe (Patrick) we can keep close links with you as we do this and get this message out.

(Patrick): Absolutely, I think that's an excellent idea and we're looking back to maybe it's the case that we (in our section) have been more aggressive when we didn't see so much communication around SAC45 which really is when we talk about the issues for example. So let me go ahead, before we talk about this our timeslot - our formal timeslot that we got for you we actually - it's actually over now so time check.

Tony Holmes: It is, what I'd like to do is just check with Mike Silber who's coming on next, can we have another five minutes Mike? Okay can we just...

Man: Sure, (Ross) says its okay to extend it a bit, so in that case I'll move over to Jim.

Jim Galvin: Okay so you're telling me we have five minutes?

Man: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay, so let me just jump right here then - no I'll just jump right to the recommendations.

I mean the purpose of this report was just like we did with a Whois taxonomy, SSAC steps back and we realized that validation is a big part of the discussions especially with respect to registration data, the registry/registrar agreements and, you know, our goal here is to try to facilitate those discussions, try to get those parties to see that there are several different topics that they're talking about and help them to organize and structure their validation discussions.

And so we created taxonomy of validation of data for use in those discussions and this just jumps right to the recommendations here. We have three phrases that we've come up with for describing different types of validation that would be useful in the registration data context. One thing I should point out is that these are intended to be peers of each other, they're not intended to be ordered in any way, one is not better than another.

They are three different types of validation and each is applicable in a different context with, you know, none of them being any better than another just whatever happens to work or whatever's needed is the appropriate way to think about it. Some tactic validation is intended to ask the question does the data look like it's supposed to, is an email address actually an email address if that's what was entered? You know, if I entered a phone number did I really get a phone number?

In addition anything which is subject to some tactic validation our expectation is that it could be automated and in that context anything which is subject to some tactic validation would be something that could be done in line with the registration process because the decisions would be relatively quick and straightforward. So it provides an opportunity for a minimum or a baseline if you will of validation that could probably be performed as part of any operation working with registration data.

Operational validation is to determine if the data itself is useful in the context that's appropriate for the data. So in the case of an email address is it possible to send an email message to that address? You know, will it actually receive something. In the case of a phone number, can I make a phone call and will it connect? And that is carefully distinct from identity validation which is the determination of whether or not that particular data element actually belongs to the real world identity that it represents.

So even though I can send an email message to the email address is it actually the email address of an actual person or the person that it is intended to be? Same thing with the phone number, if I can make a phone call to it and can connect is it actually the correct real world identity on the other side? Now the same way that the tactic validation is - could be automated, operational validation is kind of a mixed position. Some things can be automated, some things can't - it will depend on the data element and what you're trying to achieve.

The email address is a good example, you know, some email servers won't tell you anything if you try to talk to them, some will take anything from you and then just drop it on the floor, others will reject everything, so operationally it would be difficult to validate that in general. Identity validation on the other hand is intended to be a manual process, the expectation is that very little of that would be automated, it would require human intervention and so it's probably a high cost operation.

Second recommendation, this is a set of questions that I won't go through here, the observation that we make is obviously those three types of validation have different cost structures, you know, different purposes, different, you know, applications and this is simply an attempt to detail the questions that one might ask while you're looking at your data elements and considering what types of validation you might apply to it and what would be appropriate.

And in the case of the last recommendation what we specifically look for is that there is a set of validation that one can do and primarily it's a tactic validation, but a few items in operational validation that can be automated. And what we specifically call out is that the community should look to those things that can be automated and in fact should develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those things.

It would seem appropriate to do the kinds of things that you can do easily well - that you can do quickly and easily and make those decisions without delay and that's the end of that presentation.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, on that the second recommendation that you had - that one - that's the area that in the past has always been the real battleground. I'm interested to know when - I know that you've been talking to other people about these recommendations, have you actually had any let's say negative feedback on this second set of recommendations at all?

Jim Galvin: No, no one's given any feedback positive or negative in fact about the recommendation in particular. I mean it hasn't really - it's suggesting a process more than a definitive statement so if it's hard to react to it unless you've done a - or you're asking the wrong - unless you think we're asking the wrong questions.

Tony Holmes: No I think you're asking the right questions but it's the variable we've found now which is where we've always struggled.

Jim Galvin: And I agree, you know, there's always a tension between what to do and what it cost and where it should apply - (Patrick)?

(Patrick): Yes I think what you see here is that the Lamborghini is now out of their playing field, but it is still about three feet before the rubber hits the ground right?

Tony Holmes: Sure, yes that was the point, (Johnny)?

(Johnny Wagman): (Johnny Wagman), do you know of any dynamic study in that direction, I mean of automating identity by integration?

Jim Galvin: Am I aware of any studies that automate identity validation?

(Johnny Wagman): In the academic factor that have any research in this respect?

Jim Galvin: I'm not - I don't know if anyone else wants to jump in and say they know of anything, look around at some of the other SSAC members in the room, no.

(Johnny Wagman): Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay any other comments on this? If not I'd like to thank the asset team, we always appreciate you joining us for these sessions and we always get something out of it. Today we've got a problem that we need to help fix but appreciate that very much, thanks for you time.

Man: Tony sorry before - and apologies for having come in midway...

Tony Holmes: Yes?

Man: ...just the comments that (Patrick) might want to address and that is as I understood from the presentation and from discussion with staff there is a remediation plan around this.

It's not perfect, it's not (turnkey) comprehensive but there is a remediation plan in place in particular having had discussions with various of the CAs through the CA browser community there has been an agreement reached by certain (some) CAs that they will stop the issuing suits for internal use that follow the names that have been applied in the new gTLD program. So I'm not going to say the remediation is perfect and complete but there certainly is substantial remediation, it is on the way and computed already.

Tony Holmes: Yes it second that was also part of our reports that (Theabrel, Siprel and Risell) have that resolution out there and that the discussion is ongoing, so you're absolutely right.

Man: Okay is that something...

Man: I don't want people to start thinking the sky is falling, we do need to take this into consideration but the sky's not falling just yet.

Man: Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry I just wanted to complete part of that which I think you may of missed earlier as (Patrick) also noted that there are a lot of CAs that are not part of the CA browser form and did not sign up to Ballot 96.

And there are a lot of applications, you know, within which (revocates) - some revocation function don't work at all and those are wide scale rather than used applications. So SSAC I think is still considering and (Patrick) can correct me if I'm wrong, the acceptability of this and they want future things may be done related to this activity in ICANN, at least this specific issue.

(Patrick): But let me agree with you Mike that if it was the case that SSAC thought that it was even close, that the sky would be falling based on this report we would of said so.

Tony Holmes: So a bit we can do to help with moving on the right road, thank you. Okay so apologies Mike for the delay with that but we are smart to come along because we - certainly within the constituency have been well aware for awhile of the Africa strategy and I'll ask Mike to say a few words about that.

It fits with some of the thinking that we have in the constituency in terms of outreach, particularly looking towards our next ICANN meeting which is - just happens to be in Africa. The intent of having the discussion today is really to see and start the conversation about how as the ISP constituency we can help support the strategy that's been developed, why ICANN saw the African region. So with that very brief introduction, Mike if I could hand it over to you - thank you.

Mike Silber: Tony thank you and thank you very much for inviting me as I've said numerous times my day job has for many years involved working either for or with ISPs. I was previously a regular IP advisor to the Internet Service Providers Association in South Africa, done a fair amount of work with the African Internet Service Providers Association.

And part of moving from a (alley pace) proficient consulting and legal work has involved moving into working for operators, so it's (PA) South African focused voice and data operator. And currently I'm employed by a (father and V set) operator which operates about 15,000 kilometers of (unfiber) across Southern and East Africa including various retail ISPs that we've acquired to do actually act distribution on as well as wholesale and some retail services across the territory.

So I have some insight. The first comment on ICANN that what I thought was really clever of us but (unintelligible) was recognizing that business has to be

a significant driver, that strategy based on good works and donations or financial support from outside may have a limited and useful impact but it's not going to be sustainable. The second thing is actually letting Africans get involved in developing the strategy themselves.

The strategy as it stands is focused along with the same lines as the ICANN strategic plan but then looking at specific African approaches to address the wrong items in the ICANN strategic plan. So it's keeping it very much in focus with what there is (to view) organization is doing. The first issue I must indicate is that there are a number of Africanized (keys) who are already participating in ICANN. The problem is that many of those people are also participating in their own individual capacity or they're participating in other constituencies.

My involvement in ICANN has been through the ccNSO because all of us happen to sit on the board of the (Inter T-Verts Administrators today) rather than through this constituency and it's often left me feeling slightly torn but at the same time that's where my primary focus has been. There are others who are involved either in the review teams in the ALAC and elsewhere but who actually are involved in the ISP operations. So my first comment is outreach can happen even at these meetings but not necessarily in this room.

And there are a couple of us who maybe should be pulled into this room more often to get involved in some of these discussions. The second comment I'll make is that ISPs in Africa are - and I think similar to ISPs around the world to some extent, fall really within two categories. You've got the small dedicated ISPs that's really focused on customer service either driven by an individual or a small group of individuals with a small support staff.

And then you have those big beasts - the telcos and you have the ISPs that operate as a part of, you know, it could be a main focus, it could be a secondary focus of mobile operators in the big telcos. And Africa is not that dissimilar, the small ISP operators have generally been quite keen in

participation but their resources are limited, they don't necessarily have much as the financial resources but actually the time to devote a full week to coming to a meeting such as this.

And then when you get to the big operators they're not necessarily that keen on democratic process because they're used to doing things their way and they don't want to necessarily want to have to go through a bottom up process where they're talking to anybody else about how they do things and why they should do things - at least that's my experience. In terms of interacting with Africa and how this community can reach out to Africa my first comment is the mobile operators are in many countries the primary ISPs because at the moment very limited 3G coverage that they're offering is the closest that people in those countries actually can get to real Internet.

The ISPs are broken down into the mobile operators and the 3G services and resellers of one or other international satellite operator who - and I find it interesting when you're actually in country and you try to use your browser and you find that your browser thinks that you're in Luxemburg or Israel or one of the other destinations with one of these satellite operators is located because they aren't even localized, they're not the address range that they're using, they're just essentially dropping an access service in country.

