

**ICANN Costa Rica Meeting**  
**Commercial & Business Users Constituency**  
**- TRANSCRIPTION**  
**Tuesday 13th March 2012 at 13:15 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.

Coordinator: This conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Woman: Thank you very much.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks very much. My name is Marilyn Cade and I'm the Chair of the Business Constituency. Welcome to our meeting.

We will be going around the table and offering everyone an opportunity to introduce themselves in a few minutes.

Before I do this I want to be sure if you could confirm for us Operator that I can be clearly heard on the conference switch.

Coordinator: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. (Phil) I think there's seat over here and right here.

You should have an agenda in front of you. We have extras right up here.

Before I kick this off though because we have someone joining us doing some technical consulting I'd just like -- technical consultation I'd just like to recognize (Ed McNeer) from Bearland who's visibly solving the problems.

Bearland provides the technical support for all of our meetings. They have a terrific team. We count on them and I know they're here in the room and we just think things are going to happen.

But I'd like you to join me in offering a round of applause in recognition of Bearland and all the great support that they provide to us at all the ICANN meetings.

And see he owns the company so now we know who to go to.

Thank you guys. So there are paper agenda agendas up here. The agenda will be projected but if you don't have a copy come up here and just get one.

It's going to be a very fast paced discussion because I'm almost out of time to make the Chair's remarks and of course as well all know that's the most important part of any meeting.

So quickly we're going to do introductions.

I'm going to start over here and I know we have a couple of guests but that's at the end. So would you please say your name just quickly and your affiliation and whether you're a guest or a member.

And we'll start with you if you don't mind?

Jordyn Buchanan: Hi I'm Jordyn Buchanan I'm a guest. I worked for Google.

(Sara Fairly): (Sara Fairly) I'm also a guest today and I also worked for Google.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: You must speak into the microphone. John go ahead.

John Berard: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: John?

John Berard: What was I to do? John Berard. I'm Public Relations Consultant based in San Francisco a member of the Business Constituency and serve as the one of the two constituency counselors on the GNSO Council.

(Marie Patado): Good afternoon my name is (Marie Patado). I'm the Senior Brand Protection Manager for AIM the European brand...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...networks still a member of BC.

Bill Smith: Bill Smith, PayPal member of BC.

Jim Baskin: Jim Baskin, Verizon BC.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi, Facebook BC.

Ayesha Hassan: Ayesha Hassan, International Chamber of Commerce BC.

Benedetta Rossi: Benedetta Rossi, BC Secretary.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, BC Vice Chair for (Paul C) Coordination.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper, CSG Liaison for the BC and MarkMonitor.

Martin Sutton: Martin Sutton, HSBC BC.

(Amanda Semagla): (Amanda Semagla), (McCormick ICT) and I'm a guest today.

Scott McCormick: Scott McCormick, McCormick ITT BC.

Julie Hansen: I'm Julie Hansen Council of Better Business Bureau and I'm a new member of the BC.

(Celia Lerner): (Celia Lerner) from the Latin America and Commerce Institute and also new member of the BC.

(Gabriella Flacks): (Gabriella Flacks) from the Latin America in Commerce Institute and also a new member of the BC.

(Madia Mawat): (Madia Mawat) from (Unintelligible) based in Spain and I'm a member of BC.

Andrew Mack: Andrew Mack in Global I'm not sure yet if I'm a member of BC but I'm supposed to be at some point.

(Maryjo Cuclar): (Maryjo Cuclar) representing the administration member of BC.

(Andy Abrams): Hi I'm (Andy Abrams) with Google and I'm a guest here.

Jeffrey Smith: I'm Jeffrey Smith of Commercial Connect we're doing the dots chop (QLD) application and I'm a guest.

(Joan Nekula): (Joan Nekula), (Networld) Alliance that's media.

(Jack Watcha): (Jack Watcha) Compliance for ICANN, guest.

(Jonathan Dennison): I'm also a guest from Compliance, (Jonathan Dennison).

(Seth Ree): (Seth Ree) a guest at large and Whois review team.

Philip Corwin: Philip Corwin, virtual on LLC for the Internet Commerce Association member of the BC.

Marilyn Cade: And on the phone?

Chris Chaplow: On the phone Chris Chaplow, Vice Chair for Finance and Operations BC.  
  
Hearing everybody loud and clear.

Marilyn Cade: Okay Benedetta has a special announcement to make and asks you all to join her in she has you have an announcement to make please?

Benedetta Rossi: Okay I have an announcement to make that we have a special guest today and it's my mother and it's a very (good sunny) was currently taking pictures of me because she wanted to see what I look like when I'm working.

Thank you for that Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: So obviously there's a message to membership recruitment bring your family.

Thank you for joining us. I'm sure that there may be other things that would be more fun to do but we're very happy you decided to join us.

Okay I'm just going to say a few more words that I will put under the category of Chair's remarks and then I want to go to and I think we missed -- you guys didn't introduce yourselves yet.

Can we ask you to do that?

(Andrew Sullivan): I'm (Andrew Sullivan) I work for (unintelligible) and I'm a guest.

Karen Lentz: Karen Lentz, ICANN staff I'm a guest also.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you both for joining us. I'm going to say a few more things that following the Chair's remarks and then I'm going to turn it over to Elisa to talk about two about Whois.

And then we will Jeff Brueggeman will be joining us at two. We will have a very, very short discussion about the CEO search and then we will have a more extended -- we'll have a short discussion about outreach participation.

We have guests joining us at 2:40 that is the Chair and the Chair Elect of the Nominating Committee and just a reminder for some of the old hands here that the BC has two representatives on the Nominating Committee that is an unusual honor for us.

We are required to provide one large one -- sorry one person from a large corporation or association as opposed to one large person and one person from a small company or an association that represents primarily small companies.

We also practice geographic diversity in that we strive very, very hard to have our representatives from different regions.

They will be joining us the NomCom is meeting right now so and then they will our members that are representatives will stay with us for the rest of the day.

So couple of comments on a from me as Chair. For the BC members we will be handing out our new newsletter with the meet the BC document in it's this evening at the reception.

And we will have sufficient copies for everybody at that time but right now I'm going to pass a few around so you guys can take a look at them but and if

you don't and you're a member and you don't get a copy this time you'll will have enough copies by the time of the meeting because we have 17 guests from Costa Rica it turns out and we had more guests this morning at the GAC turns out we didn't quite have enough with us which is a good problem to have.

ICANN is at a crossroads in some ways and their people who are interested in painting back is a crisis.

But let's think about it a little bit differently. ICANN is 15 years old. How many of you have teenagers?

You know, we're doing pretty well aren't we?

We are going through a real interesting opportunity and changes that will have dramatic impact on users and the introduction of IBMs of the top level and on the introduction of large numbers of gTLDs but that is not the only change that is happening and it's really important that the business constituency who's focus is much more than just gTLD policy.

Understand that we have multiple jobs to do and as business people do we're going to do all of them well. And that means that we're going to have to help other people in ICANN maintain a very positive spirit about this time of very big change.

There's a series of external challenges and meetings that are going on between now and the end of the year and then stretching into June of next year where an ongoing debate about who should be in charge of the governance of the Internet read subtitle and ICANN's function is again merging in a global forum where it is receiving a fair amount of discussion.

They're always going to be governments who are anxious about what I will say if the Internet is so important why is government not in charge? Or why is the UN not in charge?

But we're business. We build and run the systems that make the Internet work.

And so while we're going to have to focus on some of those discussions because they run the risk of threatening ICANN's ability to do its job and because we will many of us find it important to participate in the Internet and governance forums as well as in ICANN.

I think we have to look at the larger Internet landscape and figure out what we do as the business constituency what we do within ICANN and what some of us may decide to do in the parallel universes of our lives when we are working in the IGF or we're working in other settings.

We will continue to use a small amount of time in the BC to share information about these other activities. But we're not going to consume the work of the BC.

If people are really interested in those other activities then we'll set up special conference calls for those that are particularly interested.

We have to focus on our job here at ICANN as well as do those other things.

So one quick comment. There was a great workshop that last night that addressed ICANN and the Internet governance landscape. There's a transcript to it.

If you didn't get a chance to go you can see Jeff Brueggeman, Ayesha, myself, Steve some of the folks who were there or are active in this area and have an offline conversation.

So I want to turn this over now to I want to I want to turn this thing see I want to turn this over now and guys do feel free to take the seat at the table.

I know it's going to be more comfortable for you.

I want to turn this over to that I should probably quickly introduce the officers for those of you who are new.

So I am the Chair, Steve DelBianco is our Vice Chair Policy Coordination. We have Chris Chaplow on the phone with us our Vice Chair Finance and Operations and we have Elisa Cooper who is our newest officer who is our CSG Liaison and we have our two counselors Zahid Jamil and John Berard who introduced himself earlier.

I want to go to Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks Marilyn. So I'd like to spend a little time and talk about the current state of Whois and in particular the Whois policy review teams draft report.

I think that probably most of you know that the Whois policy review team recently completed their draft report.

It was really a tremendous effort. There's just a considerable amount of time and thought put into 20 recommendations that were made by that review team.

And it should be noted that both Bill Smith and Susan Kawaguchi served on that review team and I thank them very much for all of their efforts because it was I know from reading it was truly (unintelligible) that it was really a tremendous undertaking and really came up with some excellent ways forward.

Next slide. Just to give you some highlights of what that report said and I feel a little silly given that you're all both of you are in the room.

But give you an overview. Some things that were recommended in the report were things like ensuring that we have a single Whois policy, making Whois a strategic priority at the board level, improving outreach as well as data accuracy, ensuring that there are actual requirements as well as penalties for privacy providers the importance of Whois accessed and then as well as the development and standards for IDN.

