

Connecting

Connected!

--- Welcome to ICANN ---

Janice_Douma_Lange: great music to start things off

Sean_Powell: I concur :)

Robert_Hoggarth: session will be beginning shortly

Robert_Hoggarth: welcome everyone

Robert_Hoggarth: During this forum we will be accepting remote questions and comments on the Wufoo form system that was so popular in Nairobi. The link to the form for each topic will be in the session details box for each topic to the right of this screen.

hta1: hello everyone

wseltzer: hi hta1

George_Kirikos: Hello.

George_Kirikos: Do we submit questions using the wufoo form today, for the public forum?

SeanPowell: Yes

Jorge19856: we are really improving I believe that this one of the first meetings that is almost troll free in regards of remote participacion

George_Kirikos: Just sent:

George_Kirikos: As ICANN acknowledged a few days ago, they have apparently read the Tim Berners-Lee document which opposed the introduction of new TLDs, including .xxx. He wrote that:"The root of the domain name system is a single public resource, by design. Its control must be for and, indirectly, by the people as a whole. To give away a large chunk of this to a private group would be simply a betrayal of the public trust put

George_Kirikos: Looks like my question is first. :)

Robert_Hoggarth: if you successfully complete your form and get the confirmation yo don't need to put it in the chat

George_Kirikos: Sorry, Rob.

wseltzer: Iso tunneling

George_Kirikos: Hey Wendy.

wseltzer: sorry, network lag is challenging in the room

Robert_Hoggarth: @george ... just trying to save your typing fingers

George_Kirikos: Just cutting/pasting, no trouble at all. :)

George_Kirikos: Cutting/pasting, like NAF panelists do. :-)

George_Kirikos: Lots of ICANN staffers in chat....maybe make them all be "admins" (so they appear in yellow on the list)? Then we can see how many normal folks are participating....

Patrick_Jones: We're not normal George?

Robert_Hoggarth: tech's checking the lag issue ...

Doug_Brent: Quick count by me is about 11 staff

Robert_Hoggarth: bandwidth issue

George_Kirikos: "Normal" in the sense of not being ICANN staff. :-)

Doug_Brent: In chat in case there is a quick comment/question that can simply be answered on line.

George_Kirikos: Didn't they say earlier that there would be equal access between live and remote questions? Looks like it's 3 live questions, zero remote.

George_Kirikos: Nice clock in the top left.....like the Academy Awards....time to start the orchestra.....

Robert_Hoggarth: you're not forgotten Mr. K!

George_Kirikos: Thanks. I guess they need the time to prepare an answer....hopefully they'll be better than last time....

Kieren_McCarthy: It is possible worth pointing out at this point that Tim Berners Lee subsequently changed his mind

Jorge: that statement from Tim is about 6 years old

George_Kirikos: That's an official statement of the W3. Still active on their website.

George_Kirikos: (and it's not just Tim Berners-Lee, it's that of the W3 Consortium)

Kieren_McCarthy: It is also worth pointing out that it also warned that .mobi would have a terrible impact on the DNS. Seems to be working fine to me many years later

AttyJones: Was it my imagination, or did George Kirikos just get stonewalled for the second time on the Tim Berners-Lee study question?

George_Kirikos: Kieren: It appears .mobi went exactly the way TBL said.

George_Kirikos: Take a look at the financials of .mobi. Mega-losses.

George_Kirikos: Afiliias had to buy them out.

Jorge: many fancy new gTLDs will go through that phase, too much hype on some names

George_Kirikos: AttyJones: You can always go to the mic, and ask if I got stonewalled. :-) Of course, then they'll stonewall you too.

George_Kirikos: Go Paul.

George_Kirikos: Yikes.

George_Kirikos: Paul gets an answer, but I don't. lol

AttyJones: Maybe you need to attend a meeting in person.

George_Kirikos: The questions speak for themselves.

Jorge: Not really a good line of asking go to the board about the process not the content they will bounce your question like a soccer ball

Jordyn: The question of whether or not there should be new TLDs seems pretty orthogonal to the current discussion.

Jordyn: (Basically, what Nigel is saying right now)

Jorge: good point

Danny_Younger: I worry about the prospect of governments blocking this domain. It sets us on a very difficult path if cultural sensitivities are not observed. I wonder... Does the Board retain the discretionary authority to continue to defer a decision on this matter (perhaps in perpetuity)?

Jorge: scroll the session details windows please

Kieren_McCarthy: I'm stuck in the middle of a row and want to make a comment - can someone lob me a mic?

Jorge: tnx

Robert_Hoggarth: For those of you joining us late, during this forum we will be accepting remote questions and comments on the Wufoo form system that was so popular in Nairobi. The link address to the form for each topic will be in the session details box for each topic immediately to the right of this screen. Links for all topic forms can be found on the Brussels mtg sched for this session

Robert_Hoggarth: this also applies to thos of you stuck in the middle of a row! :-)

Jordyn: Maybe just post a link directly, Robert?

Robert_Hoggarth: won't stick here in the Adobe Connect format

Jordyn: Oh, there's a bunch anyway.

Doug_Brent: Rob, can you post it in the chat session?

Jordyn: There's one link per topic.

Jordyn: But they're all here, about halfway down:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12532>

wseltzer: <https://icann.wufoo.com/forms/icann-38-public-forum-chair-remuneration/>

Doug_Brent: Thanks Wendy.

Jordyn: Holy cow. 15 minutes might not be enough time for this topic based on the queue.

wseltzer: Did anyone capture the scribe notes from the beginning? and if so, can you pastebin them?

Jorge: if we are willing to change the bylaws to add compensation what about giving voting rights to the org members ?

Jordyn: Org members?

Jorge: you are right this is an org without membership

George_Kirikos: Just submitted a question here, and for the new TLDs again later.

elaine: Compensation is essential in order to bring and retain talent. How many board members will not consider chairmanship because they cannot work full time and chair ICANN? A show of hands please.

George_Kirikos: Compensation isn't essential.

George_Kirikos: Lack of compensation actually attracts people who are more driven.

Jorge: I can bet that many on that table don't need at all extra compensation it is just a formality

George_Kirikos: If it's a "formality", why are they cashing the cheques? lol

Jorge: lol

George_Kirikos: If it's a formality, they can get an honorarium that they can donate to the charity of their choice.

George_Kirikos: lol No answer. I'm 3 for 3.

AttyJones: Wow, George, three for three.

Jordyn: That does seem like a failing of the remote participation process.

George_Kirikos: Ya think? :)

Jordyn: Maybe they should get someone with less of an NPR voice (and a more combative one) to read the questions instead.

AttyJones: @Jordyn, do you mean it;s too easy not to answer?

George_Kirikos: I submitted another question, about the honorarium.

Jordyn: Well, just that they never seem to answer for whatever reason.

Doug_Brent: @George; the 990 is not very useful to really understand compensation. I recommend you read ICANN's annual report to get a more complete understanding of comp.

George_Kirikos: They seem to only answer softballs. They should remember that when they go to the Hill, the politicians ask questions much harder than I do.

AttyJones: @George, yes they do, just ask Mr Twomey

George_Kirikos: Doug: It was I who read the annual report, lol. Who do you think pointed out that ICANN is using *for-profit* comparables, instead of non-profit?

George_Kirikos: Yes, I can't wait until Rod testifies.

Doug_Brent: Glad you read it George.

George_Kirikos: Because, their staffers pull questions from the archives from topics people like me bring up.

AttyJones: @Doug, George reads EVERYTHING!

Doug_Brent: :-)

gpmgroup: Rita is right

wseltzer: Rita +1

Jorge: +2

Jorge: ICANN does not operate the Internet ... it will keep running without ICANN

George_Kirikos: 4 for 4.

George_Kirikos: Looks like they've moved beyond soccer at ICANN, and have advanced to dodgeball.

Jorge: hehe

AttyJones: @George, at the beginning of the meeting, they said they would answer all questions submitted via web form. You should follow up with them on that. (We all know you will.)