So the first entities to reach out to in terms of Africanized peace are the mobile operators and there are a couple of dominant operators, (Atel) is very significant. (MTM) headquartered out of South Africa, (Velcom) and obviously is split between (Vitamcom) and (Vitafind) in terms of how they split South Africa. Orange is making a very big push and then there are one or two others that have come in from India, Middle East, Europe and held between then a number of licenses.

There are very few independent mobile operators in Africa, the vast majority are members of one or other group. And what I will say is that in reaching out to the local as well as head office you may actually end up getting more than

just the African operations sitting on this table but you might be able to drum up enough interest in head office wherever that might be to get some people from there participating in there as well.

The others are the small independents and that's where you're going to find some difficulty in Africa as you would anywhere else in the world to convince an entrepreneur who is running his sort of business and has generated pretty hands-on that it's worth their while to spend time coming to a meeting. In which case you better encourage them and advise them of the mailing lists of the remote participation of all the other tools that we've developed exactly to allow people like that to observe.

And make the occasional comment where they may not be significance contributors in terms of time but where a (salient) remark on a particular topic of interest to them at one stage or another could be all you need because that's the sort of impact you're requesting. In many - oftentimes they're expressing their concerns about their silence, they're happy that there is a group at least that shares views similar to theirs and is dealing with those views in a forum like that.

In that respect there's a number of interesting opportunities, first we be available to some trouble funding, secondly it's a lot more accessible for many of those participants to come to a meeting and in this regard I can mention specifically the entity that I'm involved in the South Africanized Peer Association. As Tony knows well we have a direct interaction with the Argentinean Association, we cooperate on a number of projects but at the same time the South African (isba) doesn't come to ICANN meetings and doesn't get involved here.

And I've been pushing for them to send a couple of people down to the Durban meeting, it means cost it means people can explore from experience and how we can get a little bit more excited about participating in this community in this constituency and actually take forward their involvement

whether it's by direct participation and getting them to future meetings or if it's just by remote participation and making sure that it's added to the mail list people already subscribe to and they contribute by those mailing lists.

South Africa is not aligned, Zimbabwe there is a unfortunately rather dormant by the association. It's managers - while it doesn't manage the Zimbabwe and ccTLD it manages the allocation of names within the commercial space. The (Zimbuinized) the association and is an (exchange pot) and that the other thing is the ISP associations in South African - well certainly in Southern Africa generally wants to operate the exchange points.

And (Patrick) has disappeared but one of the places that you generally see the guys is at (unintelligible) ISOC has been organizing for the last couple of years which is the peering and exchange for that happens in Africa. We hosted it in South Africa last year, it's happening in Morocco this year. My employer for example for the last two years has been one of the major sponsors because we see massive benefits in being able to talk to almost all of the Africanized (people) in one venue and most of the guys are there.

But there are pretty vibrant ISP associations in many Southern African countries. I can speak of Southern and Eastern Africa, my worst African experience is actually that I can offer some comments, North Africa country off of (unintelligible). But East Africa is very strong, Kenya for example - (Test Pop) the Kenya ISP Association is very strong and the (unintelligible) people get from (Test Pop) at this meeting just not in this room - a fair amount of people I'm saying need to be brought in.

Tanzania is also pretty strong, the palace from Malawi is involved in the cc side but runs the universities network. But they're pretty vibrant ISP associations and generally those ISP associations are volunteers from the ISP themselves, it's very seldom that they have professional managers. There are (one or two) we are fortunate to have a small group in South Africa who attend to our secretarial and management and ongoing admin, but

primarily they are guys who have day jobs and actually move packets around for a living and do this on a voluntary basis.

It's also part of the reason why the fortunes of the localized (P associations) tend to go out and down based on whether you've got a committed individual and how he or she happens to be in their day job. Where I think this - the ISPs in particular can reach out to interact with their colleagues in Africa, in fact the African strategy for this recognize that the African - the ICANN African strategy is primarily driven by growing expertise in the continent on business principals.

So mortgagors are selling names, not being given a easy break, he is possibly being given a foot up in terms of assistance to chief technical standards but not a lowering of standards because there's now a new African standard but rather helping new applicants to achieve their accreditation status by assisting them step up rather than downing down anything that we currently do. Personally I think a lot of people would just welcome the opportunity of engaging formally and informally in understanding how different models work.

They've been exposed to their local model, having the ability to interact with colleagues from around the world and exposure to other business models would be very useful. Understanding where the commercial opportunities are, in Africa a lot of ISPs offer very limited hosting but they will (insert) registration so other distributed (and a period) process or just by practice. Most of the ISPs also the defector registrars for the (AC TLD) and quite possibly working as resellers formally or informally through many of the ICANN accredited registrars actually for gTLDs as well.

You know, the usual approach in Africa is you ask your ISP to register and your ISP may very well go on to go there and register your .com through the (gov Web) interface not through any sort of (UPP) interface or formal recent arrangement and they just mark it up and pass it onto you as a customer and

then they agree to procure hosting in the US or Europe on a pretty much retail basis as well.

The name not having any special arrangements because one of the frustrations I can tell you in my day job has been that trying to convince ISPs in Africa to think beyond the sub-right services that they're currently buying, you know, telling guys we're not going to sell below (STM4) caused other agency Zimbabwe. (The cause within) (unintelligible) we couldn't buy this (STM4) level, well maybe we can get five or six of us together and we'll band together to take and (MTM4).

I mean you looked at this and you dropped (doc) down the number and down to an (STM1) and we still got pushed back. And in the end we got so much pushback from the guy that we (order retail wise) and we said, if the market is not going to grow up because we're bringing international (cuddle) capacity into the country. If the market won't drop we actually need to blow some serious wind into this market and open it up.

And when we gave our retail operation serious capacity and they started selling then the other guys started realizing firstly there's a market out there, secondly that on compete they're trying to buy several services and split an (STM1) between a couple of them. They're never going to be able to compete, that's when the guy started buying (STM4)'s, that's when prices started going down and consumers started getting real service.

Decent high speed, high capacity services, but before that the guys get so nervous, they were so (unintelligible) and a lot of it has to do with the history of Zimbabwe itself. But we've had similar experience in Zambia as well, we're having similar issues in Kenya as well. Sometimes you actually need to get these guys out of their comfort zone because for so long they've been living on minimum margin, buying a service from somewhere, trickling a little bit of value ads, working around with satellite connectivity and things like that that

you actually need to show them a new way and, you know, open the curtains and let them see the light.

Tony Holmes: That's been incredibly helpful, (Mike). And some of the problems that you've alluded to, I think, are similar problems to which will in some cases (unintelligible) around of the world is suffer from as well or addressed in different ways.

The other thing is this constituency, it's a little bit different from some of the other constituencies in ICANN because it - and it comes back to the way you set out the problems that you have these big boys in the world that want to do things their way and then you have lots of smaller ISPs. And engagement from them is always an issue.

And it's always very much the case of all the time the ICANN world is ticking along and is fine. Then they think they can sit back.

What we've actually been successful in is using some of the ISP associations in different parts of the world to actually engage with those people. So we get their support. They don't come to all our meetings. But they do engage when they need to. And from our side we - we'll try and keep them aware of what's happening and what's important for them.

There's a focus now with the outreach stuff that we're doing within the constituency to improve that and make it happen in a much better way. And there is this opportunity.

One of the things that we haven't been successful on is basically that level of engagement with Africa. We've succeeded in other parts of the world but we haven't succeeded in Africa. And the very fact that ICANN focused down on this African strategy I think brought that home.

The opportunity for us to do something now through our outreach initiative and also through the fact that the next meeting is in Durban provides us with an opportunity to at least start an engagement. So between now and Durban we would certainly like to try and make some positive steps forward on that.

And I think we should build this into the outreach work that we're doing. And from what you've said once we determine and agree how we're going to do this and take it forward maybe we could use you as an interface with some of those organizations to try and get some more engagement when we have the Durban meeting.

Mike Silber: Tony, it would be an absolute pleasure. Unfortunately we used to have an organization called the (FRISPA), the Africanized (unintelligible) association which unfortunately has largely fallen away.

What I would encourage firstly I've been trying to push my management committee to provide some travel funding for Durban for the South African ISPA members. We do it for our annual internet conference. It's a free conference we host.

And what we do is we allow members who are outside of what - a city to claim a free domestic ticket to attend the meeting. Obviously then they have their eye on accommodation costs.

Now it's something I've been pushing that we embarked a number of our members to since start down. If not then certainly I'll have a couple of people from ISPA in South Africa down there, people who are focused for example on security regards to in both running our exchange points and maybe spending a bit more time with the NRO than necessarily over here but just making sure that we're picking up part of their cost or their full cost if they spend a bit of time with you.

Outside of South Africa I'd be more than happy to help and also outside of the specific ISPA membership in South Africa because of some historic reasons. For example the (unintelligible) and former monopoly fixed-line operator is not a member of ISPA partly because ISPA was initially formed in South Africa to take them to court. And so there's a bit of bad blood which remains over there.

But certainly I have relationships over there that - more than happy to pass on an appropriate acknowledgement again whether it's talking to my employer or talking to ISPA or engaging with one of the other ISPs in time. I'm sure that we could help cosponsor a cocktail function with you, try and get some ISPs from around to come through, engage, even if it's just socially so that we can meet them, you know, and try to do it possibly slightly before the meeting when the schedule is not quite as crowded.

I know that one of my colleagues is desperately keen on getting a golf day going either before or after the meeting. It looks like it's going to be on the Friday after the meeting so those (unintelligible) golfers, feel free to bring your clubs or let us know that you'd be keen on hiring.

But, you know, those are some of the things that will be announced. But I'd be very keen to work with you in terms of actually getting people around and getting them into a room because I think knowing who they are, knowing what their issues are and marrying - either they're happy that you're handling it but, you know, they're happy to receive an occasional email and drop a response to the mailing just saying we agree with what you're doing I'm sure would be very useful to you.

Man: It would.

Man: Obviously it would be more useful if you could get them to become active participants. But even knowing that somebody's reading and watching and

says no, that works for us, thanks, carry on, is at least validation that you're being heard and that you can plan to represent this region as well.

Man: Sure. And that's the focus of the outreach task that we're developing now is to enable us to do that, to make sure we've put that in place. I mean, Tony, was there something you wanted to add to this?

Tony Holmes: I find what you said extremely interesting. It's so similar to what we have in South America.

And we didn't form Cabase to take the telcos to court but we nearly had to anyhow. So we have quite a few similarities.