So it's really -- it covered a tremendous amount of information.

Next slide. So in terms of the work that we did as the BC and I would really also like to thank everyone who participated because there were quite a few people who actively participated reviewed the comments and attended calls.

And I want to go over briefly just basically the process that we went through.

So back on the third of February we held an initial call with BC members who had interest in this particular topic. We then prepared a report that was sent to all members and from that report we had several revisions.

And we had comments from a number of our members including Sarah Deutsch, (Mike) -- I know I'm going to leave out names -- Mikey O'Connor, Marilyn Cade.

There was a lot of help and support also given from Bill Smith and from Susan Kawaguchi to give their feedback as well.

But we did come up with a draft that was then a second call held on the seventh where we invited all BC members to participate again very good (unintelligible) participation with that.

And then just on the tents we sent out a final draft to all members.

So at this point I believe we're very close and my plan is to get that submitted within the next couple of days because the report comments are due by the 18th.

So we must submit those within the next few days.

Next slide. This is initial comments on the initial report. What's that?

Yes so as Marilyn is reminding me that the comment process is now divided.

So this is the initial set of comments that we are submitting there will be another set of comments provided back in response to our comments.

And so at that point...

Man: Soon as I can make another peer...

Elisa Cooper: Another comment...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: ...period. Now in terms of our perspective on the report generally we agreed with most of the recommendations.

In some cases though we felt that the recommendations could go even further Whois was sure to me effective and meet the needs of law enforcement as well as to promote consumer trust.

Next slide. So like I said we'll get those comments in within the next few days.

The other document that's currently out for comment is the SAC 51 draft roadmap to implement.

So there are recommendations from the SSAC that were published called the SAC 51 and essentially those were recommendations from the (ITN) community to evaluate and adopt a replacement for Whois.

And essentially that replacement would utilize the new terminology and implement some new standards as well as support for IBMs.

And the board requested a roadmap to implement this. And so this is what is currently out right now for comment.

It should be noted that in that particular document it's envisioned that there will be two comment periods. So I'm not sure at this point, you know, what our plans are to comment on this one.

If we choose to comment in a layer document I think, you know, that might make sense because at this point there are no actual dates associated with any other roadmap items but I think, you know, we can discuss that further.

So that is really kind of where we are with Whois in a nutshell. I guess I would ask if there are any questions things that I might be able to answer.

Sorry I don't know the protocol. Marilyn would like to make a comment.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. So Elisa will be calling on you if you have a question. She'll be moderating this herself while she's taking the questions.

I do have a comment. I had invited Patrick Falstrom who is the Chair of the (unintelligible) come and join us today so we could go into more detail on this.

And Patrick had a conflict however he's agreed to do a conference call with us to go into it in a more detail.

Just be careful that when you are referring to stacked 051 and Chris will have to Chris will have to add this to our acronym buster that you're not calling it the replacement of Whois.

And because it is actually a new protocol it's not a proposal to do away with the kind of function enroll and service that the Whois as we call it today can provide but it is well and it will go into a lot more discussion on it but I did caution the (unintelligible) Chair and the Vice Chair when they came and spoke to the counsel to please not say that (whiz) is going away otherwise there will be pitch forks and torches and, you know, riots in the street from some of us.

It's a very fascinating topic. It is something that has been talked about since I chaired the first taskforce on Whois in 2000 to 2002.

And I think long overdue and it's very exciting I see (unintelligible) here from (unintelligible), yes?

Yes so we have I think we'll have a lot more to talk about this.

I am going to ask Elisa to if you're interested in playing a particularly in-depth role in the for the discussions on this let her know because we may have to do if we have a chance to have a huddle with Patrick here we'd know who we needed to get together for that.

Elisa Cooper: Yes I wanted to mention one thing. I see Bill Smith has a question but before we move to that I just would also like to thank Bill he actually did an excellent write up on SAC 51 and that was sent out on March 6.

So for those of you who've been too busy and haven't had a chance yet I would recommend reviewing that because it provides a very good overview of what some of the issues are.

So Bill.

Bill Smith: And so the first thing just to be clear the write up that I did is not on SAC 51 which is a report from the Security Stability Advisory Committee or Security Advisory Committee it is a commentary on the draft roadmap to implement that that ICANN staff has developed...

Elisa Cooper: Right, right, yes.

Bill Smith: ...to a board's request.

Elisa Cooper: It's the roadmap.

Bill Smith: Okay. So just to be clear there are two documents one of which is a report that I believe is finalized from SSAC. The other one is draft roadmap to implement that report okay where things contained within the reports and my comments are on that document.

Elisa Cooper: Right and that's what is open for comment right now not the SAC 51 standards just the roadmap...Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: We're going to asks for clarification. The public comment process was improved driven by affirmation of commitment requirement to include an initial round and a reply round but what actually happened was that a 45 day comment period process roughly 45 days it was cut in half and half of it goes to initial and half of it goes to reply.

Reply also is not supposed to be able to raise issues that were not raised in initial.

So we will take up the discussion of how that's working for us at a different time. But for this I did tell Patrick Falstrom that I was of the view that they were going to have to take comments equally in both phases.

So otherwise what we're going to have to file by the 18th will just be a statement that as the BC.

You can file individually of course and should but if we filed as the BC we would have to file a fairly high level statement that says given how late the material was made available that we are going to treat reply as so it is still open for comments.

So not to make a big deal about it but for those of you who are going to be very interested in this the 18th is the deadline on initials.

So if you don't know enough you think you're going to be interested you may want to think about it comment which says given how late I've gotten it I need to study it more and I may submit and you can just say I may submit comments in the reply round just as a little tip on what we sometimes have to do.

Elisa Cooper: Are there any other questions on Whois? As policy review team draft report or the SAC 51 roadmap?

All right, thank you so much.

Marilyn Cade: Jeff we're going to be turning to you to ask you for an update on the SSR review team but before I do that I want to remind everyone again this is an open meeting and you are being transcribed and Webcast so you're on video.

So I just wanted to mention that to everyone since later when you saw it you might be a little surprised.

So heads up you are you have remote participants with you virtually in the room.

Jeff over to you.

Jeffrey Smith: Okay thanks. So unfortunately we were not able to get out a draft report before this meeting so we are behind the Whois team.

We do have what I would say is a very stable set of recommendations and we are on track to have the draft report completed by the end of the meeting.

So our plan is to issue that as soon as possible with I think a long comment period of, you know, say 45 to 60 days.

Maybe do some socialization by conference calls and things between the meetings and then I think a lot will depend on the extent of the input that we get whether we are able to produce a final draft of the report before Prague or whether we're still finalizing that during the next meeting.

But the focus this week has been on drafting so we cancelled a number of the meetings that we had to do outreach with the GAC and others.

So I think that was the right choice to make and as I said I think we're making good progress.

So I know I've covered this a few times before but I do think it's worth maybe walking through kind of the key previewing where we are in the key recommendations because the BC input early in the process there's one of the very few comments that were filed had been very helpful to the team.

And so and I'm sure that Whois would set aside, you know, the more you comment the more that does help to see if the if you then end up in the report

and I think unlikely Whois we have a very broad open ended set of topics to cover and so we have really been wrestling with what needs to be on the list of things that we're covering in the report and one of our priorities is to try and help identify for ICANN what are the SSR issues that it should be most focused on.

So obviously getting input about what there should be is incredibly helpful.

So with that I'm going to go through as I've said before the report is going to be structured into three main sections. The first section deals with ICANN's SSR remit and limited technical mission and is it adhering to that mission.

So the we found that the evolution of the SSR framework into a part A and a part B where part A is the foundational discussion of ICANN's role and responsibilities has been a very helpful thing that as you continue.

We do find that they are generally complying with what we would say is their mission.

We also as I think I may have mentioned previously we like the way that ICANN has talked about it's responsibilities and three layers and we're proposing these slight refinement of them but basically there are things that ICANN operationally controls namely the (unintelligible) function in the L root and internal security.

There are things where ICANN is a coordinator and a facilitator. That is a very complex area that includes (D) and FSAC and working with other operators of the DNS infrastructure.

And then there's the broader global Internet ecosystem as they're referred to at where ICANN plays an important role in doing outreach and the engagement at larger community.

So we think that focus really helps to help clarify the type of activities that ICANN should be engaged in with each level of responsibility.

So I think generally we're pretty happy on with how they're managing the overall scope of responsibilities. We did note the some of the controversy around the DNS (unintelligible) a few years ago and the input from the community in our report.

And then we also I think spend just a little bit of time discussing ICANN's relationship with the SSAC and the RSAC is two very unique kind of needs that are very important to SSR related issues.

And we make some recommendation about mapping some of those relationships more consistently and especially with the RSAC trying to clarify what their role is on some of these SSR issues.

So turning to the SSR framework itself as I said before this has been an evolving we're in the third iteration of the SSR framework and the FY13 is going to be released in draft form in the next few months.

So the good news is we've been able to see progress as we've been working with the staff on our report I think the incorporating some of the input that we've had along the way.

So we seem a good improvement a good evolution. I think one of our main overall comments is that we'd like to see more prioritization in the SSR framework.

It can read a little bit like a long list of activities and we want to get a better sense of what the priorities are and then how those feed in down to the strategic plan down to the budget and down to the staffing.

So kind of have a more connected set of priorities to route that flows through all of what ICANN is doing.