Jim_Fleming: For the Record: The Online Participation Tools including this IRC text chat seem to be out-dated and open people up to Security and Privacy issues. Clicking names shows ranges of IP Address Info and cloaked addresses. Anyone can be anyone, ID theft is possible. This is not a university/academic world. When there is money on the table strange things happen. It seems ICANN may be HELPING to breed "strange things".

George_Kirikos: In other words, they'll pocket the cash.

Ron: @ George - with due respect, if you would ever attend an ICANN meeting and experience the work load that we all undertake, I could respect your comments on comp; devoid of that, your comments are losing you any credibility

Doug_Brent: Jim, you're absolutely right that people can claim to be who they're not.

Doug_Brent: Re IP address reveals, where do I see that on my client?

hta: The person who's signed up with the name "Jim_Fleming" is using the IRC username lightIRC@adsl-75-57-207-150.dsl.emhrl.sbcglobal.net. I have no idea whether that's relevant to his identity.

Doug_Brent: If this is a problem, we should vix it.

Doug_Brent: fix

hta: It's a part of the IRC protocol that this information is passed along.

wseltzer: Doug_Brent: I don't think it's a problem. We're not using these as strong signifiers of identity.

Robert_Hoggarth: @jim and @doug ... have already asked IT team members to look into it and report back for post meeting "lessons learned"

George_Kirikos: One can set IRC settings to mask that stuff.

SeanPowell: It is most commonly not a problem. The internet is typically not anonymous, why should this be different?

SeanPowell: It actually makes it more difficult to act as someone you're not supposed to if such aspects are not hidden

Doug_Brent: Suggest this (important) topic be taken elsewhere. As Rob noted, we'll post a response, and may later consult and requirements for remote participation.

Jordyn: If the intent of online participation is to mirror the in-person experience, I'm not sure why anonymity would be expected to be one of the characteristics.

Ram_Mohan: Jordyn + 1

hta: if the reason is work, we would have to compensate mr. Foody for his hard work in standing in line for the mike.

Jorge: soccer is entertaining ICANN is not :-)

wseltzer: to say nothing of per diems...

Jorge: Jordyn do you see anybody with a sky mask on the room ?

Jorge: dodgeball

AttyJones: @Jorge, we wouldn't want to "surprise" the board

Jorge: how much volunteers working over 40hrs/week will get paid

George_Kirikos: lol That question means that the Board is incentivized to keep increasing the organizational size, so that their compensation will grow further.

Jim_Fleming: For the Record: It is a small point but "Remote Participation" and "Online Participation" are different. This (dangerous) Remote Participation system can stand and people can be warned. ICANN could showcase State-of-the-Art Online Participation, but State of the Art may expose new technology not endorsed by the ISOC.

Doug_Brent: Jim. Good point (re remote/on-line difference). Can you please send any specific suggestions on tools to doug.brent@icann.org

Jorge: don't forget to CC Jeffrey Williams

Doug_Brent: @Jorge: FWIW, I'm serious. Would welcome the suggestion.

Jim_Fleming: For the Record: Online Participation would be VeryClose to "being there". In fact, people who are there would also be here [if this was secure online participation]. Since this is Remote/Random/Anonymous/Cloaked/Stealthed/etc people there likely do not want to be here.

Jorge: @Doug fair enough, then get ready to support IPv6, IPv8 and IPv16

Doug_Brent: :-)

Robert_Hoggarth: the form link for this FY 11 budget topic is -
<https://icann.wufoo.com/forms/icann-38-public-forum-fy-11-budget/>

Robert_Hoggarth: george k has already found it

Jorge: well that's not an ICANN merit

Jim_Fleming: For the Record: Another small point is that many people clearly are unable to attend an ICANN meeting in person. You do not see Castro or Chavez wandering the halls. There is also not security for major domainers.

Jorge: thank God we don't see Chavez !! iwe will be complaining all time that the room smells bad

George_Kirikos: lol Flat on this year, but huge increase compared to the \$10 million of before.

George_Kirikos: It's like a fat guy saying he's happy he's at 400 lbs, as it was 400 lbs last year.

Jorge: DNS CERT is not a good idea

Jorge: and if ever comes to exist should be outside operations of ICANN

George_Kirikos: They still didn't ask my question, did they?

Jorge: ICANN does not operate the root zone

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-fy-11-budget/>

Robert_Hoggarth: haven't forgotten you George!

George_Kirikos: Ok.

Danny_Younger: Every year I see the ALAC folk asking for more and more funding. We are now at a point where the ALAC receives more funds than either the GAC or the SSAC, yet the qualitative level of output from the ALAC is a far cry from the output generated by these other Advisory Committees. Frankly, there are some groups whose people don't do enough work to justify the current level of expenditure.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: I wish there was a dictionary for all these acronyms

John_McCormac_HosterStats: perhaps Icanm could form a working group? :)

James_Bladel: <http://gnso.icann.org/acronyms.html>

Jorge: there is a webpage with all the acronyms

John_McCormac_HosterStats: thanks Jorge (it was just a joke)

James_Bladel: Here's a better Decoder Ring: <http://www.andalucia.com/icann/>

Fatima: <http://www.icann.org/en/general/glossary.htm>

George_Kirikos: Danny: you're right.

Jorge: @john ok, with more acronyms we save bandwidth and makes ICANN more ecofriendly because they take less space on printed material

John_McCormac_HosterStats: thanks James - that's excellent

George_Kirikos: Remote?

George_Kirikos: lol

George_Kirikos: Still 22 minutes on this topic.

George_Kirikos: We've long advocated Verified WHOIS.

George_Kirikos: ICANN continues to ignore the idea.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: that WHOIS data figure is highly skewed - verified WHOIS would be a far better solution

Robert_Hoggarth: @georgek ... at least 4 more people in line and still your statement

George_Kirikos: Thanks for the heads up, Rob.

Patrick_Jones: George, the ICANN community continues to be very interested in WHOIS

George_Kirikos: Folks wasted a year on domain tasting, when the solution was obvious.

George_Kirikos: (impose an economic cost, to kill it)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: @George - but didn't ICANN facilitate the process in the first place?

George_Kirikos: Folks know how to solve WHOIS inaccuracy, which solves so many issues at once (i.e. reduces abuse, cyberquatting, allows private settlement of disputes, proactively ensures accountability, etc.).

George_Kirikos: Well, if ICANN staff continues "facilitating", they'll have job security for life. :-)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: Create a problem and then solve it. :)

George_Kirikos: Exactly. The 'net was designed to route around "damage". If ICANN is damaged, folks will go to DOC/NTIA/DOJ, to get things done right.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: With the whois data available it should be possible to detect fraudulent activity by analysis rather than wasting money on "studies"

Jorge: as I said before packets will keep flowing regardless of ICANN existence

George_Kirikos: If a nuke hit Brussels today, the 'net would go on uninterrupted.

George_Kirikos: If ICANN does approve .xxx, that's like a nuke going off in LA.

Jorge: right, we'll lose a lot of good friends but the network will keep working

Connecting

Connected!

--- Welcome to ICANN ---

George_Kirikos: ICANN probably won't survive it, as the politicians will get involved.

Jorge: don't forget that ICANN does not control IANA it just runs its operations

George_Kirikos: Right. IANA is more important.

lightIRC_4784: ok.. then WHAT is IANA?

George_Kirikos: Some registrars are bad. Tucows rocks! :)

Kieren_McCarthy: I'm with George - we need to destroy every organization that tries to oversee industries: blow up ICANN; stab the FCC; kill the World Bank; run a spike through the ITU, let's destroy everything and then just sit back and enjoy how well it all works afterwards

George_Kirikos: lol My question says exactly "registrants" pay it, lol.

Jorge: @kieren don't be so drastic

George_Kirikos: 1:25 left.

Jim_Fleming: For the Record: ICANN currently manages the IANA contract for the U.S. Government - So-called RIRs are a major component of the IPv4 /8 management - IN-ADDR.ARPA Reverse Delegations are supposed to provide

accurate information - New (modern) DNS software will look at IPv4 Addresses and ensure that Secure .ARPA links exist - Many people including ICANN Staff on this IRC do NOT have valid IN-ADDR.ARPA DNS

lightIRC_4784: @Jim.. we know about the contract. But what IS IANA

George_Kirikos: Line item budget --- yes!