Aside from that I think that possibly you might consider in your strategy group - I'm doing this in the Latin American strategy group which is actually going live tomorrow. Tomorrow there will be announcements. But we've been working for three months on a strategy.

And basically these ISPs that you mentioned in Africa, be they small, medium or large, particularly if they have any involvement with - well they do have involvement of course with the new TLDs because it will affect them all. And perhaps raising awareness of all these TLDs as they become live and their users may be picking them up, obviously their call centers, their customer support even if it's only one person should be aware of the fact that these new extensions are coming out and exists because they may get inquiries, they may get complaints. There may be, you know, and if they don't know the - what the customer's talking about it may be a little embarrassing.

So I think it's a great idea that you have working on this in the strategy group. And certainly we'd like to see more participation here in our constituency.

Man: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

Man: One of the ways of possibly doing this -- and I know it's already difficult in this incredibly busy ICANN meetings week -- is to try and find a morning, possibly on the weekend before. And I know that the GNSO council is already hard at work and - by pulling the meetings week back from the Friday onto the Thursday.

What we've often ended up doing is just ending up bringing people through on the Friday or Thursday before and sort of been flying in over the weekend or busy working already on Friday or Saturday but to try and find time to do a morning workshop on some of the impact of new TLDs on ISPs.

Again I know that a lot of the travel funding, a lot of the fellowship supports has either closed or is closing very soon. But to actually engage with the team to find out if it would be possible to look at specific ISP travel funding rather than from your constituency that is part of the outreach program to see if you can bring some newcomers through.

And I would do it on a contractual basis where they need to sign a commitment to take the materials that they receive and run a seminar for their colleagues back in their own country. And to me that would be an interesting opportunity to see how you could take that forward cause I think many people are quite willing to repay with their time in terms of receiving a financial benefit.

But if nothing else I'd be more than happy just to engage on - to try and get a social interaction. There are a couple of the ISPs in South Africa.

One of the independent data center providers has just recently opened a facility in Durban. They're very keen to get involved in the meeting. They're potentially looking at sponsoring.

There are a couple of other operators. One of the submarine cable operators is moving up the stack and getting involved in services. They're keen on sponsoring and getting involved and spending some time at the meeting.

There are a number of the ISPs that are going to be taking advantage but - from within South Africa as well as Southern Africa. They're looking at taking advantage.

I'm just saying let's see how we can possibly bring a few more people because one of the advantages that South Africa does have for many African colleagues, first is they may not need a visa whereas flying to Europe, the States, even to Asia they may require a visa. Secondly there may be a direct flight and it's a single-day flight which quite possibly is more cost-effective.

And the other thing is hotel accommodation is quite a bit cheaper. I know not necessarily at the top end. I'm not suggesting that the meeting hotel is going to be a lot cheaper than anywhere else. But some of the satellite hotels are at a reasonable cost compared to the standard hotel accommodation in Europe or the States. And that is likely to incentivize people from elsewhere in Africa to come down especially if they know that there is going to be some specific activity.

I have a sense that ISPs don't necessarily want to go into the standard newcomer track. And knowing that they've got some colleagues over here who are willing to welcome them, take them around, give them a bit of a background, maybe do a little bit of special training for them but also just hold their hands, walk them through the GNSO, make them laugh at the other guys in the GNSO and their issues and some little bit of a background over there I think would be very useful and may encourage them to come more frequently.

Man: One of the notes I've made was to discuss how this fits with the outreach stuff not only that we're doing but also the stuff that (Sandy)'s now running with as

well and the engagement strategy. It sounds as though it's a really good fit here and a unique - at this time one of almost opportunity to get this right. So I'll be very disappointed if something doesn't come out of this that's really positive on both sides.

Man:

Well Tony, one of the things you may also want to consider and being very cognizant of the comments made during our session earlier about lumping the BC together and not ignoring your - not taking cognizance of the very disparate elements of the BC.

I think there would be a lot of interest amongst both the IP legal profession as well as business so trademark holders and the trademark legal profession to actually send people down to a workshop. And it might be worthwhile as long as you get the balance right.

And you might get a bigger attendance if you can convince, you know, if you can convince your colleagues in the BC to run a full-day workshop if you would say the morning having a technical slot and the afternoon having a trademark slot. And you might find that people will come for both.

And yes, you'll go over the head of most of the lawyers in the technical side and you'll go over the head of most of the techies when you get onto the trademark side. But there should be enough sessions in both to keep the interesting people interested.

And it might be worthwhile rather than you trying your thing, focusing specifically on impact on ISPs while the trademark - the IP constituency may or may not do any outreach. The BC generally tries to gradually (unintelligible) effect. But I think that way you could potentially actually use the power of the BC as a constituency.

The other thing is not leave the CCs out. You know? They're coming down. They have a take-down this Sunday. So I would suggest you don't do it on

the Sunday but inviting them to come in as well, looking at some of the impact.

And it's been discussed within, for example, AfTLD, the CC community in Africa but not to any great extent. You know? What's the potential impact of new gTLDs on ccTLDs? Are you likely to lose customers, gain customers? What does it mean in terms of service levels?

And I'm quite sure that at least one of the .africa applicants will be willing to transfer some money at sponsoring an event like that. As the meeting hosts we had thought that I would be more than happy to engage with ICANN staff, make sure there's a room allocated. And if there's no rooms available we'll book something at one of the satellite hotels.

Man: Excellent. Thank you very much for that. Wolf-Ulrich, you wanted to...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well (unintelligible). And it's excellent and encouraging. And it reminds me. Yesterday I was attending this Middle East strategy meeting. It is really similar. You know? The situation is really - everywhere it's the same. You know?

And then I also was advertising for the participation between constituencies. And the question is right now really - actually so Durban is close. It's close. It's just three months from now. And as we all know to coordinate some things in advance it takes time.

So also it was (unintelligible). So the question remains really how we could. But this is the major chance, Durban is, for - to get those people in Africa together so really how we could use effectively your knowledge and your assistance, your help, in this.

I remember, (Yoji), you were referring to these different four, ISP four in Africa calling out to refer in the past - referring to the different right for another right, see, which is our head four and try to get in contact to them.

Also engage - we didn't have a member of us available to those four. We tried to get in contact and convey information to them that they could deploy those information to make them aware about that. So these would be able to help for - if there's something coming up in between from now and Durban and you could be passed this information and the - would be more than happy though to do something for that. Thanks.

Man: Certainly. I think what we need to do is we need to find, you know, I'm happy to act as an interim contact. But what I'd rather do is actually get somebody from our secretariat as he's in South Africa, make sure we can get some dedicated staff time other than me trying to do things after hours and, you know, when I can steal five minutes but actually get us dedicated staff person, get somebody from AFRINIC because AFRINIC is looking at having a two-day event before the ICANN Durban meeting as well.

There are a number of people who are trying to use that opportunity. And my view is let's coordinate it so that you can make sure you can get as many of those people into your event or alternatively your part of that event and it works in a coordinated fashion.

But I think you're absolutely correct. Get the message out. See how you can work more closely with AFRINIC as the regional RIR.

I think there are a lot of opportunities. And hopefully, you know, I know how valuable time is being in this community. I mean discussion with some of these colleagues, you know, whose comment has been well timing allows this work. So we keep sending in here. What we need to do is find some other people who really get passionate about this and then get their local communities to keep on sending them here.

Man: Your presence here today has been incredibly useful. I think you've actually already taken our discussion that we've had before quite a way down this path. So as soon as we can we'll have some more detailed discussion about formulating a plan and I'll come back to you, right? But your input here really has been valuable. Appreciate that very much...

Man: Oh...

Man: Indeed.

Man (Unintelligible) pleasure now. I'm actually a little upset that I didn't actually think to drag Fiona, Mark Elkins, Alan Barrett, some of the other people who are around and who either do or have worked for ISPs in Africa with. So you can see the range of people who are here and who have an affinity...

Man: Sure.

Man: With this constituency but also filling other roles within the ICANN structure.

Man: No. I understand. And we are around. I mean if we got the opportunity to do that we should certainly follow up on that. But yeah, I'm very optimistic that we can make some real progress here between now and Durban.

Anybody else want to offer any comments? But Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think the only thing I want to add is that we sort of accidentally fell into a fairly interesting project that we just submitted into the budget fast track to really shape up our outreach effort. And sort of early on in your conversation you made the point about showing them the business case as to why they would want to be involved in ICANN, why they would want to be involved in the ISPCP.

And that's one of the things that we've put into this budget request is to get some staff support to help us cause we're, you know, we're policy wants. We're not really good at developing flashy, powerful language to get people all pumped up about stuff.

So I've been working with Chris Mondini on fitting that into the broader outreach efforts that, you know, (Sally) and her gang are putting together. And so I think one of the really interesting goals would be to try and have that material ready for Durban so that when we go down there we've got really powerful stuff that we can talk to people from.

Man: Yeah, absolutely. (Chris)?

(Chris): So it's a slightly related point. This is (unintelligible). I think this outreach of getting ISPs interested is not just unique to Africa. Also in Japan we do have like a, you know, 400 ISP members within our organization.

But it's like a lot of the information that ICANN gives out is just not related to ISPs. So it's so difficult to filter out the information. Okay how does it affect us and, you know, get people to be interested?

So I think it will be really, really helpful if we can really like do - have a summary or concentrate on the information that will affect the ISPs' business operation so that, you know, people will know, okay, we'd better get - be, you know, get involved in this ICANN process instead of gong through all these like huge volume of information and then finally finding out this tiny bit that might affect them so just as an interest as a newcomer.

Man: Thank you. (Tammy)? No?

Man: Along the same line I have the same problem in Brazil. And I would like to ask you a question.

For the majority of ISPs in Brazil the access and hosting is much bigger interest than the main registration. And so they don't feel that getting the trouble of digesting all this volume of paper and discussion we have is their time. It's not - the impact is not traveling.

And that's my big problem in Brazil. So I would like to have your comment.

Man: I think it's a very valid comment. And I think what happens is those few ISPs who start specializing sooner or later will become either resellers or registrars. And then they're out of this house.

They may have started as ISPs but they become registrars. And certainly my - this is my experience in South Africa. They may still continue selling some access services. They simply will sell hosting services to line with registrations.

But they've moved their primary business. And if they were ever meeting they'd want to go and sit within the registrar community cause that's where their real interest is and that's where they feel affiliated.