Looking at some of the specifics on how ICANN is doing with respect to each of the type of functions I think we have been able to document a lot of good work that's - as far as how ICANN manages its operational responsibilities. Some of the security standards that they are building to, the routes on automations. So there's a lot of things there I think where we've been documenting what they're doing. I think generally we're, you know, very satisfied with what we're seeing there.

The coordination function as I said I think is a very complex area because there are things that ICANN can't just dictate, things like DNS sec and it's spending a lot of time and working on these issues and it's clearly identified as a priority in the strategic plan. I think what we'd like to see is some more tangible implementation goals and some public tracking. We actually are proposing a dashboard similar to what the ATRT has on how they're doing so the public can more easily see this is the tangible goal. This is where we are in meeting that. So a little bit more transparency there. I think we're not - we're trying not to over process things but come up with ways to have a distribution of information.

And then I think we're really saying this - these are the sets of relationships where ICANN really probably needs to focus the most in terms of not just the contracted parties but also, you know, other operatives of infrastructurized pieces and others who really are going to be critical in implementing things like IPv6 and DNS sec. Again ICANN can't control it but it's very important side of relationships.

Then on the outreach I think that either - there's a fair amount of activity going on there and I don't think we really have any, you know, concerns about what's happening on outreach. I think one of the ideas is that ICANN can maybe do a better job of publishing and pushing out information that the FSAC issues, a number of really good reports on things and ICANN can be a

good repository and resource without necessarily having to send staff around to just be a good source for information.

We spent a lot of time looking at the budget and the staffing on SSR issues and we do have when you look at how it's broken out there is a section that is clearly for the chief security office but there's also a \$5 million budget that's kind of generally allocated to SSR without being clear about what that is. So we are saying that there should be more clarity about exactly kind of what the budget's being used for in this area.

And then we also this is an area where we looked specifically at compliance and at the new domain name program and we said that while there has been some good analysis of the resource requirements for the new domain name program that should be turned into something that can be published and something that, you know, can more formally look at what the requirements are going to be and talk about how ICANN is scaling its compliance and other resources to take account of the new domain name program.

And then finally on - I already kind of touched on the process point of the clear and transparent process. I think we find they're very good on seeking comment and input but again I think it was more in the implementation is where we thought there could be some more consistent information put out there publicly. So that's kind of the overview of the SSR framework.

The third part of the report is the one that we actually are still kind of finalizing this week and it has to do with ICANN's risk management process incidence response and identification of existing and emerging risk. And I would say our overall assessment is that they are doing a lot of good things in that area. In particular the issue of risk management has been an evolving one within ICANN and just it should be adopted this week the new risk management committee of the board will have its mandate which we think is an important part of clarifying responsibilities on risk management that we haven't had up until now.

But I think our general recommendations in this area is there's a lot of information work and we'd like to see a little bit more turning some of that into more formal risk assessment type process and continuancy planning and those types of things, recognizing that ICANN is doing good work, doing exercises and participating with other parties on it. So but the feeling though is that while ICANN has a limited scope of control it must be very cognizant of boarder risk to the DMS and be ready and prepared to respond to those.

So overall I think, you know, it's a designed to provide constructive recommendations rather than just kind of assign, you know, grades or overall evaluation. But I'd say generally we see a lot of good things that ICANN is doing and are trying to, you know, provide some specific areas where we are proposing there be some additional focus and help them prioritize. So happy to take any questions. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I think others who are much more technical than I will have more technical questions perhaps Jeff but I'm - there's a couple of things that I'm sort of interesting in understanding. And one of them is I do think - would like to know the general categories of - that the \$5 million can go to and what level of authority is required. I mean clearly there can be an urgent situation. Probably hiring somebody off the street wouldn't be considered an urgent situation. But there can be urgent situations but there needs to be some kind of level of sign off or some. That's very typical that a CEO has a fund like that...

Jeffrey Smith: Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...but there's some kind of guidance or, you know, etcetera. So that would be that's one...

Jeffrey Smith: Right. Yes. Yes. And I should say Martin handling it from (unintelligible) also on the team. So please jump in. But I think what we said is we don't need to

micromanage the budget and ask for overly detailed line items but just that's a fairly sizeable amount of the SSR related budget that was generally not just accounted for, yes.

Marilyn Cade: The second question and by the way (Jeff Moss) is joining us later.

Jeffrey Smith: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So I hope the two of you will be able to join us as well for that. But I guess my second question is I'm going to have to really digest the report more in order to understand the recommendations and their implications for various parts of ICANN. This constituency has announced that we intend to have a primary focus on SSR. The rest of the constituencies don't have that. The registries and registrars have a particular focus on their role but this constituency has the ability to really reach the distributed set of players. So I think we will want to actually later consider your set of recommendations in light of our membership and how this might even help us to draw more members around its particular work item.

And then my final comment is I must disagree with the esteemed review team that we should be satisfied with anything going on in outreach. I think that that's one of the areas that we're hearing consistently on everything about the end communication. We're hearing consistently and I think our experience is that's a particularly weak experience overall. So do before you guys give up on this go back and look hard at that because our experience to date is not good. The tools, the mechanisms, the resources, the approaches, the list of people who don't know what we're doing is so high. And in the meeting with the board today both Ayesha Hassan and the executives - the chair of (Camtec) both noted the difficulty in actually reaching into the broader distributed parts of business.

Jeffrey Smith: Maybe just a quick response on that. I think and we've really been talking about that a lot this week. I think there is a - there's a difference between

what we're talking about in terms of actual infrastructure and really trying to do outreach in terms of other parts of the DNS infrastructure as opposed to what seems to be kind of a softer set of outreach efforts where ICANN is partnering with others. And I think we were concerned about having too many issues.

We were saying well ICANN should do more of everything. And so it's not that we're saying it's fine but we just said, you know, the part where you're really trying to, you know, collaborate more with the other infrastructure operators, you know, all things being equal should be the highest priority among those. But we're also saying there's a lot of expertise and a lot of materials here. Let's think about leveraging better what we already have to do better outreach yes.

Marilyn Cade: So we have some very technical folks here. Anyone else have questions for Jeff? Well I - let me explain...

Jeffrey Smith: Marilyn can I just make one more comment? Along those lines is I think if, you know, one thing we decided early on is that we were not going to do a security audit of ICANN.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Jeffrey Smith: So just to manage expectations if you're expecting a detailed technical security report this is not that report. But we did feel like again this is the first SSR report that to some extent by setting the agenda of what the important issues are and calling for more transparency and formal process in some of these areas it actually will enable a more robust review down the road in those areas I think at a more security focused level. But we felt like it wasn't our role to necessarily kind of reevaluate whether, you know, and get too much into the ways on the technical issues. But I felt like if we see something that raises a concern let's look at what type of gap or issue that is a symptom of and identify it that way.

Marilyn Cade: So I need to put into context about the review team, sorry, because we have a number of people who are new. So we have our normal GTLB public development process, welcome (WATO) and that you'll be hearing a lot about and your - you can become very familiar with that. But when ICANN signed the affirmation of commitment with the Department of Commerce the document that changed the nature of the relationship with the Department of Commerce they made a number of commitments that they would accomplish.

And one of the major commitments was to do four review teams. These are very special review teams. They are not about GTLB policy. They are about larger overarching issues. The first one was the accountability and transparency. And I'm going to just pause and recognize Denise Michel who is sitting here in the corner. And she is the Director of all the review team process. The - so we had the ATRT, accountability and transparency. We then had who is and you heard from Susan earlier. And now you've heard from Jeff about the SS - the security and stability review team. A little bit later, not now but Steve will be talking a little bit later about the fourth yet to come review team.

But these are broader overarching review teams. We treat these as a priority to the BC. We assume they are a priority. We don't take a vote on whether they're a priority because they are important to the overall structure of the organization. So just a little background on why we focus in particular on the review team.

Jeffrey Smith: Marilyn I just want to acknowledge the great work that Denise and the staff has done. We had to work through some very difficult confidentiality issues to be able to review things that ICANN doesn't make public but also be able to talk about them in a report. So we didn't want it to all the - under an NDA but we needed to have access to that information and it really was quite a multi-month effort on Denise's part to facilitate that and the ongoing support they've provided has been really outstanding.

Marilyn Cade: We have a remote participant. We have our Vice Chair Chris Chaplow. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Hi Marilyn. Thank you. Jeff my ears pricked up when you mentioned budget because the CSG budget and operating plan group have got similar concerns and thoughts about the level of detail sort of exactly what you said really. So I think it's - this is more of a request than a question that we need to get our heads together and perhaps you've dug a little bit deeper in those specific areas that you've got your expertise in. And we can yes share information on this one. Thanks.

Jeffrey Smith: Yes and likewise Chris, you know, if you could review this part of the report I would love to get your comments on that as part of - I think the BC could really add some value there since you've done such a good job looking at these budget issues.

Chris Chaplow: Yes that'll work two ways. That's great. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Anybody else before we move to the next topic? If you're looking at the next topic you probably are holding your breath to see what I'm going to say. Yes John?

John Berard: Jeff you said that one of the first things you did was to take a look at the mission of ICANN so as to help what prioritize, organize your thinking. Or was that something that was - that's something that you thought to do or that you were told to do? And what did - were there any - did you draw any conclusions when you looked at what ICANN was up to and what its mission was?

Jeffrey Smith: I think we were driven by the mandate in the affirmation of commitment, made a special note of ICANN's responsibilities within its limited technical mission. So we felt like when you look at the security of the DNS being an

incredibly broad issue we felt like that was an important starting place if ICANN can't fix everything. So you could write a report about the horrors of DNS security that would be misleading in terms of what ICANN should do. So we felt like that was one reason to start with that issue.