John_McCormac_HosterStats: there goes the nuke?

George_Kirikos: haha

George_Kirikos: More dodgeball.

Kieren_McCarthy: I'm not sure it's a great idea to provide a line-item budget

George_Kirikos: We have to use the IRS Form 990, as the "minimum" disclosure.

George_Kirikos: Expect ICANN to underdeliver, everytime.

Kieren_McCarthy: You'd then have dozens of people arguing over tiny points

George_Kirikos: Still no remote questions.

Kieren_McCarthy: George - you have had three questions asked already. The person who has made the most comments from the floor is Marilyn who has been up three times

George_Kirikos: Bottum up = people arguing over the small stuff.

Doug_Brent: It is a line item budget, much more detailed than what the U.N. publishes for a \$12Billion budget

George_Kirikos: Bottom, even

Jorge: @lightIRC_4784 get a name ...

avri: i agree with MCade - it is the regisrants that provide all the money- second time today CSG and NCSG agree

George_Kirikos: Avri: My question (which they've not asked yet) makes that point.

DW: That is a lot of harsh criticism to take as a Volunteer. C'mon pay the Board and then you can string them up in any manner.

Jorge: @Doug you will never get to dig too much into the UN budget

George_Kirikos: 10 more minutes, let's see if they ask it.

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-fy-11-budget/>

Jorge: @DW that's a good idea, if we pay them we can fire them !!

wseltzer: DISAGREE! Please take away a meeting

Kieren_McCarthy: Three meetings a year are *not* essential, they are part of the reason ICANN is always overwhelmed

George_Kirikos: Nex = remote!

George_Kirikos: Agree with you, Wendy.

Jorge: +1

George_Kirikos: Too many meetings, too many documents.

Kieren_McCarthy: George! George! We have found something to agree on!

George_Kirikos: Need to prioritize. These docs are longer than Atlas Shrugged, or Proust's novel.

George_Kirikos: (Remembrances of things past)

Danny_Younger: Too many occasions of covering the same ground over and over again

DW: yes... I don't know if I would want to volunteer and spend so many hours working in good faith and then be hung and quartered in this manner... one would think these volunteers on the board were like greedy bankers on wall street.

George_Kirikos: 7 minutes left, and still no remote!

AttyJones: @George, then we just need to ask one question: who is John Galt?

George_Kirikos: Exactly, AttyJones.

AttyJones: What do you mean "no remote?" You can't hear?

George_Kirikos: VeriSign = the bad guy, btw.

George_Kirikos: No remote = they won't ask my question

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-fy-11-budget/>

Kristina_Rosette: Christine Jones may want to search some UDRP decisions. GoDaddy, Tucows, and eNom have all been found to have registered and used third-party trademarks in bad faith. See the search function in National Arbitration Forum's site.

George_Kirikos: (about the budget) It's been there for 45 minutes, waiting.

DW: BTW I think they should send Danica Patrick to represent GoDaddy next time.

Jorge: @George, the longer and more complex the docs reduces the level of noise that some constituencies can generate due not having the resources to process and digest all the stuff

AttyJones: @Kristina, I see more UDRP disputes than all other registrars combined, probably. I am well aware of the decisions.

AttyJones: And, we help enough of your clients with their issues that you know first hand we aren't the bad guys.

George_Kirikos: 5 minutes left, to ask a question from the remote participants (i.e. my question).

George_Kirikos: Watch how they'll manage the clock, to go to break, and avoid answering.

Kieren_McCarthy: George - do you honestly believe that you should be able to speak more than others?

George_Kirikos: I'm representing a lot of people, through my questions, Kieren.

Danny_Younger: So how much are the three annual private registry/registrar meetings costing us?

George_Kirikos: A lot of folks share the same concerns.

George_Kirikos: Yet, they don't have the time/money to follow all the issues.

Kieren_McCarthy: Well get them to ask the question then - because at the moment it looks like just you

Jorge: 7/8 mill

Kieren_McCarthy: Meetings are roughly \$2m each

George_Kirikos: I don't need "shills" to ask on my behalf.

Kieren_McCarthy: Additional costs on top of that. Plus huge costs in resources and time used up

George_Kirikos: 3 minutes left, and they're going to avoid it.

George_Kirikos: Despite Rob above saying otherwise, grrrr.

Danny_Younger: Plenary meetings are at \$2mil, the private registry/registrar meetings should cost far less

Jorge: @kieren it's slightly more than 2 given that some stuff it's on other budget lines

Jim_Fleming: For the Record: When domains are FREE and built into people's CPE gear much of this becomes moot.

George_Kirikos: Let's ask a remote question.

George_Kirikos: Yeah, run out the clock, Rita.

Kieren_McCarthy: Why don't you just take over the chatroom instead, George? Oh, you have

avri: (is there any way for people who are in the room to shut down the camera and voice - seems a waste of bandwidth)

David_Peall: yes hover over the image and click on the icons

George_Kirikos: I'm not "taking it over". This is not a mic, where only one person can talk at a time.

Jorge: @avri WiFi not working good there ?

Kieren_McCarthy: @avri - you can select the low bandwidth option

avri: @kieren thanks

David_Peall: there is a little speaker and camera in the bottom right handcorner

John_McCormac_HosterStats: Much of the cybercrime problem is down to poor enforcement of existing rules and legislation.

George_Kirikos: And a remote question...

Jorge: @David right but I believe that stops the player but you keep getting the packets

George_Kirikos: Remote question?

George_Kirikos: lol

George_Kirikos: Thanks Rob!

George_Kirikos: (one example of a good ICANN staffer = Rob)

George_Kirikos: Same for Marika and Dave.

George_Kirikos: And Glen.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: quite a few of them seem to be good people

SeanPowell: Jorge: i believe it does actually stop the stream as well

Jorge: there is a lot of good people at ICANN

Jorge: @Sean I can still see the packets coming on the sniffer if I stop the camera/audio

SeanPowell: Jorge: Fair enough :) I stand corrected. A better option would definitely be to use the low bandwidth options (flash chat, audio streams)

George_Kirikos: PayPal's 2nd time at the podium on this topic.

George_Kirikos: Is he "dominating"? Nope. (I've queued up remotely, in the same way, on each topic)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: there's that opportunity for verified WHOIS again

George_Kirikos: All we need is one US law saying a registry based in the USA needs to do it.

George_Kirikos: And it'll happen.

George_Kirikos: .com is the only TLD that really matters. But, .net/org will do it too.

George_Kirikos: Lastly? No, also remote.....

Patrick_Jones: Several ccTLDs might disagree with you George

Jorge: awesome ?

George_Kirikos: Well, ccTLDs aren't regulated by ICANN.

George_Kirikos: So, Verified WHOIS isn't something they could impose.

David_Peall: tcpdump says it stops the packets ?

John_McCormac_HosterStats: some ccTLDs in EU are using thin WHOIS but the registrars/registry collect actionable data

Jorge: where are the original findings of the JAS report and who is JAS names !!!

George_Kirikos: Yes to drug testing. :)

Jorge: pee-pee test

George_Kirikos: Hair is better.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: IED (the .ie registry) has an element of verified WHOIS but it is a managed registry

Jorge: right it last longer

John_McCormac_HosterStats: IEDR

George_Kirikos: It'll detect long-term use of drugs.

Ram_Mohan: George, the chatroom scrolling means I don't actually see your original question - could you repeat it please, espily w.r.t. gTLDs

George_Kirikos: Which one, Ram?

Ram_Mohan: don't know, whichever had an impact on COM/NET/ORG being the only TLDs that matter?

George_Kirikos: lol Another dodge!

Jorge: dodgeball

Jim_Fleming: For the Reord: ICANN as the IANA contract administrator could recover many IPv4 /8s from RIRs and private parties if the IN-ADDR.ARPA DNS rules are enforced. Rather simple automated software is able to sweep the IPv4 Address Spectrum and reclaim space. As noted, the current live meeting is being hosted on invalid IPv4 Address Space

George_Kirikos: Predictable, so predictable. I'll keep asking, though.