What I'm hearing from a board perspective is that there's an incredible amount of really good content that is generated out of an ICANN meeting. What we fail to do, yes, with the change in website, with some of the other document management issues we've lost some of that or it's gotten stuck in an archive and we're struggling to extract it.

But what I'm really hearing is we need some staff report after a meeting to pull out of all that fantastic material generated, out of all of the staff and the other presentations, the SSAC and others, out of all those fantastic presentations to actually pull it up and say this is the ISP stream. Of all the presentations coming through yes we may not get it 100% right in which case we can go back to the source material. But here is the headline. Here are the 20 slides. Out of all those slide decks that have been showing during this

week here are the 20 slides that are really of interest to ISPs, here are the 20 slides that are really interest - of interest to the IP communities.

That, you know, and even if, you know, it would be really nice if they made them consistent and, you know, if they also gave you it in editable format so that you could reshew to your friends, colleagues back at the office, whatever it may be to show that you're not here just having a fun holiday but there's real work and there's real issues that you need input on.

But I think that would be an excellent outcome. And you need then staff who understand your issues. And it may be one person that can be shared across a grouping of two or three but to some extent people who can pull that out and say of all the stuff we've heard this week these are the key messages for us. Yes, I think some of the underlying flashy marketing to say why is this important in ISP, what did we discuss that's of importance, is useful. But also, you know, I'm expected where - when I travel to come back and submit a one- or two-page summary report just to show that I actually did the work that I was supposed to do, I don't eat room service and watch pay-per-view.

And to some extent using staff time to help pull that together could be a very useful exercise. And it's something that certainly all (unintelligible) as well because - or maybe it comes through on the policy side. I'm not really sure.

That to me would be an excellent outcome so people who are not here can also access that slide deck and say wow that's interesting, I want to go back to the source material for this presentation.

Man: Have you read any of...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Submission because hearing this is great because it's exactly what we've been asking for. Just - and it really fits so well. I - it's nice to know that we have that same vision.

Mikey, do you...

Man: You're not the only one (unintelligible) some of the suggestions.

Man: It's - yeah. It would be so helpful and not just to us. I mean it's helpful to ICANN and it's helpful for the realization of the strategy that's been set out as well quite clearly.

Did you want to add to that Mike, just the guidance?

Mikey O'Connor: Well I - actually I was going to bring up another point. It was more to (Jamie)'s point which is what's been emerging for me as I've been involved here is that there's a whole story to be told about ISPs are sort of at the sharp, pointy end of delivering the DNS and that in fact the selling of domain names, no big deal but the impact on our operations, the impact on our helpdesk when a new DNS does something peculiar is really one of the places that I think we'll be able to hang our hat when we say what's the business reason to come to ICANN. It's to understand the impact on the sharp, pointy end of our operations. And, you know...

Man: I think that's a very valid point. The reality though is the vast majority of ISPs are not going to see it that way. They're very happy you're doing it. They're not necessarily going to send their staff too often.

But giving those people access to the information so that it can filter down to helpdesk, you know, we're spending days and days here. It may only be five bullet points that need to filter down to the helpdesk. If you can help do that you're going to have a lot of fans out there.

Man: Okay. So we should probably wrap up this part of the agenda. Once again, Mike, it's been really useful input from us and - for us. And...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Really appreciate you coming along and looking forward to Durban even more now so...

Mike Silber: Thank you. A pleasure being here. And next time I'll bring some friends along.

Man: Great. You're always welcome. Thank you very much.

Okay. So we're going to get down to one of the parts of this meeting that we always need to go through and address because it's the meaty part of the work for some of us involved in the constituency. And these are the issues around the GNSO and the working groups where we like to review where we are and prepare for some of the things going forward.

And the first thing we've got to prepare for is the GNSO council meeting tomorrow. And certainly we always make a point of making sure that all of our members are well aware of the issues that are coming up, the motions that are coming up and always going to be our line on that.

So unfortunately one of our councilors isn't here today. (Ross Valgas), I'm going to have to rely on you walk - to walk us through that part, just where the motions are and the positions we will be taking in the council meeting.

(Ross Valgas): Yes. I'm happy to do so, at least my half capacity - well half ISP capacity on council.

So maybe with regards to the motions, Mikey, you could put it to the strings if you find it. If you go to the - who is managing that call?

Now if you look at the schedule, you know, it's - of the council meeting on Wednesday, you click on that and there is when I - there's a link to the motions. Yeah. Please. If you try to use them, in between I can talk about that.

So - well the councilor agenda on Wednesday is relatively much devoted to updating discussion on several issues and still - and two motions on the table. But up there in discussion the question for example, there's one initiation of a possible development process on the translation consideration of contact information that is related to the Whois data and those things.

And the question here is so there is - there was a - an issues report given and - on translate - translation consideration of those contact information. And - but it was told we - to put it on hold and not to put it forward to a PDP at the time being as long as these new groups, expert working group, is, you know, and they - in the position where - to come up with first results on that because they are dealing also with this contact data, contact information in this form.

So this is one thing for which we are going to discuss how to proceed with that. We have questioned whether it should be put forward as a PDP or should be put on hold and how we should deal with that.

The other thing is there is a preliminary issue report on uniformity of reporting which I think one of us knows very well about that and could dive into the details if necessary. This is to be given an update also to the council. It's just an update and discussion I hope.

Then there is, okay, the more general discussion to be done about this ICANN policy now and implementation. It's still called the policy versus implementation. But as we had this discussion extensively on - over the weekend that is also a big focusing on what we have discussed already in the

board of GNSO and then updated and bring it to the focus on the council meeting.

Man: But no resolution?

(Ross Valgas): No resolution, no resolution. That assess discussion and discussion of - about next steps, you know...

Man: Okay.

(Ross Valgas): With - regarding to that. So - well, you know, I think we are all...

Man: You know, we should probably focus on the two motions.

(Ross Valgas): Okay. It's just about that, you know.

Man: Yes.

(Ross Valgas): And then there's another update. So the two motions are on the screen.

This is - the first motion is with regarding the trademark clearinghouse and so-called straw man solution. So you remember that there was a fear or feeling of members of the council that the way in which this straw man solution has been dealt with and the way which ICANN came up with that solution is bypass the bottom-up and the stakeholder process.

So - and this motion is about that. So - well - but then the question is well really the content of the motion and the tone of the motion and what it is about.

The motion, if you look at this, at the end in the last paragraph that you see condense over there, says the GNSO council therefore requests that the board reconsider as a proposed course of action regarding the trademark

clearinghouse and specifically that the extension of the trademark clearinghouse claims procedure to 90 days and including of 50 additional terms not to be implemented until these proposals have been approved by a majority of the GNSO council after careful consideration of the applications.

Now that is the motion. The content, you know about that. We have also within the CSG sort of discovering this discussion about that. So we should find a position, bring in the ISPC regarding this motion.

I have to add that -- and maybe you can see -- that the motion came from Maria Farrell and is seconded by Volker Greimann from the registrant constituency. He told me - Volker told me that they are discussing at the moment and how to deal with that motion today as well in their meeting.

Man: Okay.

(Ross Valgas): In the registrar meeting. It's - they'll be sure that the outcome of that is maybe very different so - on the one it could be at least several meetings that they wouldn't like to have the last part of. And it - but it's - the meaning will stand. So there may be also the outcome that there - this motion is to be then changed in the letter more or less to ICANN rather than a motion. It could be an outcome. I don't believe. But...

Man: Okay.

(Ross Valgas): It's still on that. In case the motion is as it stands we should have a position on that.

Man: Well by the way whether it takes the form of a letter or whether it takes the form of a motion we have had some discussion on the list around this. And certainly the prevailing view seemed to be that - because this constituency we weren't initially involved in the meetings that developed these proposals -

the initial meeting was in Brussels and the ISPs didn't involve - didn't get involved in that meeting at all.

There was a follow-on meeting in Los Angeles. And there was representation from the ISPs at that meeting. We weren't the drivers behind the meeting. Then we attended it because basically it was being driven by the other parties in our stakeholder group. So we elected to certainly have some representation at the LA meeting.

It's very difficult for us as a constituency now to come out and say to ICANN we don't agree with the process that was used for this although we didn't instigate it. It's difficult for us to take a view on that when we were involved in part of the process even though we were not the drivers.

So it would be I think fair to say that the views expressed so far have been that we wouldn't be able to support this motion on the basis that we had that involvement earlier. So if anyone has any different opinion on that then now is the time to raise that. Otherwise that's really part of the guidance for our councilors' mark.

You - (unintelligible) expect.

Mark McFadden: Yeah. Is - I'm just reading this. I mean is this motion about process though? I mean it's actually about the substance of...

Man: It's about both I believe.

Mark McFadden: Yeah. I guess they're mingled together, aren't they? Yeah. I mean one of the things that occurs to me here is that it does argue against the process.

But I think that the third paragraph of the motion is about - is not so much about process but it's about the implications of what the adoption of the

authority and the RA and RAA would lead to. It's consequences of that. And it's less about - it seems to be less about process.

And so your reluctance to sort of get on board with it - and I'm just sort of sorry to be a devil's advocate here but I think that the ISP community has always been concerned about not following - not allowing the bottom-up process to work properly. And I really think the third and fourth paragraph here are not so much about process but protecting that principle.

And so I'm just reacting to your comments about well we can't really sign on to something that argues against a process that we were participants in. I understand that.

But I think that we might want to think about supporting something that argues in favor of the principles that we all pretty much agree to. And that is that it ought to be a multi-staker - multi-stakeholder, bottom-up process that actually approves these kinds of decisions.

Man: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think you're -- this is Mikey O'Connor -- I think you're on the right track, Mark, when you say that these are two different things in one motion.

And when I read it I was equally strongly in favor of supporting the bottom-up process. But it's like they've pulled that baseball bat out of the bag and swung it to hit a different target. And the real substance of the motion is the second bite at the apple on a negotiation that's outside the picket fence.

And so I would, you know, rather than making the argument that we can't support it because of the bottom-up - because we participated in the process I would make the argument that all of that process stuff is irrelevant to the substance of this motion. This motion is all about a bilateral negotiation between two contracting parties that is outside of the remit of the GNSO.

And so I guess to refine your thought, Tony, I don't support the motion but I don't support it for a different reason.