And the other I think was because of the - some of the debate around the DNS cert that had just happened when launched our effort we felt like that had really pulled out a lot of view from the community about what ICANN's role should be. So we thought that, you know, that would be an important kind of foundation for everyone to in evaluating and thinking about how ICANN is doing on SSR issues to first think about what's their role as a starting point within that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay so the next topic is the CEO search. I'm sorry Bill please.

Bill Smith: Yes just a quick point of order. I have a comment slash question I'd like to make back on not this subject another one. And can I do it now or hold it until the end?

Marilyn Cade: I think it's probably fine to do it now.

Bill Smith: Okay this is on the - I believe there was a comment made about their being a second comment period, a reply comment for the who is review team. I do not believe that is accurate. Our comment was issued comment - call for comments was issued on 5 December 2011 and during that time period there was one, you know, there was a comment period open for some number of days. I'm stating this because the review team has no expectation to my knowledge that we have to open a second period to deal with replies. And I just found the page on the ICANN site that says the change is effective for those period comments that open as of 1 January 2012. So I'm just throwing it out there because it was confusing to me.

Marilyn Cade: So yes. So I'm not as worried about who is as I am about - sorry I'm not as worried about the comments of the BC on the who is review teams comment report and recommendations as I am about the SAC 051 since we are groping our way out of a dark room. But thank you for that comment and we will take that up and is that okay and figure it out later.

Woman: Yes thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Okay so I know you guys are wondering if I have some sort of secret knowledge about the CEO search. No. The answer is I don't. However, I wanted to call to everyone's attention that and Ayesha and Jeff are here as well as others and I made comments as well in my individual capacity that when the committee of the board was announced the - there are five members -- I think it's five, five or six -- members of the board, a board committee that is engaged in the CEO search. It is chaired by George Sadowsky.

And they did hold a public comment which was I think really a breakthrough for all of us. It was quite refreshing that they sat in front of the community and took comments on what we thought the characteristics and the priorities of the CEO should be. So you can follow the progress that they are making in the selection and my comment is not about that but about the fact that there were comments made on behalf of ICC. I think Jeff Brueggeman made them and so we might ask him or Ayesha to sort of highlight those. I'll highlight the comments that I made at the time. I think it's just worth people understanding where we are in the process. And what we have said in the past that it's our business community.

You do not need to read them. I'm just looking for a really high level statement. Do you want me to tell you - tell people what I said? You're okay. Okay. What I said in my individual capacity was that I thought it was important for the ICANN board to be open to having some kind of communication with the elected leadership of the constituencies and the

advisory committees and the SO about the qualifications in the final days before they make a final decision because the last time around they got down to two candidates and there was significant disagreement on the part of the community and the leadership of the community about what characteristics were needed for leadership for the next period of time.

So there was a fair amount of disappointment or tension between the members of the community and the process. I think this is a very critical time for ICANN and I am not aware at this time whether or not they are going to take any further comment on what we might call the characteristics. So we're not talking about the candidates. They will not be able to do that. But I know that some comments were made Ayesha and either you or Jeff might share that at a high level.

Jeffrey Smith: I think we - the comments reiterated the fact that it is a critical time, you know, within ICANN and therefore the new CEO has to have a skill set that's both going to be able to manage a very challenging external environment and be able to deal with governments, with other internet governance organizations and with kind of the broader landscape externally as well as manage the, you know, all of the transitions happening within ICANN, you know, particularly the new domain name program. So we kind of viewed it as a set of criteria for which to think about the new CEO would be someone who can bring that very diverse set of skill sets to the table.

Marilyn Cade: So I will make one final closing comment. I said in my comments then and if I'm offered the opportunity ever to make comments again in my individual capacity I will also be enforced that the CEO needs to actually stay at home and run the organization because we really do have a need for a very strong focus on the broad - we are in fact facing a hugely challenging internal environment as well as external environment. We're going to move to the next topic unless anybody else wants to make a comment on this. And this is just an exchange of views. This is not a formal BC position in any way. Anyone else want to make a comment?

Okay an update on outreach and participation. We've been struggling a bit and I think Chris is on the phone. We've been struggling a bit with trying to within the GNSO's counsel trying to bring some rationality on how outreach and participation can - that's going on or ideas about it that are going on in a number of places can be brought together into a more coherent strategy. There are - this year there are - there's the opportunity and we have submitted proposals from the BC into the budget process to ask for financial support for us to create a local leaders program of our own where we could do some outreach that is more regionalized or localized.

We are looking for support to help us actually continue to do our newsletters and to enhance and strengthen the communications and some other activities of that nature. But there's a number of disparate proposals coming into the ICANN budget process ranging from \$70,000 for a summit for (Arelo) to \$50,000 to workshops that might be held in conjunction with the IGF. Large amounts of money being asked for and no real coherent strategy of thinking about how an outreach and participation plan would benefit all of ICANN.

There's also a document being driven by staff that suggests that it's ICANN's job to pick and train the leaders or to support the development of leaders to create and support ambassadors. None of that has been rationalized with the constituencies and we ourselves are really sort of struggling with trying to provide the guidance and the input but in a sort of a strange vacuum. That is we're pushing information up and request up. Things are going on at the top. We haven't brought them together.

So one of the things we're trying to do while we're here is to - is have a rational discussion about how outreach and participation should work across all of ICANN so that it's not outreach and participation for the (ALAC) and outreach and participation for the GNSO and outreach and participation. But we think holistically and then can have activities and materials that are more customized to the interest. Mario is new and as you can speak to and

Gabriella can speak to the materials that reach your interest may not be the same materials that would reach civil society or would reach government.

So we're working on that and for those of you who are interested in it Chris is involved. Ayesha's involved. I'm involved. We welcome others who want to - and I know both of you Celia and Gabriella have indicated an interest as well. So we will come back to that. This is a more a heads up for you to say we're really going to want to put some focus into this and without - we also need materials that reach large corporates as well. If we can't communicate more effectively with the large corporations and (Anjolee) is new with us from the Better Business Bureau. But it would be - it's very difficult for us to have the right kind of communications materials unless we understand the questions. So stay tuned for our wanting to do more work on that.

Prague is coming up and we will want to have a very strong focus in Prague, some kind of a significant business outreach because it is generally easier for people in Europe - for business people in Europe to travel within Europe and we may be able to do a more customized series of activities there. We're going to be wrapping up so that we can get ready for our next speakers and make space for them here. But Chris did you want to say anything about this particular topic?

Chris Chaplow: Yes I've got Marilyn - I've got a quick presentation on the outreach event that we did in Spain and I think it's quite interesting. There's a couple of lessons for that.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Yes and I think we'd like to go to that if we're ready to. Yes we are. I think you're on the screen.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. Yes as I said an event in Spain, an outreach event for the BC was something that I wanted to do for a while because the awareness about ICANN and the BC is very low in Spain. You've only simply got to check the meeting registration lists and you'll see there's only about half a dozen

attendees from Spain and Mario and I are two of them. So and I tried to organize something initially in Madrid and my sights were a panel event, something like Ayesha did - the excellent one Ayesha did in Paris with the ICC.

And I found organizations that I was talking to, host organizations like Chambers of Commerce, were very interested but and willing to commit. And although ICANN, the corporation, on the back of its communications, detailed communications plan were offering materials and even speakers what I found was that what was sort of needed was some sort of underwriting. You know, organizations were concerned well if it - if nobody turns up or if there's a, you know, not enough people and it all goes belly up then, you know, we could lose out. And it was that - getting to that point of no return that I find was the problem.

Next slide please. So really after a chance meeting with a president of a local, of a regional press club who invited me to do a presentation down in southern Spain here in Marbella. And go onto the next slide if that's possible. You go on the blue one or the white one. Yes that's great. Thanks. And actually this event is the only event on the whole of the ICANN GTLD calendar between the opening date on the application of January and the closing date in April. So that's quite incredible that our BC event should be the only one.

Moving on to the next slide please. There was about 46 people present for the 25 minute presentation. Thanks Marilyn for going through the text and for very little redlining in it and to (Sarak Atwood) for taking the speech and making a really professional looking keynote presentation. And it was actually the biggest attendance in the history of the organization and a mix of journalists and small business people. And really was everybody there had hardly ever - well one or two people had even heard of ICANN let alone the BC.

Next slide please. So it was very much back to basics. It was internet history, (John Postel) formation of ICANN, explaining the multi-stakeholder model, GTLDs and IDNs. And really the simple take away for everybody was to have an interest in ICANN and the BC. Next. And also of course to warn people to be very careful with their credit cards with Web sites like the one you see on the screen that are currently taking pre-registrations on the GTLDs. Next slide please. And happily it was very well received and one editor who emailed me afterwards said that it was 100% new and 100% interesting.

Next slide please. And the report later appeared in various media in the local press and that's an example there. And the local TV station did a news spot and interviewed for news programs both in Spanish and in English.

Next slide please. Yes, so what I call an outreach event, to people who had never really heard of ICANN. And although we didn't actually sign up a BC member one person was interested enough to join the pre-Costa Rica webinar a couple of weeks later.

And I asked them about it later and they said, I don't know how they control so much information in the first place, so much work goes on behind all this. So I thought that was an interesting comment to finish up, thank you very much for listening.

The last slide's just a thank you slide. But thank you, over to you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: So Chris, and I know Mario is here, (Gabiella), (unintelligible), and some of the rest of you who have tried to do outreach events. And we have done outreach events ourselves as a group. Ayesha's done a number. We've done a number in Washington, D.C.