George_Kirikos: Not answering me means the politicos will ask instead one day.

George_Kirikos: (Dingwall loves tough questions)

Jorge: I'm still amazed how ICANN as an organization that does not produce any goods or services gets to spend so much money

AttyJones: Just so you know, a few people in the audience called for an answer to the question.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: I wonder if this accountability issue is a factor in the rise of ccTLDs and the possible decline of gTLDs?

George_Kirikos: Well, folks can always stand at the mic and repeat the question.

George_Kirikos: (there's a "general" group of questions, i.e. "any other issues" later, where one can try again.

George_Kirikos: See ya after the break....time to get breakfast here.

Jorge: soccer game about to start :-(

Jorge: have to decide between soccer and dodgeball

Ram_Mohan: George, when you're back, would love to hear that question re.COM/NET/ORG

George_Kirikos: Which one, Ram? About the Verified WHOIS?

Robert_Hoggarth: we are on break. next topic - new gTLD budget

George_Kirikos: If someone's logged in via IRC, maybe they can email a transcript to RAM?

George_Kirikos: (i.e. if they've had logging turned on)

George_Kirikos: <<--- munching on Special K (K = Kirikos)

Jorge: cool adobe connect working on the ipod touch

George_Kirikos: BTW, folks might want to take a note how CIRA (.ca) does public consultations. They had a 100 day comment period, and sent notice to *every* .ca registrant, as they discuss possibly modifying the CDRP (.ca version of UDRP).

Jorge: going for bfast and watch Paraguay vs New Zealand for a while

George_Kirikos: Is the music that's playing licensed, by the way? (one typically needs to pay royalties) Good songs, but the RIAA might slap ICANN down. :)

Jorge: you right

George_Kirikos: International audience, too. So, not just RIAA, but lots of other organizations could 'tee up ICANN for a lawsuit.

George_Kirikos: Better to play recordings from ICANN Music/Karaoke night. :)

Jorge: lol

George_Kirikos: ICANN Idol.

George_Kirikos: Winner gets their own new TLD.

George_Kirikos: :)

Jorge: Marylin will get the mike first

George_Kirikos: I have no questions in this part.

SeanPowell: Who would judge ICANN Idol?

George_Kirikos: But, had 2 on new TLDs.

Jorge: audio and camera view working great on the ipod

George_Kirikos: Just like American Idol, the public would vote. :)

SeanPowell: how about chat, Jorge

George_Kirikos: The Board will be happy to note I had no questions on the new TLD budget.

Jorge: @Sean chat does not work because is a mod version to enable IRC so it's not the same as the client app from Adobe for iPhone/iPod

George_Kirikos: An answer like "Yes" lol

George_Kirikos: He missed the question, already, about for-profit comparables.

Jorge: @Sean but the screen and camera windows work very well and audio is perfect

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-fy-11-budget/>

George_Kirikos: He already missed part of the questions.

George_Kirikos: I guess he's hoping folks forgot the questions by now.

George_Kirikos: The other non-profits that use for-profit comparables? Other non-profits paying \$200K/yr to so many people?

Jorge: that's not true there is talent all around the US

SeanPowell: Jorge: aha. That is what I figured. so no custom pods work I assume

George_Kirikos: And if the Sydney office will be closed.

George_Kirikos: He's dodging, still.

George_Kirikos: Yes, need to benchmark to *non-profits*.

George_Kirikos: ICANN would be in the 99th percentile, if they did.

Kristina_Rosette: where is the new gTLD budget document? can't find on website (what else is new?)

George_Kirikos: But, thanks for at least attempting to answer, this time.

George_Kirikos: Instead of just "yes."

George_Kirikos: Kristina: maybe
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-4-31may10-en.htm>

Robert_Hoggarth: question form for this forum segment is at -
<https://icann.wufoo.com/forms/icann-38-public-forum-new-gtld-budget/>

George_Kirikos: (go to the public comment link, from the home page of ICANN's website, and it'd be one of the open comment periods)

Karen_Lentz: Kristina: you can find the budget at
<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/explanatory-memoranda-4-en.htm>

Kristina_Rosette: Thanks, George. I was looking under budget. Silly me.

George_Kirikos: I know, Kristina.....it's not a great website.

George_Kirikos: Probably my IP addresses use it more than anyone else, and I often can't find what I seek.

DW: Give it a rest George. Since you have so much of a hang up with Not-For-Profit comparables; just think for a moment if your criticisms would be of any merit whatsoever if ICANN were a For-Profit company.

George_Kirikos: WIPO's site sucks too, by the way.

George_Kirikos: DW: They are a non-profit, or pretend to be. Are you saying they *are* a for-profit? LOL

George_Kirikos: They certainly act like one. When Rod says "we are a for-profit", that's the day ICANN dies.

Kristina_Rosette: \$30m seems a little low for litigation risk to me.

DW: Given the importance of the organisation that manages the building blocks for so many multi-million dollar companies. I am surprised that their budget is so low.

Jim_Fleming: QUESTION: How will Microsoft's FREE PNRP domains impact your plan?

SeanPowell: Jim_Fleming: please submit questions through the form found here: <https://icann.wufoo.com/forms/icann-38-public-forum-new-gtld-budget/>

DW: Only domainers have issues with ICANN budget and the miniscule fee they get per domain name.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: individually the fee is small but it scales to over 120 million of those small fees

George_Kirikos: I just submitted a question for later on Jones Day, and its legal spending.

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-other-community-issues/>

DW: For 99 percent of domain Registrants the cost of Domain names is a rather insignificant line item in their Expense budget.

George_Kirikos: Wrong, DW.

George_Kirikos: ICANN has cost the public billions of dollars, through its wrong decisions.

DW: Point me to your article to support your 'wrong' assessment.

George_Kirikos: Toll-free numbers cost less than \$1.50/yr (see the tariffs at sms800.com). Why should a .com cost more, when it should cost less.

DW: Nonsense

George_Kirikos: I just did.

George_Kirikos: If dot-coms were at \$2/yr, that'd be a savings to the public of \$400 million/yr.

DW: can you get the sort of branding and mileage from a 1-800 number that you can get from a Domain name? Not even close. Actually you may need your domain name and website to publicise your 1-800 number.

George_Kirikos: Other abusive monopolists have cost the public much less.

George_Kirikos: DW: You're confusing "benefit" with "cost."

George_Kirikos: A TM for Coca-Cola still costs \$200 or so, while its value is in the billions.

George_Kirikos: What you're suggesting is that domains be "taxed" according to their *value*, rather than that their maintenance costs (i.e. registry, etc.) be done at the most competitive pricing available (i.e. via tenders, etc.).

John_McCormac_HosterStats: Ken's point is excellent considering the performance of .aero/museum/name/pro etc

George_Kirikos: When they tax Coca Cola's TM or Disney's TM more than the TM of some fresh startup, let me know.

DW: they built up that value over Many many years. My trademark cost me the same and does not have any value beyond me. so your point is redundant.

DW: Nobody who owns less than 10 domain names that they are actually doing something with has any issue whatsoever with the cost of a domain name.

George_Kirikos: No, my point is relevant. Your TM costs the same as Disney's.

George_Kirikos: My cost for example.com should be the same as the cost for Google.com, and the registry should be run on a cost-recovery basis, like the USPTO.

DW: What expense in your entire business is less than a domain name?

George_Kirikos: Not an abusive monopolist, like VeriSign.

George_Kirikos: If NTIA runs a competitive tender to outsource it, that's fine.

George_Kirikos: (as long as it's not a permanent monopoly, like VRSN)

DW: so you could pay a penny per domain and then try to peddle them for millions...

George_Kirikos: DW: Many expenses are less than my domain names, because they're offered in a *competitive* marketplace, where multiple suppliers compete for my business.

George_Kirikos: Name one product that you buy that is a monopoly, where the price isn't regulated in some way? (e.g. utility boards, etc.)

DW: Name one expense that is less than a domain name.