Man: Yeah. I - and let me follow up with that. I think that's exactly right. I think that this motion is confused because there's two parts to it.

There is a spanking. And then there is someone telling you here what the rules are going to be in the future. And they're mushed together.

And I think the spanking is unimportant. I think that the CEO of the organization has been appropriately spanked and that's over with.

But the interesting thing is the meat of the motion. And I completely agree with Mikey that it's outside the picket fence.

And so one approach and - one approach for the ISPs could be to make that observation that there appear to be two separate parts of the motion and that we believe that the first part of the motion has been overtaken by events and the second part of the motion is not germane to the GNSO.

Man: Wolf-Ulrich, how do you feel about...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Really I take this so just in case if it's standard is - I don't expect it will remain the same motion if it arises on Wednesday. So I will keep you informed. I do expect today, late afternoon, new version at all - if at all.

So the thing is - and then what I - we - my perception is from the discussion I had after the weekend is that it - we - on council that there is a - let me say a significant group of councilors trying now to convert it to a letter to the ICANN board.

Yeah, not to ICANN but to the ICANN board, writing the hand with regards to the process failures which have been done obviously by Fadi on the one hand. But he was, as you say, spanked enough.

But (unintelligible) and flagging him and saying okay that is what happened and so we would like to make you aware about that. So that is what I'm expecting.

But on the other hand I hear from this - from - if it stays as it is right now, if that would be the case then we would say - and it comes to a vote then it would be negative.

Man: Yes. That's my understanding as well. It would have to change substantially to allow us to support it on the basis of both of those points.

And obviously we have to rely on both yourself and (Rose Varda) on that. Okay. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. If I may, the next motion. Is that okay?

Man: Yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That is related to the RAA and the - these customs have been taken that may (unintelligible).

So it's just saying okay. And you followed also the online discussions on the RAA. And there is in between in that motion there will have been discussions in between and amendment again. So none of you really know this but not really the status of - at the time being (unintelligible) about that.

So - but it says since - one thing that the council recommends that ICANN permit registrants to extend their rights and obligations in the current RAA

and its renewals to the new gTLDs until such time as the GNSO adopts a consensus supporting the policy changes in any proposed new RAA.

So that would mean on the one hand go to the link between the existing RAA and the ongoing negotiations in this respect. And on the other hand we are giving the council the permission or all - to discuss the RAA and any supported - and to discuss policy changes and a proposed new RAA.

So this is the - what is it about the motion and we should have also find a position on that.

Man: Okay. My understanding from the discussions we had previously is that as a constituency we looked at it from a different angle which is being - that we wanted the RAA agreements concluded in a way that's satisfactory but we wanted them to apply to both the new registries and the existing registry operations as well which it seems somewhat counter to this proposal rather than just allowing the current situation as the de facto answer.

A lot of confused looks around the room. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to come at this a different way. I feel like this is just as far outside the picket fence as the last.

Seems to me that what happened is various folks took a bite at the apple. I won't name names. But they're in the same stakeholder group that we're in.

And they got this clause put into the RAA. And now this motion is taking an equally outside-the-process...

Man: The other way.

Mikey O'Connor: Trip the other direction. It's sort of two wrongs don't make a right in my view.

I think that again the position that I would take is this is outside the picket fence -- this is a negotiation between two parties; the GNSO doesn't belong in here at all -- and again not support.

Man: Well it's one of those issues where it's always been difficult to discuss it because there's been this argument if you don't discuss it in the GNSO where should you discuss it. And for me the answer to that is well that's no reason to discuss it in the GNSO. So I tend to agree with you on that one.

Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well for - to my understanding you are right. So we have a - these two parties discussing, negotiating this agreement, well ICANN and the registrar negotiation team. Yeah?

So - and then you say it is outside the picket fence. Do you refer to the whole - to the entire discussion on the RAA, to all items which are on the discussion, to the whole process? Is that what you mean this being outside the picket fence?

So I would like to understand, you know, in - because several times over the years -- it was pointed out this morning -- while the negotiations are going on since more than three years, almost four years, there have been periods of discussing - discussions on council levels. There have been periods of comment, public comments, periods of whatever. You know? Everybody has raised his hand.

Also all these people have not been sitting at the table, you know, the negotiation table. So is that the position where because we are not sitting at the table so that is not our item?

Man: Sometimes you need to look at - take a very broad view of things and - to see how it fits with your overall view of the issues. And one of the things that we

discussed when we've talked about restructuring is that we would like the GNSO to focus on what clearly is within the GNSO remit.

That doesn't mean we don't have concerns about some of the other stuff that we may want to take a view on as a constituency along with other voices. But the argument to put it all back into the GNSO because it doesn't fit anywhere else currently hasn't been one that we've subscribed to.

So Mark, I saw you looking mystified at me.

Mark McFadden: No. I wasn't really feeling mystified. I was feeling argumentative.

Man: (Unintelligible) there then.

Mark McFadden: I don't think that's what's going on here is that - first of all what my take on this motion was to eliminate the second - the consequences of the second paragraph. And that is that the negotiation of the RAA shouldn't be a blocker to the implementation of the new gTLD program. That's the point of the motion, right?

And I think it is - and contrary to Mikey I think it is within the remit of the GNSO to talk about the policy implications of an RAA negotiation, right? I - you can talk about that.

You're not in - directly involving yourself into the negotiations. But if you're interested in the policy you can certainly talk about that, right? So I think that's - that part of it is inside the picket fence.

What I would say here is that the actual resolution is that the council's making this recommendation that the status quo apply to everything until the RAA is renegotiated. And then it applied to everything in the renegotiated part.

There's a parallelism thing going on here. And it's a mechanism to unblock - it's the second paragraph that's the key. It's this parallelism that's being used to unblock the RAA and I - the RAA negotiations.

And I guess what I would say is that what the ISP community has said in the past and I think is true now is that the RAA negotiation should be allowed to proceed and should be completed before the implementation of new gTLDs. And I think that's right.

And so I think from the ISP point of view there's no need for this motion. And we would - it's our argument that the RAA negotiation should take place and complete - be completed before there are new gTLDs in the zone.

Man: Well that was the remark. I may not have made it in the right way. But that was what I was trying to say at the start. That was our position and has always been our position. And that isn't what this says.

Mark McFadden: Right. And I think that should be our feedback. And what I would recommend is that the ISPs', you know, position on this motion is negative in that it's the ISPs' communities feeling that the RAA negotiation should be completed before new gTLDs are allowed into the (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah. I would like to voice my complete support. I will say the same thing too as Mark said. But I don't think the RAA is out of our scope of interest, I mean, as ISPs.

And our point is that the RAA - I mean to say the new RAA should be completed before the new gTLD. And this goes the other way around...

Man: Whether it's out of our scope or not is almost a separate issue...

Man: Okay.

Man: From that. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I - I'm fine with the way this conversation is going cause it's not supporting the motion and that's my main goal. But just to get back to this notion about what's at - one of my hobby-horse issues is that the GNSO council has a tendency to do a lot of stuff that a policy management council shouldn't be doing. And this is that kind of stuff.

They're tinkering with two things at the same time. They're tinkering with a bilateral negotiation that is not part of the council's role as a policy manager. And they're - well I guess that's the main thing.

But the thing about the picket fence is that I don't subscribe to the idea that the Council gets to talk about stuff outside the picket fence.

Mark McFadden: Okay. And let me be clear. I agree with 90% of what you said there. I think that - but the 10% is important. I think that the GNSO Council should never be allowed to participate in negotiations, right? They're not the people who are actually the parties who are contracting with each other. That's - so that's - I completely agree with you there.

But I do think that those agreements that ICANN reaches with contracted parties sometimes have policy implications that effect stakeholders in the community. And I think the GNSO Council has a responsibility to discuss and react to those.

Mikey O'Connor: I agree 100%, but I think there's a process called bottom-up working group blah-blah-blah, et cetera, and this bypasses that.

Mark McFadden: And so that's why my - that's one of the reasons my recommendation is for the ISP community to react negatively to this motion.

Tony Holmes: But I think we're all on the same page.

(Unintelligible) Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. If I understand you correctly, and I think that it's covered here in the - in (unintelligible). If you - with this motion really, so it means, you know, until such time as the GNSO adopts a consensus supporting a blah-blah-blah-blah-blah - so - and this implies to my understanding all this work to be done before, you know, with regard to coming out to a level of consensus.

Tony Holmes: No. I don't think that's the case. I don't think that's the (vein) that this has been written in.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. Okay. Good.

(Jamie): Is opened up a way to circumvent the (unintelligible)...

Man: Yes. That's it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So - then let's try to find out. Is that the way to promote those (unintelligible) to amend? (Unintelligible) come up with amendment - friendly amendment implementing such a clause which - so is that a way or not?

Mikey O'Connor: It's my understanding that the RAA is done. They had champagne. That this is mute because they've got a deal. So my suggestion would be vote it down and await further developments. Because right now I don't see a way to amend this to get what they want done that doesn't you know run outside the tracks of...

Tony Holmes: If you go the other path, you leave the door open. That's the problem.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well, my question is - well, just for me, for the positive point of view, Wendy Seltzer, she - today, I submitted it to (you as well). She resent the

motion as well, and saying, "Okay. Now. It states that it is," but she's open (it up) to accept friendly amendments if it's friendly.

So - and the question is for me is there a way - from our point of view, is there anything where we say, "Okay. If a so-called friendly amendment is going to be accepted which covers our needs, then we put it forward." Or, is it just now saying, "Okay. No. it doesn't matter," so we put it (unintelligible)?

Tony Holmes: Well, maybe you're more adept at this than I am, but there's no way I could sit down and write a friendlier motion - a friendly amendment to this motion that would be acceptable to the current proposer and cover the point that we make. I just couldn't do it.

(Jamie)?

(Jamie): My mood is not friendly to that motion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Perfectly clear and then we take it). No problem.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

So could I ask you to just ensure that Osvaldo is also aware of the discussions we've had go out to the GNSO meeting?

Okay. So moving on from the GNSO meeting, there's a few things that we need to provide an update on. (Clinical) working groups. Someone here is pretty keen on them. So Mikey, it might be the good one start with is the good news one, the IRTPD.

Mikey O'Connor: I will call your attention to the fact that its 4:00 and we're only going until 4:30. So I'm going to...

Tony Holmes: We need to go...

Mikey O'Connor: ...go really fast through this.