I think we - one of the things that made a big impact to me about Chris's experience was the real importance of - and that is an awareness event, that is actually not a recruitment event.

And I say that because normally if we were doing recruitment we would probably do a very targeted set of - you know, we'd identify and try to requalify companies that we think or associations that we think might be interested but as Chris has pointed out to me, we have a fundamental challenge of first of all creating awareness. And we need to get ourselves recognized.

One of the things we have started doing - one of the barriers to understanding who we are is actually our name. The VIZCONST.org is a little hard to get your mind around. So we have started calling ourselves - and you guys may see this, as BC@ICANN. And we are in discussions with ICANN about their hosting our webpage where we would then be BC@ICANN.org. So that I think would be just a kind of a start.

We wouldn't - the name of the constituency is actually the Commercial and Business Users Constituency. We don't have to change the name of the legal name of the constituency because we always call ourselves the BC but even having the kinds of materials that Chris custom developed. And I will just tell you when you get a chance, he did a fantastic presentation.

I had the opportunity to provide a few historical facts and I thought it really, really resonated to start out with somebody who knows nothing about ICANN and explain what it is, that's a pretty tall challenge. So do when you get a chance take a look at the materials that he developed.

And I think the lesson that I think we're learning - and I know Waudo helped us organize an outreach event with Kenyan business when ICANN came to Kenya and we might actually touch on that. We've got to become, I think, strategic about this but targeted.

So where we have members, where you may have contacts, what kinds of things that we do that is similar to what Chris did or Waudo maybe, what we

did with the dinner and business outreach, if we don't have a member there it's very hard to have a brand new member who has to sustain everything by themselves.

It seems to me that it's logical that Waudo's association, with you, (Gabriella), with Chris being in Spain, it may be more logical for us to try to start thinking about building around members first and then thinking about branching beyond that.

But do - we're going to be joined in just a minute by the Nominating Committee but do share any thoughts that you have with us. And again, I'm going to say, reaching big business, reaching business with a specialized interest about security and stability is going to be very different in reaching small businesses.

By our mandate, we must reach - Waudo, did you want to say anything about the difficulties of continuing to support business outreach in Africa? I know you and (Jimson) both have concerns about that.

Waudo Siganga: Thanks, Marilyn, and greetings to everyone. Apologies for coming in late, I had to come from another meeting of the NomCom of which I'm a member. With regard to outreach in places like Africa I think there's a large potential there because we have a lot of organizations and a lot of companies, both large and small that could be interested in membership of - and there's a benefit in membership with a BC.

But in many cases we find that they don't have the information about - first of all, how ICANN works, how ICANN - by (unintelligible) in ICANN can benefit them.

So from the experiences we have had, both with Marilyn and my other colleagues from other African countries, I believe that there's good potential

to increase participation of companies and associations as well from the African continent. And I hope this efforts are going to continue with time.

(Gabriella Flacks): Okay, well I'm (Gabriella) from Argentina and the Latin America in Commerce Institute. Well, I think we have lots of things to do in my region and I think we have an organization that can really reach out a lot because a lot of outreach - because we have events in whole region.

We have events that are called e-commerce day events where the whole e-commerce community comes. So I think that would be an interesting thing to explore. And also we have a TV channel that is online, an online TV channel, and I think it would be interesting to prepare special materials for that.

And I have many ideas and I will discuss with you some of them. And also I will have to discuss all of this with our Board but - because we are an NGO. But I think there's lots of things to do and I think we really need more involvement in our region, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I will just mention that one of Waudo's colleagues, (Lonre) is here with us today, and we - from - we also have another colleague of Waudo's that is becoming very interested in these issues.

His name is (Nizar Zaka). He is the Chair of the (Witsamina) region, that's 13 Arab countries. And (Nizar) recently brought four ministers and 50 Arab business men to the United States for ten days.

So they were there for commercial purposes. They went to see us. They went to Silicone Valley. They met with IBM. They met with a - Google, a number of companies.

They came to Washington, D.C. and we did provide some assistance - I did provide some assistance to them and some of the facilitating meetings with the State Department and the Department of Commerce. But - and they did a

gala dinner but they did a roundtable on the Internet and the landscape of challenges, which included the opportunity for us to talk about ICANN and about the IGS.

So that was not - it was not an event that was organized by us but it has resulted in (Mina) - I see (unintelligible) will take place in Jordan in November and they have now added a workshop on ICANN issues and on Internet governance to (Mina ICT) week.

So, you know, I hope I'm not creating so much work that you guys are not going to be able to develop gTLD policy but my only point is to your point of maybe instead of us trying to do things ourselves we could try to turn to the events and activities that members are doing and think about how we support some materials and speakers and, you know - so we'll look to bring ourselves together to talk about that.

And I can see I'm going to have more volunteers than we've had in the past on that topic, which is fantastic.

We are expecting - and let me just see if that's who's arriving now. We're expecting the Chair and the Chair-Elect, fantastic, and some of the team from the Nominating Committee. Hello, and perfect timing.

Vanda, I picked up a little propaganda for you (unintelligible).

Woman: I know.

Marilyn Cade: Well, let me welcome. We do have a couple of remote folks. Let me welcome - and your agenda, of course, has the folks who are here with us. Vanda Scartezini and Rob Hall, the Nominating Committee Chair and the Chair-Elect. And we joined as well by our two BC members - Sarah will be right back in.

So we - as I mentioned to you all earlier, we're very fortunate that we actually have two BC members on the Nominating Committee, Waudo Siganga and Sarah Deutsch. And we have a - experienced product of the Nominating Committing process as well in the appointment - one of your Nominating Committee appointees is joining us as a guest today.

So Vanda, can I turn this over to - okay.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes, I'm trying to find out some way to be connected.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Chris, give us just a minute.

Vanda Scartezini: Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Marilyn, this is Ron coming in. I'm sorry, I'm not sure if you can hear me or not but the screen on the Adobe Connect is very large and if you could just resize that would be very helpful? The slide screen in particular, we can't communicate in the chat because it's completely covered up, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I think (Phil) is taking care of it now. Thank you, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade : And for our remote - for the remote speakers, I know we don't have the slides to share with you but we will be posting them on the wiki and I am going to move ahead now so that we can...

Vanda Scartezini: Yes, I can send to you certainly the slides when we finish here. The idea here is from the last year we start to - based in the ATRT demand that we listen to the community and that put some kind of profile from the community for both members.

And we did this last year. And we selected, you know, information and collect information for all SO and ECs and (unintelligible) and wherever could - came from the community. And to put this - our resume about our understood what is coming from the community.

So we are now back to the community and say, wow, guys, that's what we understood. So please tell us it's correct, needs to add some thing, needs to withdraw some thing from this list of, you know, skills and profile. And that's our mission here today with you.

So for the end of the year, we need to have this clear to the public, compare the people that we can select and with the demand from the community. And show how they match in some ways, okay

So just to remember what we are talking about, three Board members, two ALAC members, one for you Rob, another for North America. One member for the GNSO and one member for the CNSO.

So this is our timeline. We are now in the - we just opened in the end of the year in December, middle of December, and the window will be closed on April 2. So we need to have enough people, qualified people, to apply for that position, leadership position until that day.

And after that day we start the process that we also we're going to have - we have a methodology that in we going publish that methodology to everybody know how we are working to select the people.

So from this we have two ways. One is inside work of the NomCom and we have a contractive party to interview those, you know, selected group of people that we believe that needs more knowledge.

And for them to - for a professional analysis about manager skills, human behavior, all those things that we as a professional from other areas are not (unintelligible) extracted to do that.

So having those together to analyze their profiles, we start to deeply analyze those peoples and then we select a smaller group of people that we believe that are more closed to the profiles we need for the Board members.

So we invite them to go to Prague and we going to have during Prague meeting a face-to-face interview to each of one. And after the end of the meeting the NomCom will retreat and in those retreatings today we need to reach consensus about who is going to be the selected member. And that is all.

So it's all at that. So what do we got from the community? Experience. What we heard about that? Is technical, is need to have some general idea, not be an expert on technical issues, that general idea is important.

Policy, must understand what are we talking about for policy here but also understand that is not the (unintelligible) across the board to do policy. It's just to approve policy that comes from the community.

Governance, it's not only managers skills to understand issue but broad experience is quite important. And broad experience in similar or large organizations become more and more important.

Ability to ease communication in English but now a days and for the future more and more abilities to talk in another language is still relevant to talk with the community to face (unintelligible) place in the world, community in that language. So have different skills in that who are skilled (unintelligible) how the image of this organization.

So general skill, you know, human behavior. It's ability to listen, good to building relationships, diplomatic attitude. We don't want people that cannot face debates with the governments. Executive mind, decision maker, capacity - capacity to assimilate a lot of information in the short period of time and make decision over that.

Integrity, ethnicity, and certainly we need to add here independence. And - of mind. Confident - be confident but not arrogant, we don't want people sitting there and face the community as an enemy.

So accept public criticism with elegance because the people are allowed to criticize any position of the Board and that you in the Board should be able to accept this and respect this. So you need to have elegant behavior in front of the community.

Ability to delegate is not the task of the Board to execute things. So they don't - we don't need people that grab things, that I need to do that, that I need to do that, and also that. This kind of behavior that is if you only look for manager skills you're going to have this kind of thing to face. So we need more people with broad skills.

So a strong understand of and belief in ICANN multistake model. We don't believe that people that don't have a strong belief in the mission and the vision of this organization will be able to defend them. So we need people that have this strong belief to face any criticism around the world and defend us with a huge belief that they are doing the right things.