George_Kirikos: My pen is less.

George_Kirikos: My paper, is less.

George_Kirikos: I can choose from multiple paper suppliers, each competing to win my business.

DW: Over the course of a year sir.

George_Kirikos: Why can't multiple prospective registry operator, like Neustar, Afiliis, DENIC, CIRA, etc., compete for the .com contract?

DW: The cost of your pens and boxes of paper is less than the cost of your domain name?

George_Kirikos: Yes, I don't use many pens. Each pen costs less than \$6.

George_Kirikos: Each ream of paper costs less than \$6.

DW: They can all give you the domain name for ZERO dollars and make all the money from hosting... c'mon

George_Kirikos: That's called "tying."

George_Kirikos: If I can get the name for free, and then pick my own hosting, that'd be fine. :-)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: or loss leader? or bait and switch?

DW: If \$35.00 is a high expense per year.. your business is not doing too well I would suggest.

George_Kirikos: lol Yeah, right. Just because I can *afford* to pay more doesn't mean I *should* pay more.

George_Kirikos: The value of water is far more than its cost, for example.

DW: the point is that it would be a race to the bottom that does not fairly reflect any true costs.

George_Kirikos: That doesn't mean that the water company should charge me \$10,000/yr, under a monopoly, for what costs them \$300/yr.

George_Kirikos: No, DW. It would be a tender process for a set Service Level Agreement.

George_Kirikos: So, a 99.99% performance level, DNS reponse within XX milliseconds, etc.

DW: that is why they don't and that is why ICANN only charges a fe cents.

DW: few cents

George_Kirikos: There's no "race to the botom" when the government tenders for door knobs, or staples, or paper, or any other product.

DW: so what do you think the floor would or should be for a domain name?

George_Kirikos: Whatever the registries are able to offer it for.

DW: you are correct... they pay through their nose to halliburton.

George_Kirikos: No floor. But, I expect it would be around \$1.50/yr or so for .com, given its scale.

Jorge: probably with 10 years of ICANN's budget you can fund the root server operations for 100 yrs

George_Kirikos: Maybe \$2.50 for .net and .org.

DW: Ok, I'm done for now... you can get back to harassing the Board.

George_Kirikos: lol.

George_Kirikos: If this was a Harvard Debate, where they poll the audience afterwards, I doubt the board would get many votes. :-)

Jorge: it is not harassing you must take this oppty to ask the tough questions

DW: sorry I may have used an innapropriate adjective

George_Kirikos: No problem. At least you actually appear to own some domains.

DW: Just remember you are not paying them a cent... where is their incentive to win the debate?

George_Kirikos: The trolls who don't even own any domains.....they're the worst.

George_Kirikos: I'm not paying ICANN a cent? \$60 million / 100 million domains (i.e. gTLDs).

George_Kirikos: That's 60 cents per domain (x 500 domains for me) = \$300/yr for me wasted on ICANN.

George_Kirikos: And for others, it's a lot more.

DW: I do own a few, but my business model can handle them at the current pricing level quite adequately.

George_Kirikos: But, then they cost me \$5/yr more on excessive fees charged by VRSN, due to their wrong decisions.

George_Kirikos: That's another \$2,500/yr wasted, just on me.

George_Kirikos: I'd rather give that \$2,800 per year to charity, rather than give it to ICANN.

George_Kirikos: I had a remote question or two on this section of the public discussions.

DW: You may be correct that you are wasting the money if the domain names are not profitable on their own. your business model is the real problem not the ICANN Fees.

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-updated-new-gtld-issues/>

Jorge: what if we start charging a fee to stand in front of the mic ?

George_Kirikos: DW: I'm making a lot more than \$2800/yr (I own math.com, paper.com and many other elite domains).

George_Kirikos: Doesn't mean I have to give it to ICANN/VRSN.

George_Kirikos: (same for other registrants)

George_Kirikos: My company breaks even each year in early January. :-)

George_Kirikos: Very early, January!

George_Kirikos: Doesn't mean ICANN is entitled to tax that success.

Jorge: @george do you have any openings ? :-)

George_Kirikos: Nahhh, just one employee, me. I might actually open a real office at some point, as more domains get developed (waiting to see if another acquisition goes through next week, which could accelerate that process).

George_Kirikos: <<--- crossing his fingers and toes

DW: I bet you pay your lawyer more than ICANN for filling in form documents year on year.

George_Kirikos: Yes, I do.

Jorge: he is a lawyer :-)

George_Kirikos: Same for accountants, etc. Thing is, I can choose which lawyer I use. I *have* to pay ICANN and VRSN.

George_Kirikos: No, I'm not a lawyer.

DW: tell him to take a pay cut as he is not doing anything you can't do.

George_Kirikos: If he doesn't do his job, I can pick another lawyer. If ICANN doesn't do their job, I can't fire ICANN.

George_Kirikos: Someone at CircleID made a proposal that folks *opt-in* for ICANN fees.

George_Kirikos: That would be something. :)

Jorge: interesting

George_Kirikos: Don't forget the remote people, Peter.

DW: They must be doing their job if the thing you are paying for from them is making you so much money.

Robert_Hoggarth: @george ... if you have a choice of me reading just one of your two posted questions live ... which one would you choose? remember, the un-read one will still be answered and posted on the forum schedule page

Jorge: Dina looks cute

George_Kirikos: Someone should wear a t-shirt with "Bullshitters Anonymous", which is the TM application of Rod Beckstrom. :)

Jorge: I mean Tina

Doug_Brent: Ad hominem stuff should stay off of chat.

George_Kirikos: Rob: If I had to choose, I'd go with the first one (with the TIm Berner's Lee). But, if you combine them, they should be less than the 3 minutes we're allotted!

DW: you have access to millions of lawyers and end up paying thousands to one of them... ICANN has a Monopoly and you pay a couple hundred to them... so much for competition.

Robert_Hoggarth: @george ... its two minutes now :-)

George_Kirikos: That wasn't ad hominem, nor an attack, Doug. It was a compliment of his TM application, factual. :)

George_Kirikos: Rob: How about the speaking faster? :-) Or, if it runs over the 3 minutes, ask the 2nd in the "any other business" section later?

Robert_Hoggarth: for everyone else, to assure that you get your questions asked and answered please consider posting a comment on a Wufoo form to preserve your remarks - <https://icann.wufoo.com/forms/icann-38-public-forum-new-gtld-budget/>.

Robert_Hoggarth: @george - but you have two questions already over tin the next session! :-)

Robert_Hoggarth: scribes don't like fast talking - miss half the text

George_Kirikos: Ok, well, try the first one, and use the remaining time to start the 2nd one? If they cut you off after the 3 minutes are up....well, that's a risk. :)

George_Kirikos: Of course, the ICANN staff reading here will alert them to cut off after 3 mins.

George_Kirikos: Like Gladiator, though, win the crowd.....has ICANN's Board won the crowd? I think not.

George_Kirikos: Rob: You can print out the question for the scribe?

George_Kirikos: They'd miss zero.

George_Kirikos: (or take over your laptop, and they can copy/paste, or pretype it)

DW: You seem to be up again George... seems to me you are getting a disproportionate amount of time.

George_Kirikos: DW: Nope, not at all. I'm lining up remotely just as others are.

George_Kirikos: You can ask a question too, DW.

George_Kirikos: Why don't you? You can praise the Board for their great work, in your statement, and suggest VRSN fees are too low.

DW: heaven forbid I should ask a question just for the sake of it... you are representing us quite well thank you.

George_Kirikos: Still aminute left, yay!

Robert_Hoggarth: got in half the second one ...

DW: Perfect timing

George_Kirikos: Thanks Rob.

George_Kirikos: They didn't address Vertical Integration, by the way.

George_Kirikos: (i.e. price caps)

DW: don't get greedy mate, they may well come back to it.

Robert_Hoggarth: thank you for noticing DW! :-)

George_Kirikos: By the way, pushing it on the GNSO as being "to blame" is wrong, because the GNSO is captured.

George_Kirikos: (registries and registrars get excessive weight in the voting)

George_Kirikos: So, of course they voted for new TLDs, as the suppliers want more to push on the public.