Tony Holmes: Perhaps really quickly.

Mikey O'Connor: IRTPD is the last of the inner-registrar transfer policy GDP's and - so we're sort of tying up the loose ends. We're going to take a look at the transfer dispute resolution policy which is the way that disputed transfers ultimately get resolved. Do some tinkering there, and we're going to fiddle around with FOA's. And I'm going to skip right through that one.

Another one that we're working on is called Thick Whois, which is the fact that most registries are thick, so all of the data sits at the registry. But a couple of them are thin. They just happen to be the biggest ones. (Unintelligible) and (.jobs).

And that one's - for the most part not terribly contentious. There's one hugely contentious issue which is what are the privacy implications to a registrant where they have registered in a country - a registrar in a country that has a fairly friendly privacy regime. And now that it's transitioning to thick, what happens to them?

And we had a really good meeting yesterday morning at 7:30. I may have been hallucinating, but we found I think a path through that. And, there's language that's coming into the new RAA that will help that path. I won't go into any details, but that one's coming along.

Another one that's coming along pretty well is the (unintelligible) security and stability analysis working group. And it's coming along pretty well, but it's hit a giant bump in the road that I'll know more about in about two hours. But, there's nothing for us to review or consider or act on right now.

The other one that's active but that I'm not involved with is the IGO/NGO (EIEIO) PDP, and Osvaldo's on that one. And, I'm getting conflicting messages from Wolf Ulrich.

But you know, I think given the tightness of time, we should blast through that one and I can keep you guys posted on the list.

Tony Holmes: Well, it's not going to get resolved quickly, that one I don't think, so (unintelligible)...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...that's a good approach.

Okay. One of the other things that was on our agenda was the reports of meetings that we've been involved in since Toronto. We've referred to one of those already. It was the one around the trademark clearinghouse consultations and the rights protection measures. And I don't really want to go back on that.

I just want to mention everyone should be aware of -- and the fact we're running tight for time -- the intercessional meeting that was held, which was really just our house. So it was all of the commercial stakeholder group constituencies plus the non-commercial stakeholders. It was basically a two day meeting held in Los Angeles and we were allowed to send six people from each of the constituencies to make that up.

We actually did real work there talking about some of the issues that we don't get to talk openly about with the other people in our house. So there was some real benefit came out of that.

Also, it was good to actually have some house discussions, which we have struggled with. We even struggled to get it in the agenda for our meetings. So

most of you would've seen the report that was circulated after the meeting for the detail. But I just wanted to make everyone aware of that.

And the feedback we gave is that we would certainly not be against that type of meeting being held again in the future, though there's no way it can ever replace the actual dialog we actually have at an ICANN meeting itself.

Probably the most important meeting that was held for the ISP since Toronto was a roundtable event. And this spun out of the intercessional where - when we had a presentation from Fadi. He mentioned that he'd been meeting with the CEO's of registries and registrars, and the point was made that the ISP's are just as an important part of the community, and that dialog needs to take place with them as well.

And he was very positive. Seized on that straight away and wanted to hold a meeting at the CEO level with ISP's on the back of an event that was already planned by ICANN prior to coming here to Beijing. And, that was a meeting that the cc's have actually organized in London. So we were not only given a venue for this; we were given a date that was pretty short notice to try and arrange something that could facilitate that meeting in between the ICANN CEO and CEO's of ISP's.

It's always a tough job getting into the diary of CEO's at any time, and to do it at short notice was a real challenge. So the involvement was somewhat limited from a set of ISP's, but we did have representations from both Europe and from South America as well.

And to make it more complex, I - although the meeting was in London, I couldn't attend for other reasons and Wolf Ulrich was going to represent the constituency, and other events intervened that prohibited that happening.

Despite that, the - all of the feedback both from the ISP's who attended and from ICANN staff has been very positive. So much so that there's a desire to

take that forward and orchestrate further events with CEO's from ISP's. And one of the things we discussed in our closed meeting here was how to do that.

And the outcome of that is that we will be sending a letter to Fadi suggesting that we try and organize that next session in concert with an ICANN meeting. And we particularly picked out that the meeting in Argentina would be an ideal time to do that. And, we could bring in a different set of CEO's from a different part of the world probably without too much hassle.

So we plan to work with him to fix the agenda, to identify what other topics that are going to basically facilitate that engagement and work on it more in advance. And we had some discussion around what those issues are going to be.

So we have much more time to plan for that than the earlier initiative we discussed with Africa. And certainly a hell of a lot more time than we had for this session in London that was really difficult to organize in such a short space of time.

So I'd like to thank all of the ISP members who really went out of their way to make that a success and actually get people to that meeting, which I think has stood us in quite good stead.

So I'm going to step on down the agenda in a slightly different order now because I see the people from the Nom-Com are here, and we invited them along. Said we would give them ten minutes of our meeting. We will come back on a couple of the agenda items we haven't taken after that.

But I'd like to formally invite you to join us and tell us all about the Nom-Com where you are and how we can help.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Okay. My name is Yrjo Lansipuro, the Chair of 2013 Nom-Com. Thank you very much for allowing us in. We want to give you basically three messages.

One is that to perform our job we need a good pool of candidates - a pool of good candidates, and we're still running a bit low compared to historical average in terms of numbers. I'm not talking about the quality. I'm just talking about numbers at this time.

So we would ask you to help us in thinking who good candidates could be for the Board? We are - actually know there are three slots there. At GNSO two slots, one in each house, one at ccNSO, and three in the ALAC. They should come this year from Africa, from Asia, Australia, Pacific Islands, and one from Latin America and the Caribbean.

Either you know think of yourselves applying for some of these positions, or invite your friends and acquaintances whom you think that would make good candidates. This is number one.

A second one is that I want to delete and erase a conception - an impression of us - of the Nom-Com as a black box or a - you know, collection like the Cardinals who went in a room in the Vatican and elected the Pope and nobody knew what was happening before there was white smoke and poof - and a new Pope was elected. So we've tried to be different in spite of our red lanyards.

The - in meeting in Toronto for our kickoff meetings, we decided that of course we need to keep the names confidential. That is the basic - basis for our work because otherwise, no one would apply. So there is strict confidentiality there. But it shouldn't be used as an excuse for surrounding the whole thing in secrecy and making a mystery of the whole thing.

So instead, we are trying to limit the needs of confidentiality. Those issues where it belongs. And that means that the process is open - as open as

possible and the data is confidential data. That is to say names and so on and so forth.

We have implemented this in two ways. There is a monthly report card issued by the Committee. The mechanism is that a first draft is produced immediately after the meeting. It's circulated on the list, commented, and then there is an accurate version which each member of the Committee is responsible for sending to the constituents - your stakeholder group where they come from. And I hope that this has worked well also with you.

The other thing is that here in Beijing, we'll have - or we have had already one open meeting. That's to say the subcommittee for outreach Chaired by Cheryl had a meeting yesterday and today. Like in 50 minutes time, there's an open meeting of the entire Nom-Com - Nominating Committee in the same room actually.

So I hope at least that we will convince people that something is going on and there will be more steps in opening up.

The third thing is that we'd like to hear from you about the - you know, the characters, traits, and skills, and experiences that the nominees for these various positions should have. Not only concerning GNSO, but also concerning other posts that are open. We'd like to get that feedback from you either now or later. Talk to us in the corridors or send us email.

I think I stop here and let first Cheryl continue and then Adam. Please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much, Yrjo.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr. For anyone who doesn't know me, I'm the Chair-elect on the 2013 Nominating Committee, meaning the expectation is - survival of course is one of those issues, but I should take the post as the 2014 Chair of

the Nom-Com. And thank you very much for the opportunity to speak here today.

As you can imagine, we've spoken in a couple of rooms. One or two. But our message has been consistent and our questions have been - given back to us have been quite diverse.

I did want to raise a couple of issues as I have in other rooms. However, they seem small things, but they're vastly important. And it's your networks, your rolodexes, your ability and those who you know to get an appropriate sized puddle of people for us to choose from and to have appropriate qualifications and skill set should (unintelligible).

Please don't assume someone else will say to you at the end of the table - you, (unintelligible), "Would you like to have the opportunity to serve in the leadership of ICANN?"

I also don't want you to in any way just know narrow it to the GNSO postings for the Board. There is absolutely no reason why you may not know and be able to tap on the shoulder and suggest to someone who may be eminently suitable to be put into one of the geographic regions that the ALAC needs, or even the ccNSO Council.

Don't just think about your own. We want independent, preferably external, preferably nice, fresh blood and with all the right skill sets to fit all of these positions. So do think about all of these positions.

To make this easy, we had a cunning plan. The cunning plan - this whole pile of wonderful little tiny -- everyone can carry them -- business cards which on one side has the URL for how anybody could actually go in and fill out a statement of interest, which Adam will be talking to you in a moment.

And on the other side was the URL where people could suggest to their best friends or closest enemies how they could be put into be considered.

And for whatever reason, I perhaps - and now after thinking it was a black hole this morning, (unintelligible), there could be a secondary market in them, but if they hit the country, they never got into the possession of (Joy), which is a bit of a shame because we've got thousands of them, but never mind. I'm sure we can get them to you somehow.

What (Joy) has managed to do however is bring me to her own, ever-diminishing pile, and it is getting a fairly small pile now, of the little bookmarks. So we will leave some of those with (unintelligible) who is at the front, and please do take them and you know fold them up, stick them in your pocket or your briefcase, your handbag.

And if you find someone you think might be appropriate at the next cocktail party you're at, then feel free to tap them on the shoulder and try and convince them to come along and join.

Now by that, it brings me to another point, and that is the confidentiality question which I've said (unintelligible). You raised the, "How do we know?" It was actually polled. We did a - they (unintelligible) polling and the evidence was that we would get far less people to put themselves forward, particularly those of certain business and prior high profile status.

Because if it is public that you've brought yourself forward to serve on the ICANN Board, and for whatever reason, maybe that the ICANN Board of that particular year may be in desperate need of a trademark attorney. And if that's the case, then that's one of the filters that will be applied.

So it's no reflection on the status, and ability, and CV of the person that's applying, but many, many apply and only a couple will ever make the cut, and

that is something that may not be desirable to be printed on the front page of the morning newspaper. It may affect some people's business networks.

And it certainly, according to them, not to us. According to them, would affect their likelihood to apply. It is the way it is.