So understand that the clear communication with the community is an important part of consensus building process. So that is all about the respect and work together with the community to reach those consensus. And of course, for the last thing, is time availability is really relevant for Board position.

So our task here is just what is your suggestion. It's - this reflects what you think about that or not, what - which should add to that, withdraw from this list to trying to make the more close profile that fulfills all the - you know, talks from the community.

Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Yes, Rob?

Vanda Scartezini: Yes, please. Just Rob, wanted to say what about.

Rob Hall: Sorry, if I can just add to that, my position here is a little different so for those of you that don't know this is the first year they've ever had a Chair-Elect so I have the privilege of serving as the first Chair-Elect.

In the past it used to be you had a Chair appointed by the Board and then a past Chair to kind of help the Chair get up to speed. The ATRT recommendations suggest a change to that where you have a Chair-Elect that shadows the Chair the year before so they're ready to go by the time they actually take the Chair person role.

So what it gives me the advantage of doing is coming at groups like yours much earlier in the process than normal to say I want to know who your candidate is for next year. So I'll be chairing the following year, which we'll meet for the first time in Toronto. Typically we'd wait until right before that to ask for your candidates.

Marilyn will be getting an email from me shortly after this meeting requesting that your candidate be in place by Prague or shortly after Prague so that we can start the process of getting ready and getting the community ready and educated beforehand. So it will be a little - it will be moved up but it should follow year after year, hopefully on the earlier schedule.

The other big difference I'm working on in discussions with the Board is how can I start to document a lot of the processes that go on in the NomCom. I think one of the determinates that the NomCom has fallen into in the past, and I know Vanda agrees with me, is that we're not as transparent as we should be.

There are secrecy rules around the candidates names and identities and information as well as the discussion that occurs about them. And that seems to somehow extended to everything to do with the NomCom must be kept secret.

And I'm working very hard with Vanda to stop that and reverse that to almost with the attitude of why shouldn't this document be released as opposed to do we have to release it. And so what you'll see from us in the very near future is a lot more - here's our process, here's our procedures, here's our agendas, here's when we're meeting, you know, where can even here's what happened at the meeting.

You'll never see from us identities of candidates or discussions about them or their personal information but everything else in my opinion should be perfectly transparent and I think it's caused some dissension in the community from what they don't know they fear.

And we're going to do our best to take away that fear by saying, there's nothing to hide here. You know, this is a group of people that come together and do their best to pick the best candidates for the Board. And I think in every NomCom I've been on in the past that certainly is - has happened.

So I welcome your input but my job this year is to simply support Vanda and get ready for next year but you'll see me starting to do that earlier than normal.

Marilyn Cade: Well, I'm going to kick it off with a question and ask you guys to think if you have questions. I did serve on the Nominating Committee as your representative myself a number of years ago. And we had no process and we had no staff.

And at our first convening meeting none of us could figure out how to turn the speakerphone on because it wasn't a variety we'd seen before. We've come a long way.

And I'm very proud of all the changes that we have made. I'm very impressed by the staff support that's provided and I used to hear from our representatives some oh my God stories about the lack of support. And I never hear that anymore, I only hear how pleased the representatives are about opportunity to be a part of the Nominating Committee.

I mentioned to you last time a request that I bring to you on behalf of the BC and I'm going to mention it one more time, and that is in your budget requests we feel strongly that when you bring the representatives of the Nominating Committee together you should be able to bring them together to ICANN meetings.

And that you should have full funding for them to be able to attend the full week of the ICANN meetings so that they are themselves - they have really if they're from the community so they have (unintelligible), which is already an obligation for them as constituency day.

But the rest of the week is an opportunity for them to cross pollinate, cross learn, interact. So it's just a - do count on us to be interested in your budget to make sure you have enough budget.

Rob Hall: So I can speak to that. This is the first year I can - so Vanda walked into a budget the former Chair had to create for her and she had to live with it. I

have the advantage of being able to work with staff to say, this is what I want to do. I can tell you I agree with you.

One of the changes I'm trying hard to make is the trauma meeting, typically the NomCom isn't officially incorporated until the Board meeting on the Friday. And they typically stay the Saturday and Sunday and don't fly in until after the meeting's over, that seemed ludicrous to me.

I'm trying to find a way through the bylaws and working with the legal staff to say, I need to fly them in on a Monday. Maybe we have two half-day meetings during - it's an informational session.

For the most part it's getting people up to speed on what's going to happen. There's no actual decisions being made. So the fact that we don't legally exist should be irrelevant.

And so I think I'll win that battle frankly but I agree with you, we should be more in touch with the community and it makes no sense to have where possible not overlapping meetings.

Vanda Scartezini: But anyway (unintelligible) we have budgets because we also work last year with those that were in the Committee. So we could work to have more budgets for this year. So we going - we have this meeting, everybody here, to make all the (unintelligible).

We're going to have everybody in the next and everybody in the other one together with the newcomers so they can use the opportunity to be with us the whole week. And like this week, everyday we are meeting so we can exchange experience here you each day.

Marilyn Cade: So I do have a comment about the criteria, thank you both. I think that this is a very critical time for ICANN to have the benefit of experienced people on the Board.

And this is a conversation that actually Vanda and I began in the hall but in the past there has been something of a shadow expectation that people who worked in the community cannot be fairly considered as candidates.

And I want to raise a real concern about that and raise it publicly with all of us. Eight members of the Board are selected through a selection process managed by the Nominating Committee, only six are selected. That means the majority of the Board is appointed.

And we are - just before you came in we were talking about outreach and participation and recruitment to strengthen ICANN, to strengthen the constituencies and communities that work within ICANN.

If people feel that they will not be fairly considered as a candidate for a Nominating Committee appointment because they have sullied themselves by becoming a part of the workers and the community within ICANN you're going to give us a huge barrier in our ability to bring senior participants and participants into the constituencies because they will - particularly business people often feel that they need to pay their dues before they accede to leadership.

I'm not going to comment on whether everyone feels that way but business - senior business people feel that way. And so if there is a barrier to fair treatment of nominees from within the community - the constituencies and the SOs, then we need to put on our website and on our materials, no one who is involved in ICANN today need apply.

Now I know that sounds fairly strong but I cannot continue to recruit senior business people. Ayesha and I are talking about trying to bring senior business people to prod to help to deepen the - we can't tell people their (unintelligible) here, we can't tell people if you come and get involved in ICANN you're not going to be considered for a leadership position.

So it's a dilemma that I bring to you and I know you and I had started that conversation that in the interest of being honest with candidates I will just say my own view is that this is a very critical time that we do need some experienced people coming onto the board, particularly experienced people who do not have conflicts. I see Ayesha has a...

Ayesha Hassan: I just wanted to build on what Marilyn had said and say that I think one of the challenges too for this organization is being on the ICANN board is a real commitment of time, energy and devotion.

And I think as candidates are considered both internally as well as from outside the community who haven't experienced what happens internally here, really underscoring that with candidates should be a priority.

So A, they're not surprised at the kind of workload they're getting. I'm sure this is something you've considered - I just want to reiterate that - but also we see this in other things in the IGS (mag) and various working groups.

There is a sometimes a sense of a maybe I can just kind of be there and here we really from a business perspective cannot have people at the board level or the other level structures who are just kind of going to be there.

Really being devoted to rolling up their sleeves and doing what is necessary I think it's a real priority at this time. So you've got the full boat of the board rolling together. Thank you.

Woman: I just wanted to echo Ayesha's good comments and just say that in at least in my view there's a big difference between experience and conflict of interest. You either have experience inside of ICANN or you can experience outside of ICANN.

It also translates well to doing well inside this space but equally as important you can have a conflict of interest because you're inside ICANN. You can have a conflict of interest because you're outside ICANN because you're someone who knows nothing unless somebody pushes you into that space. So we have to keep our eye on what's important.

Steve DelBianco: I think this is something that we've talked about a lot. Certainly I'll address the hour issue first. So we've heard a lot about, you know, it's 20 hours a week. And the more we talked to board members in the (card) and really sat down with them we've discovered that it's actually not that. It's more like two to three a day.

And so you can't just say I'm going to take Fridays and do ICANN board work because the way the mailing lists work as you can all imagine like ours is their always going on, the debate's constant. So I think we're certainly trying to educate people as to how much work it is.

What we have heard from a large part of the community is they want people with board experience of a similar size company to ICANN. So it's a 70 million dollar company now, it's probably going to be a 100 million dollar company. They would love more board experience from that level.

I don't think that in any way - I've never seen a candidate in my experience treated unfairly, I would say, because they were inside or outside the ICANN community.

However, we are very aware and have been told very clearly by the general council of ICANN that it's important that we ensure the independent balance of the board and this year in particular the possibility of conflicts with GTLDs.

So the worst thing we can do is we know already who on the existing board who would be conflicting with GTLDs. If we were to put three people on the board that also have a conflict, it's possible the board could not vote.

And so we're mindful of additional criteria such as those this year in particular that we're looking at. But it is always our job to make them - appoint the more independent members, if you will.

And that always starts the huge debate of, you know, if you could get there through the community way should you get there through the nominating committee way. I've seen candidates ruled in and ruled out based on the criteria but it's just of a much broader set of things we look at. It is never a definitive factor in my experience.

Marilyn Cade: Time for one more question.

Bill Smith: This is Bill Smith. My question is what constitutes both a potential conflict of interest within new GTLDs and then the second one - the follow up - which is what would be an actual one?

Steve DelBianco: So we've had a lot of discussions with ICANN's general council about this exact fact. We - this year I think we're asking every candidate do you have a financial interest in a GTLD, will you be in a conflict position with an applicant? This will become much more clear in a month or so.