George_Kirikos: But, the AOC says that they need to take into account the costs/benefits, which is something that the GNSO hasn't done.

George_Kirikos: (whereas Tim Berners-Lee **does** address that)

DW: so your problem is that your domains will lose value if new gTLDs are allowed?

George_Kirikos: No. What's of greater concern is that if prices in new TLDs are uncapped, then VRSN might ask for the same.

George_Kirikos: So that they can then gouge .com owners, asking for "equal treatment" to other TLDs.

George_Kirikos: That's why we opposed the .biz/info/org attempt to eliminate price caps.

Ram_Mohan: George, it's an interesting theory, but as far as i know, GNSO has a strong voting balance that intentionally attempts to eliminate the capture that you allege

George_Kirikos: (and even though my side **won** that debate, the issue of caps still exists in all the versions of the DAG)

George_Kirikos: Spoken like a registry operator would, Ram. :)

George_Kirikos: Why not give every .com owner an equal vote, like they do at CIRA for .ca?

Ram_Mohan: Why dont you propose that in the GNSO and make it policy?

George_Kirikos: Results would be very different. No taxation without representation.

George_Kirikos: I'm not in the GNSO. I left the BC, due to their ridiculous policy.

Ram_Mohan: you ceratinly have a voice and representation there

Ram_Mohan: if you choose

AttyJones: @George, how would you do proxy voting?

George_Kirikos: I have no real voice to propose anything, except appealing to the public.

George_Kirikos: No I don't, Ram. Take a look at the BC charter. It stifles people's voice.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: how many .ca registrants would exercise their votes?

George_Kirikos: Mike Rodenbaugh and Zahid certainly don't represent me.

George_Kirikos: You'd have to check the CIRA election results (on the www.cira.ca website), John.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: It is an interesting idea George. It seems a very democratic way of doing things.

George_Kirikos: Nominet even listens to the public in .uk more than ICANN does.

George_Kirikos: *Nominet, even

John_McCormac_HosterStats: This idea of shared ownership could be a factor in the increase in ccTLD registrations.

George_Kirikos: Drug tests for new TLD applicants would be nice, too.

KK: Fingerprints and footprints, too!!

DW: How many ccTLD domains do you own George?

George_Kirikos: Maybe 10 out of 500 total?

George_Kirikos: A couple of .co.uk, and a few .ca.

DW: prices to steep for speculation right?

George_Kirikos: (maybe more by the end of next week, though)

George_Kirikos: No, .uk is cheaper than .com, and .ca is around the same or slightly less.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: @DW there is speculation in ccTLDs and .uk is relatively cheap

George_Kirikos: I prefer a global audience for my domains, and .com is the place to be.

George_Kirikos: Go Phil.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: ccTLD speculation follows different rules to that of gTLDs due to the direct navigation effect

DW: c'mon blaze a new trail... conquer new frontiers.

George_Kirikos: If a deal goes through next week, I'll have a good set of .ca names. :)

George_Kirikos: (I'm in Canada)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: The .eu was a classic example of how .com speculation rules don't work well for ccTLDs

DW: you are not exactly going out on a limb there.... how about some .co's for example. You are staying well within your comfort zone.

George_Kirikos: Nahh, .co are worthless.

George_Kirikos: Any site builder of a .co will leak a high percentage of their traffic to the .com.

DW: math.co

George_Kirikos: Take a look at games.com (owned by Spil). All they use it for is a redirect. They're not going to invest in the domain, and send lots of traffic to games.com.

George_Kirikos: Feel free to grab it. For every \$100 you invest in promoting math.com, I'd make about \$90 of it, and you'd make \$10.

George_Kirikos: Oops, I meant math.co, lol.

George_Kirikos: (that's the typo all the surfers would make, too, haha)

George_Kirikos: Like .asia and other failed TLDs, we'll get spammed a year or two ago from those who speculated on the names, wanting to sell them.

George_Kirikos: Sell them at a big loss, rather than face additional renewal costs.

George_Kirikos: New TLDs will massively profit from sunrise periods. That's their main business model.

DW: so you are saying that essentially the game is over if I can't get good .com domain names?

John_McCormac_HosterStats: most of those landrush domains that could not be flipped/monetised drop in the first three years

George_Kirikos: It's the business of running the registries after the landrush/sunrise are over that they can't handle.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: .asia has had its second landrush anniversary drop recently

George_Kirikos: DW: All the good domains I've bought in the secondary market.

George_Kirikos: One can pay fair market value in the secondary market for good .com domains, and run a real business.

DW: they can't be that good if you can afford them.

DW: ok I'll take your word for it.

Jorge: Italia about to get eliminated from the worldcup

George_Kirikos: If you choose to invest in a new TLD, it's like building your store in Alaska or Siberia, rather than in Manhattan.

George_Kirikos: Don't expect a big audience in Siberia.

George_Kirikos: I can generate 1 billion signatures, with a bot. :-) How do you verify that support is "real"??

George_Kirikos: (.xxx, for example, says they have a community, while others disagree)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: verified WHOIS? :)

George_Kirikos: Yes! :)

Jorge: Uptdate ITA 1 - SVK 2

George_Kirikos: Greece was knocked out. :(

Jorge: sorry I'm from ARG

George_Kirikos: Euro 2004 will be the pinnacle of Greek soccer for at least 50 years.

Jorge: actually Greece forgot that they had to play ball

George_Kirikos: hehe I know, the time of possession said it all.

AttyJones: @George, you're smart, how about coming up with some system whereby whois data can be electronically verified and associated with a real live person or entity.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: @AttyJones 666? :)

George_Kirikos: AttyJones: By definition it can't be don't in real-time or electronically, at scale, internationally.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: everyone gets their own digital cert

George_Kirikos: It needs to be done out-of-band, with a link to the physical world.

George_Kirikos: (e.g. doing it via PIN codes physically mailed to a postal address, etc.)

George_Kirikos: But, it scales very nicely. Say it costs \$2 to do it. Most people have more than 1 domain.

George_Kirikos: I think the average is around 10 domains per customer, at GoDaddy.

AttyJones: okay, so work on that, you'll make a fortune. or, maybe we'll give you a job. :)

George_Kirikos: So, on a per-domain basis, it's really small.

George_Kirikos: You can't afford crazy folks like me. ;-)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: actually a lot of people underestimate the cross TLD ownership figure

George_Kirikos: PIN codes are mailed for me to access my Canada Revenue Agency taxes online.

George_Kirikos: I think the IRS does the same. Casinos do it, too.

Bret_Fausett: .EUS? Don't know that .EU is going to be too thrilled with that one.

George_Kirikos: If you want to have mail forwarding, the post office will send you a similar kind of verification code, to do it, by mail.

AttyJones: @Bret, that's what I was thinkking

DW: is there any History here... I got bumped and lost that domain advice from George :-)

George_Kirikos: Mail is legally protected in most advanced countries. The Universal Postal Union could come up with some good advice.

George_Kirikos: DW: You can actually replay the entire Acrobat session, and fast forward, etc., later.

Jorge: Update SVK 3 ITA 1

George_Kirikos: AttyJones: Here's a way to do it electronically, actually.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: .eus would be a good one as the Basques have been around longer than EU

George_Kirikos: Have .post (Universal Postal union), have verified postal boxes for their domains (which they probably give free to citizens).

AttyJones: @John, but that would belie Adrian;s theory. :)

George_Kirikos: Then they could use some API to cross-validate.

SeanPowell: chat transcripts are not included in the Adobe recording unfortunately, but they should be published as well

George_Kirikos: (it wouldn't deal with stolen accounts, but a .post mail box might at some point become the equivalent of a verified identity)

George_Kirikos: And since it's run by the post office, it's linked to a physical address, so you couldn't create unlimited fake identities (unless you were in cahoots with the govt, like in some rogue countries)

John_McCormac_HosterStats: @AttyJones a lot of this identity stuff was being worked on in the early 1990s with electronic cash and it was very difficult to solve then.