Now along those lines, if you have applied in the past and have been unsuccessful, and indeed if you know people who've applied in the past and have been unsuccessful, remind them that it's all about (unintelligible) for any given year. So do not think that, "Oh, well I tried that back in whenever. I won't do that again." That's not a good argument.

You really should keep trying because it's your information, the community information, even the Board, particularly after the ATRT1, gives us the core criteria we need to look for.

Two things there. We therefore need enough people with that core criteria or the fallback position may be whatever is left in the puddle because we can only appoint from the people we have putting themselves forward.

And the deadline this year for that is the 1st of May. So it may seem like a short time to you. It seems like it's a very, very short time to me. But, it's only possible for someone to put their name in.

A question raised in other rooms was would the statement of interest that - although that's a throw over to Adam to talk about. Is that it is an online form and do you really expect the, you know, Chief Financial Officer -- or insert name, whatever it is -- to fill out one of those? My first response is, "Well, what's their PA for if not for that?" But that - it was a matter that's been raised because - we are not just doing our own outreach and asking you all to do outreach as well through the community.

We have contracted with a professional search agency. They did point out exactly the same thing, that the people they contact don't normally have to fill out an online form. And we said, "Yes? Well tough."

Everyone (unintelligible) dealt with it exactly the same outline here in the wonderful world of ICANN. And all right, yes - we'll look at their surveys first. But obviously, they still have to fill out the form, so it's one of those it happens stories.

And at that point, if I've filibustered long enough, I'll toss it to Adam. Thank you.

Adam Peake: Thank you. I'll try and be quick.

Very quickly - okay, so Nominating Committee like most councils and other groups within ICANN has its own Web page, and that is noncom.ican.org. Sorry, I've got a cold, so it's a bit (unintelligible). nomom.icann.org.

If you'd like to look at the statement of interest form which is our application form, add a slash with the word apply and that will take you to the application form.

Something we find particularly useful and would like you to think about very hard is to suggest and recommend candidates, and you can do that by using the slash-suggest, and that will take you to an online form which will allow you to recommend somebody. That can either be done anonymously if you wish, or with your name attached to the recommendation.

It's helpful because it gives someone the encouragement that there is support for them already within this community. So I think you can imagine receiving a recommendation and somebody you know has said, "I think this person should apply," is a strong impetus for them to do so. And so there's two things on the Web site there.

You'll also see a lot of information on the Nominating Committee Web site about the types of characteristics and skill sets and so on, and these are things that we've been developing over the years but have grown, particularly since the ATRT report and the recommendations that came out of that.

And, we'd be very interested in your thoughts on have - are we describing the types of skills and the candidate profile accurately? What's missing? Looking it in aggregate, it's an enormous list, but you know your expertise, your knowledge would be very helpful.

So if you can take a look at that and feed it back through to Tony, your representative, that's excellent. Or, you can talk to any of us. But Tony's a very effective member of the Nom-Com and (unintelligible) as a partner. That Tony. Not the other Tony. Although, Tony's tend to be on the Nom-Com quite a lot.

Anyway, so thank you very much and you know, you're help is much needed. We need you to help us suggest candidates. The more candidates we have, the better candidates we have. It's a hard job, but it's - that's where we'll find the right people for ICANN. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just (thought of something) that Adam normally says but he left that part of the script out because he's headed for the (unintelligible). Normally - but right now, he's also got a cold. That's another issue. Is that - it's an Australian humor thing, and Mikey cannot manage it. He loses it every time. I shouldn't be in the same room with him really.

With the form, the online statement of interest, we can get down on bended knee and apologize, but (unintelligible) again, at least for this year. The form doesn't alter or save. Oops.

So if you just put the world's best reason why you would be the ideal Board member in and then you move across to just pick up the URL from some other page, guess what? The data won't be there when you get back. We - it is fixable. It is to be fixed, but not during this active phase. It won't be a problem next year. It is a recognized problem this year.

So please, if you don't want to tear your hair out or give up, it's probably a good idea to import your important bits from an external document.

Thank you.

Adam Peake: Prepare offline.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you very much.

Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. Well every question and every comment - question just - you mentioned that you engage a professional firm - search firm. Is it related only to - for the Board members (unintelligible), or also for (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This year, yes. Just the Board.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Got it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Note what I said.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This year just the Board.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I would like to know that because if I talk to people to apply for the GNSO, I would like to know this about that.

So the other thing is with regard to the GNSO and thinking about that. Not having specific person in mind, but in order - we have always a lack of participation from several regions. It's this outreach - it is general outreach problem.

Yesterday, I attended this Middle East strategy forum. So there was (unintelligible) that was for the - from some specific areas, there is no participation for example from the business community in that area, for example, and from other communities as well. And but we know there are business communities, but we don't know how to get there.

So my question is how to - how you are doing (unintelligible) and if you could approach those communities as well.

The other thing is - the last comment is we have been from a - and how can I say it from a point of a vice-Chair of the GNSO. It has been very lucky that some decisions taken by the Nom-Com in the past with regard to Nom-Com appointees. I would like (unintelligible) call some names, but (unintelligible) really we have been lucky and you should take that into consideration.

It may be that those people may even apply again for that, and I would be happy to have them again on the - to see them again on the Council.

So - but that is my personal view. Thank you.

Yrjo Lansipuro: The - if I can answer directly to this (ability). As far as the - those regions are concerned which are now under-represented, first of all as you all know, we've been - they bylaws set us some framework which is quite right (unintelligible). It says that no region can send more than five representatives

- I mean total of five voting members to the Board. On the other hand, each region has to be a minimum of one.

But still, I mean within those limits there are clear imbalances and we try to do something about them.

This year, the instructions to this recruitment (form) included specifically a couple of regions. That is to say Africa and Eastern Europe, which are definitely under-represented. So we told them to look for good candidates which are specifically in those areas.

And of course, there's been outreach in Africa. One of our members went to (unintelligible) for this big meeting (unintelligible) - whatever was his name, so that - so that - we've been trying to do what we can.

But still, I repeat what I said earlier. We still need more representatives.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Was there another question?

Adam Peake: Yes. (Unintelligible).

I think it's good questions and it's somewhat cultural. But about the surveying of people, what's happened on two occasions is that people who've been appointed by the Nominating Committee have been asked, "Would you have applied had your name been public?" And I don't remember the numbers, but it's about 40% simply just said no. So we would've lost 40% of successful candidates because they wouldn't have gone into the process in the first place.

And looking around the room, and you probably know that I live in work in Japan and I think about Asia. I think it would be very difficult culturally for senior Asian people to put their names up for a process like this. They prefer the anonymity.

And it's not because once they're on the Board they won't speak. It's because they would be losing face if - "Who on earth is this Adam Peake denying me a place on this kind of," you know, you don't want to go through a process like that.

Something that would worry me, and particularly I think in social networking, and I'm going to say this personally as myself, is that you could just imagine the Twitter storm of negative lobbying that might occur with some people applying. And it would be unfortunate you know, and it does happen.

And I'm trying to think of - you may think of some negative communication that happens in other areas of ICANN, and just imagine it extending to individuals who are trying to volunteer their time.

So perhaps we're being overly sensitive, but I think it's an area where sensitivity is probably good.

Yrjo can talk to how he feels about how does the Nominating Committee feel if somebody says, "I'm a candidate," which is a little bit difficult because we generally don't - if I say, "I'm a candidate," then the Nominating Committee won't then say, "Yes. He is." So that - you can't really prove it.

But no, the Nominating Committee does not think negatively of that person necessarily. It might tell you something about the person. They might be you know an advocate for openness and so on. So - but how an individual Nominating Committee member would view that is up to them. But no, it doesn't necessarily mean negative.

Tony Holmes: I'm sorry, we're running rather tight on time. But just a few comments which I hope may help you; although, some of the comments aren't going to help this time around. They may help you in the future, (unintelligible).

The issue that we were just discussing about becoming public, here's another element to that, and that is that if you're volunteering for some of these posts, in particular at the Board level in ICANN, you're actually committed to give a huge amount of your time to that work.

And for some people to be in a position where they're saying, "I'm volunteering to stand for this position and I'm willing to give up all of this time," certain other people may be asking, "Well, what are you doing now if you've got all that spare time?"

And I don't mean that lightly. I mean, there is an issue there. If you can devote that amount of time to something new, people might think you've got all of this spare time anyway to do other things.

The other point I wanted to make is you referred to the issue of getting the message out there that people should apply again because you may not fit one year, but you'll be a good fit another year. I think that's a really good point, but I don't think the Nom-Com have been really good in getting that message out there. That might be something you want to think for next time around.

The other points that I thought about the other day when I listened to Fadi's presentation about engagement and bringing people into ICANN, I think that's a real focal point there for the Nom-Com in future years.

Because for people who aren't aware of ICANN, but would be really valuable, independent people, it would be really helpful if there was a space on the ICANN site somewhere that was dedicated to people who want that correct level of information if they're thinking about applying. It doesn't exist today and it needs to be tailored purely for that alone. That would be helpful.

And the final point is I'm talking to some new Board members since I've been in Beijing. They all admitted that they go through quite a long period of time

learning what ICANN is about before they can become effective to the right degree. So there's also a need I think for tailored introductory training for newcomers who are successful through the process, and that doesn't exist today either, and that's quite specific.

Thank you.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Thank you very much. These are very, very good points.

Engagement, yes, and the time commitment. I think that when people look at this time commitments, they need to be realistic because there have been cases where people say, "Yes. Yes. We can - I can certainly do that." And then the you know reality kicks in, and what we have is that there's no time for that.

On the other hand, what we need is not just people who think that, "Okay. I mean I devote you know this and this another time, and that's fine, and then I'm free to do other thing." And I'm - (unintelligible) quote Fadi again, he talks about passion - passion for the Internet and passion for the ICANN. And this is what we would need. I mean passionate people who don't count the hours that they work for the ICANN.

But then again, another reality gets in - I mean, they may have their day jobs or whatever, so things are not so easy.

You also touched another thing, which is important, and that is that there is no real continuity now in this process. I mean each Nom-Com is like - is one whole. And after our period as Nom-Com members is over, we are actually now, according to our own procedures, are - we are required to destroy all material relating to candidates and so on and so forth. And then the new Nom-Com is appointed and they start from the scratch again.

So we have been talking on the committee and it's of course of special interest to Cheryl because she will Chair next year's committee. What could we do so that there actually would be more continuity in this process and it would not completely stop after every annual general meeting. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you.