But you know, we're having to delve in to that specific conflict because that is one that we already have declared conflicts on the board and we have to be very mindful that we don't put the board in the position where it cannot vote on anything to do with GTLDs.

So that's half your answer I think. Is that...

Bill Smith: Yeah. I would - sorry, Steve. I would suggest that that is going to make it extremely difficult to get a board to be able to have enough people on the board who have no conflict with respect to GTLDs.

Steve DelBianco: Sorry, no financial conflict or ownership interest in the GTLDs.

Vanda Scartezini: Is no money is involving. It's just money involved. That is California law.  
That's the only thing I know about this but I believe - sorry I can't be more specific what is about conflict of interest and maybe to exchange some ideas inside this community. Okay. Thank you for your patience.

Marilyn Cade: Join me in thanking Vanda and also Rob both of them are - I would just say we have the benefit of two extremely experienced leaders and thank you so much for coming and joining us.

Vanda Scartezini: I will be available for any discussion. Speak to us after that.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. And we are privileged to have Waudo and Sarah. We are going quickly to Steve because we have a very aggressive set of policy topics and I am going to Steve right now.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. We're going to cover - try to cover three of the four policy channels. The one we'll drop out today is the CSG policy channels because that happened already. Three channels in front of us address policy discussions, even some votes that have to happen in the next two days.

So on the screen in front of you is policy channel one. We've only got four slides on this. And it's funny, I heard Rob Hall mention that they're looking for board members but you can't say that an ICANN board does their work only on Fridays. But I can tell you that the business constituency policy volunteers, we only work on days that end in a Y. So please sign up. We need the help.

So channel one means public comments. Defensive applications at the top level was a set of comments we filed on February the 27th. If you recall the BC reviewed and then voted on this comments. It's pretty extensive and addressed a few top level but mostly we went to the second level like a lot of the other commenters did.

The reply comment period is open to March 20th. And, again, this would be the first time we did so but we - the notion of taking a look at the comments that came in and deciding whether we wanted to reply to reinforce and agree or disagree or probe about what someone else put in.

If we don't have any volunteers that want to take a dive into that we probably won't pursue the reply comment period. We do have a strong comment that we did put in.

Now staff has summarized the defensive applications comments so far. They have eight remedies that came in through the process. Now, three of them at the top level and five at the second level. And I'm going to go through those a little bit later in the discussion because there's a panel on Thursday to discuss defensive applications at the top level and second level. And Jeff Brueggman will be on that as well.

Second item up here is the new WHOIS protocol SA- 51. Bill, thanks again. Where did he go, Bill? Great. Bill's not here so we're going to volunteer Bill Smith on this one. No, he already did a lot of the work by drafting about a two page memo.

But Bill's an engineer in the best sense of the word and it is a very cryptic document that he wrote is not ready for us to hit the submit button and we would need to by Sunday. This Sunday the 18th of March is when our comments would be due.

(Angie Graves) - I don't know if she's here today. Jim Baskin, you were one of the members who mentioned on a call you might be interested in helping out with this when we had the member call.

We need somebody that can translate Bill Smith's engineering speak and do a B.C. comment by this Sunday. Do we have any volunteers? Looking at Jim.

Can do? Got it. Any other volunteers to help out on this? This is WHOIS SAC-51, the roadmap. You don't have to comment on the SAC-51 protocol per se but on the notion of the roadmap and I'm referring you to the March 6th email to BC private that came from Bill Smith.

If I don't get any help on that then I'll try to control Bill into helping me.

Third one up here is the review team draft report. Elisa gave you a whole heads up on that and it's going to be submitted this Sunday. Great job, Elisa. Acceptance of IDNs. Chris Chaplow, I think you're on the line. Are you volunteering to speak at a panel on this tomorrow?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I've been volunteered to speak on the panel on this tomorrow so any input from the constituency on that would be gratefully received.

Steve DelBianco: I doubt that will happen during this call but if you're speaking on this tomorrow, BC members, this is about IDNs international domain names in top level domains.

And what staff is looking for is actually report that suggests that we have to work with standards bodies and organizations that set standards. We have to work with network operators, managers, browser developers, browser distributors, email product distributors, apps for mobile.

All of these different technology elements have to learn how to accept IDN characters to the right of the dot. So this sets the roadmap of guaranteeing that if we roll out new IDN GTLDs, how are we going to get acceptance across the world.

Do we have any volunteers in the group that are particularly interested in helping Chris before tomorrow? Chris, I'm not seeing anything. Would you please send a note to the list with a link to the actual report and see if we can get some feedback in the next 24 hours.

This isn't due until March 23rd. The chief urgency is so that Chris could say something at tomorrow's panel. Any other comments or questions on that here?

Let me jump to the next one then. Mikey O'Connor is not in the room with us now but Mikey O'Connor has volunteered to draft some comments on the...

Marilyn Cade: Chris, I was originally asked to be on the defensive registration. No, it's the universal acceptance. I was just told by the staff that actually it is a broader topic. There's - but let me talk to Chris by email. Is that okay?

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thanks, Marilyn. And March 23rd are when those comments are due and we don't have a (wrapper) tour or volunteer scheduled for that and the BC has not taken detailed positions in the past so we may or may not comment on this formally. But it is great to try to support Chris Chaplow who is going to be on a panel tomorrow.

IRTP is inter-registrar transfer policies under Part B. It's about WHOIS status messages. Now Mikey O'Connor is one of the several BC members who are really active on that working group. Mikey has volunteered by the 25th of March, that's a week from Sunday, to give us a comment that we can submit.

He's probably just going to support what the working group came up with on WHOIS status messages because the staff report is pretty much accepted what the working group came up with. Anyone else that was active in IRTP want to comment? Thank you. Just two more on this page.

There's a board discussion of conflict of interest of policies and the initial comments are due by the 2nd of April. Marilyn, I know you in particular feel strongly about that but I would be interested to know if we can have other volunteers who want to be involved in drafting BC comments on conflict of interest. I saw Ayesha.

Ayesha Hassan: I'm actually not able to volunteer but I just wanted to let you know that we are sending that out to the ICC relevant task force to encourage companies and organizations to file comments and we will be evaluating whether ICC itself can file comments. So if we do I will be happy to share whatever we start to develop with the BC, thanks.

Marilyn Cade: What I'd really like is a couple of - if we do it with an initial brainstorming call then maybe more people - maybe we could get Janet O'Callaghan to participate and Heather and a few other people, Zahid.

If we do an initial call then we could do a bit of a brainstorming because I think this is really important for us to comment on. You're going to have to read those documents, guys. They apply to you.

I know you've been thinking they apply to the board but the code of conduct and the conflicts apply to the community as well which means someone can allege that you have a conflict of interest and even file an embezzlement complaints about you.

So I'm not trying to scare you, I'm just saying it is important - and (Ashley), you might have some - you know, but let's do a call on this topic. Okay?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. Again, that's due April the 2nd. And to my knowledge the BC hasn't been specific and articulate in the past on this so we do want to try to give the members several days to review it before we even submit it.

The last one on this list is advice to the board on how to define and measure set targets. Three things terms we're going to use to determine the success of the new GTLD program. And those three terms were consumer trust, consumer choice and competition.

The affirmation of commitments required that one year after the first new detail goes in the (root) that one of these affirmation review teams - Marilyn spoke about the first three, this is the fourth - the affirmation review team would evaluate the extent to which the new GTLDs have achieved goals for consumer trust, consumer choice and competition.

John Berard and I are on that working group. It's been posted for public comment, initial ones by the 17th of April. And with John and I so engaged on that and I was the chief drafter of the advice it would probably be important to get other BC members other than John and I to weigh in. I think it's really fantastic. I would love to see that.

Okay. John, go ahead.

John Berard: You should note that former BC member Berry Cobb was the staff resource on that as well so we had diligence all around.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, John. And if we have time at the end of this presentation I will discuss this after we do the council review. I didn't want to take time out of council matters that are going to be voted on tomorrow.

But I actually have a summary that I will be giving tomorrow at 11:00 of this entire consumer trust choice and competition. You'll be glad to know that we've designed almost 40 different metrics with three-year targets as part of the advice that will go first to GNSO and then hopefully then onto the board.

I'll take questions on that later when I summarize that for you. And I did hear that Ron Andruff was also interested in helping (Angele). He's in the queue. He's volunteered and he's in the queue. Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Steve. Good afternoon, all. Sorry I'm not with you but it's great to follow along by this channel. Steve, no, I wasn't offering myself for any service but what I did want to do was just bring whoever was responsible for

the WHOIS review team draft report bring to their attention this morning in the CSG session I brought up the issue of compliance department and then again in the CSG board call.

Along the way a member of the compliance staff was in a side chat with me in the first instance and then Chris in the second and referred us to the appendix of the WHOIS draft report and it's page 16, 17 of the first section. In fact, Chris can send the link around as he sent it to me earlier. But the point I wanted to bring out of that is it's very clear where the issues are in terms of the deficiencies.

In fact, the very last page states very clearly that they're committed to their tasks but they have meager resources. They're overstretched with the current workload, et cetera, et cetera. So I would just encourage someone to go back and have another look at that from the BC before filing our comments because it really supports everything we've saying.

It's too little too late and I heard our CEO's comments at the CSG board meeting giving all the statement about what has been done. The fact is he didn't tell about the things that haven't been done and when they're going to get done. And two years is just too long to find 15 people. It's insane.

So that's my comment and I just wanted to bring that to the floor. Thank you very much.