Jorge: Update SVK 3 ITA 2

George_Kirikos: There used to be the Thawte "Web of Trust".

George_Kirikos: Of course, it died, after being bought by VRSN.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: there was a proposal to introduce an electronic cash system without an audit trail and the state banks went ballistic :)

AttyJones: @John, yeah, we've had this discussion with everyone under the sun. no one can come up with the perfect solution.

AttyJones: @George, they still do domain validated certs.

George_Kirikos: A domain validated cert becomes a circular-reference, though.

George_Kirikos: The Web of Trust was an attempt to link personal identity, though.

George_Kirikos: (e.g. if I met with one of the founders of it, and they vouched for me, I'd get a certain number of reputational points)

George_Kirikos: And then if I vouched for someone else, they'd get a certain number of points, etc.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: a facebook of trust?

AttyJones: if you can figure out how to do it with some physical contact but verified electronically, you'll be onto something.

George_Kirikos: ICANN's Board asks us to read all the documents --- I bet 99% of the docs were never read by the Board, though.

George_Kirikos: Well, you can do as PayPal does, and send out a security key (I think VeriSign used to do this for school kids).

George_Kirikos: And then you can authenticate electronically against that security key.

George_Kirikos: It can be done. I'm sure someone like RSA could do it at scale.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: yes but those systems are only as strong as their weakest links (look at what happened with Pay TV)

Jorge: Update ITA and NZL out of the 2010 Worldcup

George_Kirikos: Is Rob going to ask any of my remaining questions?

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-other-community-issues/>

George_Kirikos: (about UDRP providers and also Jones Day legal costs)

George_Kirikos: Both can be asked in under 2 mins.

hta: ?

John_McCormac_HosterStats: just thinking on the verified whois - Nominet does a form of validation for new .uk doms.

George_Kirikos: Yep. I think .be or another small ccTLD does it too.

Jorge: .IT and .NZ on sale

John_McCormac_HosterStats: .ie is a managed registry so you have to demonstrate entitlement before registration

Robert_Hoggarth: we're still on new tld subject. not sure how chair will conduct things after he completes his queue list. WE are quite over-time at this point. I'm glad you and others have your points preserved in the record.

John_McCormac_HosterStats: it has limited problems somewhat

George_Kirikos: Well, there's a difference between asking them live, vs. a written response.

George_Kirikos: They almost never answer in written ones, they dodge.

Robert_Hoggarth: understood and agreed - with your first point, not your second

George_Kirikos: :)

gpmgroup: What is the best way to get items in for scoping for the second part of the economic studies?

George_Kirikos: Better to cut off board discussion, rather than reduce public questions.

Jim_Fleming: GK: just my 2 cents but ICANN is for lawyers and face to face

George_Kirikos: Or, heck, cut into their martini time, etc.

George_Kirikos: 3 times a year, we get a chance to ask tough questions.

Bret_Fausett: Is it sounding like we are delayed yet again? Or are we still on track for AG in Columbia and Applications next Spring?

George_Kirikos: In parliamentary democracies, there is "Question Period" every day.

Jim_Fleming: GK: 365 times per year you get to vote with your feet, your software, your time, etc

Karen_Lentz: gpmgroup: you can comment on the economic studies here: framework

George_Kirikos: Bret: you should make an electronic futures market for new TLDs in one of the idea exchanges.

George_Kirikos: I bet new TLDs won't launch before 2013, and I'd put money behind it.

Karen_Lentz: sorry, link is <http://icann.org/en/public-comment/#economic-framework>

AttyJones: @Bret, the board said they are going to decide the issues at a special Board retreat in October. But, that is always subject to delay.

Jim_Fleming: DNS is now a FREE Market and much of this will be moot

George_Kirikos: The PM of the UK answers questions at least once a week in Question Period. The official opposition keeps the government accountable.

Bret_Fausett: Thanks, @AttyJones

Jim_Fleming: Lawyers will lose interest when the money goes away

George_Kirikos: The board retreats more than the French army. :-)

gpmgroup: Thanks karen is there a cut off date for items for consideration in the second study or is it the end of the comment period

Bret_Fausett: Is someone really advocating that terrorists should get TLDs?

George_Kirikos: .hamas

Jim_Fleming: But as long as people pay and play there will be an "Eco-System"

John_McCormac_HosterStats: brings new meaning to the the term dot.Bomb :)

George_Kirikos: .alqaeda

George_Kirikos: .hummus is too close to .hamas -- .hummus = rejected. :)

Jim_Fleming: People seem unaware of what will emerge in the next 12 months

Bret_Fausett: I like Mr. Palage's suggestion.

Karen_Lentz: gpmgroup: by end of the comment period, to give us time to consider the suggestions

Jim_Fleming: 2010 is not 1998 there are now nukes ready and waiting

George_Kirikos: Palage's reconsideration about transcripts/audio recordings was rejected, wrongly, by the board.

George_Kirikos: (i.e. of their private meetings, etc.)

gpmgroup: thanks Karen thats great :)

Jim_Fleming: Many things are changing in 2010 and then people will look back and wonder why they wasted 10 years

Jorge: @George I don't think it will happen sooner than 2014

George_Kirikos: You might be right. I think the NTIA/DO/DOJ will spend a long time considering what ICANN does, and will do the right thing.

George_Kirikos: They've tipped their hat on what they want done....if ICANN deviates, they do so at their peril.

Jim_Fleming: The North American bandwidth disparity is a dividing factor that can not be changed

Jorge: huh ?

Bret_Fausett: "No person putting their hand out for a special benefit is going to benefit registrants."

Bret_Fausett: Agreed.

George_Kirikos: True, Bret. All of them are gaming it.

George_Kirikos: Just like .asia and Afiliis gamed their community, and then ex-post asked for fee reductions, etc.

Jim_Fleming: Eyeballs are the name of the game and they move to the bandwidth and compelling content

PW: lost sound?

Jim_Fleming: Playing in the DNS arenas is not something that attracts many people as you can see

John_McCormac_HosterStats: sound is fine here

Jim_Fleming: All of the major players with eyeball platforms are close to rolling out solutions that will make this all so silly

Jorge: And of top of that many find him very "cute"

Jim_Fleming: this is great for Internet History books

George_Kirikos: Ask remote questions!

George_Kirikos: I have 2.

Jim_Fleming: IAHC is in the History Books

Robert_Hoggarth: @george et al ... The Forum form links on the Forum Session page will remain open for a day to give you all time to submit additional thoughts. I will share it all in the session record and circulate unanswered questions in this forum with fellow staff members.

Jim_Fleming: This is sort of like World of Warcraft with real people

Jorge: lol

Jorge: World of Namecrap

Jorge: I mean Namecraft

John_McCormac_HosterStats: more like a working Tower Of Babel :)

Jim_Fleming: For anyone that knows Internet History from the 1970s this is jaw-dropping

Jorge: I agree with you on that one Jon Postel would be screaming

Jim_Fleming: In 1998 Jon Postel said he would create ICANN to fail - I was there

George_Kirikos: If they're not going to talk about Janis, they should go to remote questions.....testimonials really take away from real work.

Jim_Fleming: His comment was that he would staff it with people who do not know anything

George_Kirikos: They should save testimonials for the dinners, etc.

Charles: Jim, any reference I can read on that Postel comment / idea? thanks

George_Kirikos: The grand ball, etc.

Jim_Fleming: Postel made those comments at the IETF Meeting in Chicago in 1998

Jorge: "The Domain Name System was created to simply name computers attached to the Internet. There was no intention that domain names identify products or services in any way, or that domain names have any relationship to trademarks."

Jim_Fleming: Many deals were made in 1998

Jorge: <http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-postel-iana-itld-admin-01.txt>

Jim_Fleming: DNS is also NOT WHOIS the lawyers only care about whois

Charles: thanks jim

Jorge: "This directory problem is not really a Domain Name System problem. The Domain Name System provides a name to address look up service." same draft

Jorge: in answer to the question "Is the Domain Name System a directory service?"