Mark?

Mark McFadden: Can I just make - I know we're sensitive on time, but - and in full disclosure, I actually served on the Nom-Com with Adam for two years and still talk to him.

But in the - while this doesn't appear in the Nom-Com 2012 report, in the Nom-Com 2007 and 2008 report, there were specific recommendations about continuity and the ability of the Nom-Com to actually contact previous year's applicants.

And of course that process isn't available to you this year, but thinking about future years, perhaps looking to previous year's Nom-Com reports for those recommendations? Because, they were concrete recommendations made to the Board to change the Nom-Com process to introduce that continuity, which I think was very important. I think we lost - I think in the years that I was on the Board; I think we lost some very good candidates because we couldn't reach out to them again.

And so one of my recommendations would be to look at previous year's Nom-Com reports when you're thinking about recommendations at the end of the process.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks.

Tony, quick last word?

Tony Holmes: Yes, very quickly. That's very important.

Excuse me.

Because sometimes - I've been on Nom-Com three years. This will be my fourth time. Sometimes we have found that we can't fit all the good candidates we see on the table. We just don't have room to fit them in on one year. And perhaps, the spillover could be used in the following - on the following year? So that's a very good point.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thank you very much for joining us and (unintelligible), and we're hopeful we can look forward to seeing the results of your work. Thank you.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Thank you very much for listening. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay, so we've got a couple of items just to cover off very quickly, and I'm aware we're somewhat overrunning, so I'm going to try to do those within no more than five minutes each before we can wrap up the meeting.

The first is to mention where we are with the budget process. And I think I'll turn over to Mikey, who's done the really hard lifting on this in the last few weeks, just to say a little bit about where we are with the advance submissions that have gone in from the constituency to the budget build process for the next financial year.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Tony. It's Mikey.

There were two - there are two waves to the budget process. There's the fast track. The deadline went by a couple of weeks ago. And then there's the normal process which is coming up in a couple of months. And we put in two requests to the fast track. The objective of the fast track is to get things moving quickly that are pretty urgent.

And the two that we put in were one for officer travel. So we've got funding for that piece of thing, and the other was for the outreach program, because there's a fair amount of urgency there. And I think the - just a highlight for each.

On officer travel, I went ahead and invented a new idea and I said, "Funding for officers and working group chairs," because I'm a maniac about working groups. And, decided to subversively insert working group stuff into our budget, and we'll see what kind of ripples that had. I did it entirely without permission and I'm not ashamed of it, (dang-nabbit).

So that's the one thing.

The other thing that I did also entirely unsupervised, went completely off the reservation, is I collaborated with (Chris Mondini), who is the new sort of - I don't exactly know his role, but he's a part of (Sally Kosterton)'s outreach - global outreach program. And we sort of collaborated on this much bigger project than ISPCP is ever going to get funded for.

But (Chris) and I collaborated with (Javier), the controller, and (Javier) said, "Put everything you want in, and I will distribute where the money comes from and what budget it goes into." So the outreach proposal is one that we might want to circulate to the list at some point, because it's quite a bit more detailed and (projecty) than the last one.

But the big goal is to get staff support to help us develop - you know, I mentioned it when (Mike Silver) was here, this assemblage of really good material and a really good strategy, and so on and so forth. And in five minutes, that's tough to cover.

So anyway, that's the budget.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

And just a - before I hand it over to Tony, you mentioned circulating the budget proposal on outreach. I think it would be good to do that before we actually had an outreach bucket - an outreach call. And then anyone who's got any questions on that - because there's a lot of information in there that probably would raise questions.

Anyone could come in too on that call.

Take it away, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I have a question for you Mikey, since you went subversive and did things on your own. Did you remember to ask for champagne and caviar in our meeting rooms?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry.

Tony Holmes: I'm so mad.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll sell a domain name and buy it myself.

Man: That's just a pity. What a wasted opportunity.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

And talking of opportunities, Tony, the other issue on our agenda that we haven't fully covered is the outreach activities ourselves. And we've put some substantial effort in to that recently. You put a lot of substantial effort in, so maybe you could just say a few words as to where we are with that initiative.

Tony Holmes: Well, I have to be embarrassed to say for the last three months I've been struggling with this, but we finally have final consensus (unintelligible). What we've developed for the what we're going to call the ISPCP Bulletin Number

1 is a series of articles - I'll just read the titles; New gTLD's, The GNSO PDP, The ISPCP Mission, A Report on the IGS 2012, a very good article written by a Chairman on the (Wicket) meeting in Dubai which I'm - I think it's really excellent.

We have materials - in the materials the (R/IR) outreach text, which ICANN already proposed, including the bulletin. Then we have a report on the CEO's Roundtable, an article on working groups, which (unintelligible) of course, and - well that's about it.

And now, the task is to figure out exactly where to put these in the bulletin and how big we need the bulletin to be. And we're sort of still shifting ideas around on that, but we should have that straightened out before the end - (unintelligible) the week anyhow so we can take it to print.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you.

So I mentioned we're overrunning, but I should still ask if there's any other business before I do?

Wolf Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, it's related to that. I'm sorry. (Unintelligible).

So the question is for me, you're talking about the bulletin which would contain this material. So is it the intention, or are we talking about this like a kind of a couple sheet of paper of (unintelligible) people like with the BC's or kind of material will be (unintelligible)?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

It would take the form of a brochure. It's - the number of (unintelligible) is as Tony said, it's somewhat flexible at the moment. It was initially looking at

some form of double sheet, but it's expanded out. So there's a substantial amount of stuff there.

One of the issues that we're still deciding is how much of that stuff goes in the bulleting, the brochure itself? How much goes on the Web site? And, there's going to be links to various articles on the Web site.

So, that was the discussion that Tony was referring to taking place over the next week. The intention is not only to have these things to distribute in Durbin, but also at a number of other (unintelligible) forums beforehand where we can hopefully do some substantial outreach.

And just a conversation we had today with (Mike Silber). Obviously, we would target some of the meetings that he has access to in Africa beforehand.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: But when is that available? And you said that's (unintelligible) it is (unintelligible)?

Tony Holmes: The budget for the current financial year covers all of this initial work, so that's another reason it has to be done way before June, because that's the end of the budget cycle. So the budget's there. It's ready for us to use and it covers everything we need for this and a little bit more.

(Jamie)?

(Jamie): I just strongly recommend that we have a smaller version of the - either in print, then also for distribution by mail - something, and a link to the whole (unintelligible) that (unintelligible) - like Mark said in the main points to be extracted to draw attention.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

That's something we hadn't discussed. It's a useful idea and we should talk about that in our discussions over next week how we can fit that in. But thank you.

(Unintelligible) Mark, did you want to say something?

Mark McFadden: All I was going to say was that I assume that the brochure is being developed in a way so that it's a PDF as well and Mikey, in his usual way, will post it on the Web site.

Tony Holmes: Mikey does exactly what he wants. He just told you that.

Yes. No, you're right.

Mark McFadden: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I just make you believe that you wanted me to do it that way?

The links (Jamie), to your point, that - we've created the links. We haven't poured the content into those links yet, but it's ready to go.

(Jamie): Whatever.

Man: I just wanted to follow-up one last point that we discussed when we met in Toronto regarding the possible membership of an US association called the i2 Coalition, and you had a phone call with David Snead in November.

And as David is in the room, I just want to suggest to give him a minute to present his associations and especially his members so that we have a basis to decide about a possible application for membership.

Tony Holmes: More than happy to do that.

So if you want to come to the table, David, you're more than welcome.

David Snead: Okay. Thanks for the opportunity to talk.

Mikey O'Connor: David, I just want to apologize. I have another meeting. I don't hate you.

David Snead: I try not to take things personally.

So I'm David Snead. I'm one of the co-founders of the Internet Infrastructure Coalition. The i2 Coalition is a group of infrastructure providers that are based primarily in the United States or have operations in the United States.

The group is primarily made up of people who are organizations and businesses who are involved in the Internet infrastructure, and that would be Web hosts, data centers, software as a service providers, application as a service providers, and people of that nature.

The group's goal with regards to ICANN is two-fold, and the reason that I'm here is first to find a place where we can work to help our members understand better how to work within the ICANN structure. So that's my - that's the primary focus.

The second focus, and actually the reason that the members are sending us here is to support the multistakeholder model. What we found was that our members really looked at ICANN as a counterweight to the ITU. We've gone to Toronto just kind of as an exploratory effort, and our members came back and just said, "You really need to continue to go because we see this as a great counterweight."

What I'm doing here and what the other co-founder will be doing in Durbin is trying to find out where the best place for us to be? Our members don't really fit neatly in any of the constituencies. We do think that because of the businesses, the ISPC is actually a very natural home for us.

What we've been doing lately is - just in terms of advocacy is we've been advocating in the United States on legislative issues, and we also work internationally with some other groups. So, I'm happy to chat about what we do or take any questions about why I'm here. So...

Tony Holmes: Great. Thanks for that.

We have had some discussion in the past. You mentioned in your presentation that you didn't see an exact fit anywhere but a fit in various places. And I think we do need to iron that out.

The one thing I will say without any doubt, that - I think that there is a need for engagement from your sector that hasn't been dealt within ICANN efficiently before. That really is something that has to be fixed one way or the other. So we're happy to work with you to progress that and see if we can provide a hook in there.

You mentioned some of the engagement with ICANN as a counterweight to the ITU, and I think that's a similar path to which many of us would be allied to that cause, certainly on issues that are pertaining to the Internet.

So I think the message I can give you from now is that I haven't got all the answers that you want. We need to continue that dialog. But, we are 100% with you on engagement. We really are. And we'll work with you all we can to fix that.

David Snead: Great. I mean that's super to hear.

We're available, and I'm here until - I don't know, until Monday, so I'm happy to chat about what we do and why we're here, and why we think we'd be a good fit.

Tony Holmes: And it would be good if you could chat with as many members of the constituency as possible.

David Snead: Absolutely.

Tony Holmes: We welcome everyone to have that dialog and then we can take it further.

Thank you.

Okay. So with that, I'm just going to thank everyone for attending and close the meeting, and look forward to seeing you all around during this meeting. And for those who are members, on our next conference calls and further activities. Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: We - I think we have to take that to the mailing list. We have to - because that's a - it may sound as straightforward

END