Jim_Fleming: There are zillions of other name spaces and ways to find an IP address from some hint, DNS is not essential

Jim_Fleming: The trademark lawyers dont seem to care much about other name spaces

Jorge: at least it was never intended to be used as it is being abused today

Charles: Thanks Jorge

Jim_Fleming: When all you have is a hammer; everything looks like a nail

Jorge: my pleasure

George_Kirikos: Ask my remote questions, Rob!

George_Kirikos: Please!

Charles: other name spaces - I think this is more an issue of the average user not being aware of these spaces. thus not a threat at this time

Jorge: there is not a final conclusion of those reports

George_Kirikos: (others are tossing up softballs, and have access to the Board all year long)

Jim_Fleming: Twitter Names?

Jim_Fleming: FB ?

George_Kirikos: The public gets limited opportunity to ask the tough questions.

Jorge: also merged with the JAS report is not clear IANA will be ready to support the root zone expansion

Jim_Fleming: DNSSEC makes the IANA root zone management into NASA

Charles: ie hugely beaucratic?

Jim_Fleming: Ceremonies ?

Jim_Fleming: sheesh

Jim_Fleming: 1960s

Jim_Fleming: Cold War - Berlin Wall thinking

George_Kirikos: Remote questions!

George_Kirikos: 3 live, 0 remote, even though they said remote would be treated equally.

Jim_Fleming: Fortunately young people will not play in these silly arenas

Jim_Fleming: Third-world contries are the target market

Jim_Fleming: countries

Jorge: hey granpa I still consider myself young

Jim_Fleming: lots of noobs and suckers

Jim_Fleming: Over 18 is over the hill on the .NET

Charles: :) @ Jim

George_Kirikos: 4 live, 0 remote

George_Kirikos: How about 2 minutes for some remote questions?

George_Kirikos: Remote.

George_Kirikos: Lots of folks care about UDRP providers, but can't get ICANN to comment on the record.

Jim_Fleming: 2010 should be an interesting year with Nukes now readt

Jim_Fleming: ready

George_Kirikos: (even though they had it on the agenda at a recent board meeting, but then didn't do anything)

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-other-community-issues/>

George_Kirikos: Questions ICANN needs to answer.

George_Kirikos: (one of them isn't even from me)

George_Kirikos: *applause*

Jim_Fleming: People will have many more options by the end of 2010

Jorge: good point

George_Kirikos: That is insanity.....

Jim_Fleming: Insanity?

Charles: I hope you are right Jim, I'm not so sure ...

Jim_Fleming: Options?

Jorge: the gTLD program will drag forever and be the demise of ICANN

George_Kirikos: Time for a remote question.

Bret_Fausett: I am not sure I understood what point Zuck was making. Specifics?

George_Kirikos: If they approve .xxx tomorrow, Jorge, that'll kill them.

Jim_Fleming: Lots of fractures are going to become more clear and ICANN has chosen their bed to sleep in

George_Kirikos: Watch both the adult community and conservative/religious groups get NTIA/DOC/DOJ and congresss to slap ICANN harshly.

George_Kirikos: Remote questions!

George_Kirikos: Marilyn twice!

Jorge: @George my impression is that they will find a workaround to keep the ball rolling

George_Kirikos: She already spoke about Janis.

Jim_Fleming: Legal Perry Mason pan balances have THREE outcomes Left Right Middle

Charles_Christopher: Fractures = innovation = good

Jorge: even if ICANN approves it insertion and delegation on the root zone by IANA needs to be approved by NTIA

Charles_Christopher: but, ISP's still define most of the client experiance

Jim_Fleming: Some people are terrified of Fractures

George_Kirikos: Next up, a remote question from Rob.....?

Charles_Christopher: yes, due to their lack of control. Thus you come back to ISP controlling the experience

Jorge: innovations = good ideas != fragmented bad ideas

Jim_Fleming: PayWalls and Walled Gardens will grow

Robert_Hoggarth: @george ... i am shocked and dismayed that you don't think I am looking out for your interests today

Charles_Christopher: that tends to sort itself out of the system is truly freely operating

Jim_Fleming: it is fascinating the ISOC and ICANN have put a tax system in place but not a financial banking system

George_Kirikos: So far so good, Rob....just a few more questions, though.

George_Kirikos: No remote questions were asked in this latest segment.

George_Kirikos: It's like 8-0 or 9-0 for live vs. remote.

George_Kirikos: And it was suggested the queues between live and remote would be treated the same.

George_Kirikos: If they didn't want to treat them equally, they should have just said so, and I wouldn't wake up at 5 am to prepare.

Jim_Fleming: Face to Face is all that matters and then not 100% of those

George_Kirikos: Plus, many of the folks asking questions have access to ICANN staff all year long. The public does not.

Jim_Fleming: it is a club a very small and tight club

Robert_Hoggarth: @george I must have missed your tribute to Ambassador Karklins

George_Kirikos: Here's a suggestion. Why not setup a weekly or monthly "Question Period", where folks can ask the Board questions remotely?

George_Kirikos: I saved my questions for the ones that benefit the public, Rob.

George_Kirikos: A tribute to Janis could have been done at the live feast, ball, etc.

Jim_Fleming: Do you think the ICANN Board makes any important decisions?

George_Kirikos: Of course fees, etc.

m_vernon: how do I find the transcript of the public forum from its first two hours?

Jorge: I believe it will be posted later

George_Kirikos: Thanks Rob.

Jim_Fleming: Was the ICANN Board elected by the public ?

m_vernon: do you have a time frame?

George_Kirikos: Yay, thanks!

Charles_Christopher: :)

Jim_Fleming: What important decision do you think the ICANN Board will make tomorrow?

George_Kirikos: hehe Charles.

el: Mr Hoggarth, why was my question not raised?

George_Kirikos: Joe Sims will still make his millions @ Jones Day.

George_Kirikos: Eberhard Lisse had a question, too.

George_Kirikos: <https://icann.wufoo.com/reports/icann-38-public-forum-other-community-issues/>

el: ANd I have posted it shereal hours ago

DW: Well I think at the next meeting; George should just stand off to the side and shoot off questions to the Board at 20 minute intervals.

George_Kirikos: DW: I wouldn't need to, if they didn't dodge the questions the rest of the calendar year.

George_Kirikos: Scroll up for the regular "Question Period" suggestion above.

Robert_Hoggarth: transcripts fro the scribes have been being generated in about 4 hours for the shorter session. Given the substantial record of this session I would expect a longer ead time. Marilyn v I think you are coser to the scribes right now than I am. perhaps they could give you an estimate directly

George_Kirikos: There wouldn't be a backlog, if they answered people during the year.

Jorge: one world one internet one firewall :-)

Jim_Fleming: You want to see Fractures head on over to the 5 flavors of IPv6

George_Kirikos: One world, one censor.

George_Kirikos: One world, one central point of failure.

George_Kirikos: EL's question.

Charles_Christopher: yeah

Charles_Christopher: the centralization is the opposite of the point of the internet

Jim_Fleming: If there is a Single Point of Failure it must not be the Internet, right?

Charles_Christopher: yet at some level it's helped getting us where we are

George_Kirikos: Legal costs = board, UDRP under contract = board.

George_Kirikos: GNSO doesn't have a constituency for registrants.

Jorge: hmmm then lets all become members of the organization and have a vote

George_Kirikos: BC and other constituencies have been captured.

Charles_Christopher: the problem is the closure of innovation, the blockading of it since it might result in the replacement of the current centralization

Jorge: what ICANN executive staff is decided by the board not by its constituencies

George_Kirikos: Board can impact legal costs.

George_Kirikos: Notice they "negotiate a discount", instead of doing the tender.

George_Kirikos: Board can impact compensation for staff, we can't.

George_Kirikos: Have a nice day/night, folks.

Robert_Hoggarth: Thanks everyone for participating remotely and in-person. See or read you in Cartagena. ☺

Robert_Hoggarth: the session is now adjourned ...

John_McCormac_HosterStats: later all - time to do some work

Jim_Fleming: FREE domains will change the game

Jaime_Wagner: great job Rob

Jorge: bye bye

Jorge: yes great work for the ICANN folks facilitating remote participation