Steve DelBianco: Ron, this is Steve. Thank you very much for doing that. Voice came through clear but Elisa has to get these comments in by Sunday so I have a favor to ask. Would you be able to send Elisa an email please copy BC dash GNSO summarizing the points you have there so Elisa can consider them for the comments that are going in in just a few days. Can I count on you to do that?

Ron Andruff: Yeah, I'll list those two pages. I'll send them to the group right now.

Steve DelBianco: And add any commentary that you wanted to as well in terms of guidance on our comment. Thanks very much, Ron.

Ron Andruff: My pleasure.

Steve DelBianco: Any questions from the group about the public comment channel for the BC? Why don't we move to the next slide. Thank you, Susan.

Okay. The next slide is channel 2 which is what happens in council. And when we cover this under our ordinary weekly calls in it's preparation for council teleconferences but when we meet at ICANN it's about face to face meeting which actually started over the weekend with lots of council preparatory sessions.

So there are two councilors for those of you who are new. John Berard in the bright blue shirt, Zahid Jamil in the dark suit on the end and I'm going to let them walk us through the four key items in front of us for the GNSO council who will meet tomorrow for several hours tomorrow afternoon.

John Berard: The first item is that there are five items. The three of us put our heads together and we miss one this morning.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Go for it.

John Berard: So Zahid, I'll start with the one that's missing. You've heard a lot about complexity at this meeting. ICANN always talks about complexity. It's essentially a surrogate for why things take so long. But it's true and it's only going to become more so.

The issues that the organization confronts are going to require that all the parts of the organization work more closely together to create solutions. The GNSO and by the GNSO council recognize this and first out of pain but now out of hope that it can be useful.

I've created a set of principles for cross-community working groups. And before the council tomorrow is the adoption of those draft principles and if adopted they will be circulated among the rest of the SOs and ACs in order to begin the process of building a way for all groups to work together on stuff that are ICANN-wide issues. And this is important because many groups have different approaches, different guidelines by which they accommodate and deal with the issues in front of them.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, John. I want to move to the next topic up there which is the motion on a PDP for Thick WHOIS for comm.

John Berard: Again, the Thick WHOIS is something else that you've probably- or if you haven't you will hear a lot of in the hallways. It is a part of a bigger solution. This part seeks to get the one registry, (Reverison) that operates dot com, dot net and the back end registry for dot jobs to move to the same kind of WHOIS database that every other registry already now operates on and it's called a Thick WHOIS.

If you can Google Thick WHOIS, Thin WHOIS, we have a longer description. Let me just quickly say Thin WHOIS is about four or five lines about information and not all of it necessarily accurate. Thick WHOIS can be four, five times the depth of data.

The assumption is or the thinking is a Thick WHOIS is a better way to begin the march towards verification and if you listen to the law enforcement and the government advocates here at ICANN you will learn that verification is a step in the direction of monitoring.

So law enforcement wants to know who a bad actor is behind a particular Web site and would like to be able to use WHOIS right now, they can't always do that.

And so the motion to start a PDP, policy development process, makes a lot of sense. It will not as we have been assured prejudice any of the other work going on that could also lead to advances along that chain that I've described such as my (decur) with the RAA, the registrar agreement.

And so we will be voting not - we will be voting in favor of this motion tomorrow at the council and I didn't say it but of course we will be voting in favor of the - have I misspoken? I see a policy sidebar down there.

Man: Not at all. Just wanted to supplement, that's all.

John Berard: All right. And we will also be voting in favor of the draft principles of the cross community working groups.

Zahid Jamil: Just to add to this motion of Thick Whois, we were concerned that basically since Whois forms part of the RAA negotiations that are currently ongoing between ICANN staff and registrars, would this basically be the initiation of the policy development process.

Would that in effect give an opportunity or an excuse for registrars to say, well, we can't discuss WHOIS because there's a PDP going on so let's not talk about it right now and let's, you know, just put it to the side.

And so this was a concern that the policy development - our policy group basically, Steve and John and I, have basically raised at the council meeting and after a couple of questions that we weren't getting answers to eventually the registrars were making a verbal commitment despite the fact that a PDP would be initiated it will have no impact on the current negotiations on the RAA with ICANN staff and the registrar. So I just wanted to add that. And that was something we were really concerned about and we got the answer we wanted.

John Berard: As new members join the BC it can probably seem daunting to deal with the acronyms and the way things are parsed. I've been involved with ICANN since 2003 and if it weren't for the acronym translation engine that we have on the business constituency Web site there are many things that would fly by my understanding as well.

It's important to, I think, appreciate the context for these things. The law enforcement agencies that have been petitioning ICANN for the ability to deal with bad actors has led to a long-standing conversation and one of the things that has come out of that is this focus on the Thick WHOIS because it would offer a great data set. And that makes a lot of sense so we should consider that, right?

The cross community working groups, it's, - you know, I guess it either CCWG or CWG depending upon what it nets out at - but it's not just another acronym, it's an opportunity to try to address a real problem that confronts the organization as the issues that we need to deal with extend beyond the mandate of any one SO supporting organization or AC advisory committee of ICANN.

And so don't be afraid to ask what the context is for some of this stuff. It will be a good reminder to us because sometimes we can lose sight of just what that context is.

Steve DelBianco: John, thank you. And there are a number of ways to compel the registrars to convey this information through to the dot com, dot net registry officers. One way is the RAA that John and Zahid has spoken and another would be a PDP policy development process resulting in a consensus policy that becomes binding upon all the registrars and registries.

Other ways are negotiated through renewals of contracts but in any event there needs to be something that will force the registrars to provide the data to the operators at com and net.

Let's move onto the next one but I did want to say on thick who is the voting on that is entirely uncertain. This is a PDP initiation. It requires two-thirds of either the contract party or non-contract party house or requires one-third of each to get that passed.

So it's an unknown as to whether that will pass tomorrow. It chiefly affects all the registrars and just one of the registries and on the non-contract side of the house there's differences of opinion about whether to proceed. So this is an unknown for tomorrow's voting. We have a queue. Jim...

John Berard: But the motion is offered by the registrars.

Steve DelBianco: Does that increase your confidence that it will support their own motion? Jim?

Jim Baskin: This is Jim Baskin. There was a comment yesterday in one meeting from the registries from (Gustar) I think that they were thinking about voting against.

Steve DelBianco: The latest update I have about a half an hour is they probably will vote for it. Property constituencies Steve Metalitz made a comment yesterday in the Whois session that the IPC doesn't love the idea of a PDP.

They feel there's another way to make this happen whether it's the RAA or the renewal of negotiations for dot com later. There might be other ways to get it done. Just like we didn't want the thick who is PDP to interfere with something, the IPC feels the same way so I don't really know where the IPC voting will be on that.

Why don't we move on to the next one which is a charter whether to launch a PDP for locking domain names in the UDRP. This is a lot of acronyms on this one, right? Zahid or John, do one of you want to handle that?

Zahid Jamil: Sure. Basically the IRP let's put it - practically speaking for those who may not be familiar when a dispute is launched in a UDRP against a domain (unintelligible) cyber squatted domain et centers or whatever dispute it might be, the question is whether doing the dispute - oops, we've lost the screen - during that dispute would the - could you move that domain name, could you change the registrant details of that domain name or should it just get locked because you want to make sure there is a restraining order or sorts that's an analogy of that so that the registrar can tinker, transfer or change the details of the domain name.

So this is the recommendation that came out there was a drafting team set up for a charter and they basically laid down the different principles of the charter and now there's a motion on council to see that based upon that charter a working group should be formed.

Now I'll just quickly take you through these things that are supposed to be included as part as the TOR for this working group. So for instance, whether the creation of an outline of a proposed procedure which a complaint must follow in order for a registrar to displace a domain name in registrar lock would be desirable. So it's just a question would this even be desirable or not. Second with the creation of an outline of the steps of the process that a registrar can reasonably expect to take this during a UDRP producer would be desirable. Third whether the timeframe by which a registrar must domains after UDRP has been filed should be standardized that all registrars comply with the same timeline.

Fourth A, which is better what constitutes a locked domain name should be defined, so the definition what is locked, B, whether once a domain is locked pursuant to UDRP, UDRP proceeding the registrar information for that domain may be changed or modified. So if it's locked, it can't get transferred but can you change the details of the registrar on that domain name. And the last is whether additional safeguards should be created for the protection of registrants in case whether the name domain subject to a UDRP proceeding.

But this is what the drafting team came up with as a charter, now the motion is that we have the charter let's go ahead and form a working group and that's why this motion is there for tomorrow. For people who are brand - who have brands and would like to protect them who have UDRPs, this would be of interest.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic thank you Zahid, any other questions on that - on the - Bill Smith?

Bill Smith: Bill Smith, on that one Zahid, what if as a brand holder someone files a UDRP against my brand, my domain?

Steve DelBianco: You get locked.

Zahid Jamil: Well we don't know because the working group's going to have to work on it and that's why the way the charter questions our (put) whether it's desirable or not. And so the working group if you become a member or somebody else volunteers to be a member of this working group subsequently could actually provide input into that issue and say, well it depends on case itself and it's not been decided, the working group will have to work on that issue.

Bill Smith: Okay some concerns, if it has locked all DNS records as an example with DNSsec and you have to change keys periodically and you can't change them, that becomes an incredibly huge issue.

Zahid Jamil: So somebody harasses you by doing that basically.

Bill Smith: Exactly you perform a denial of service attack through it.

Man: Does the DNSsec key locking issue, is that mentioned in the charter right now?

Zahid Jamil: No it is not and it's probably - no it's not. I would encourage you to be, you know, watch out for this and if the working group is formed to take part.

Steve DelBianco: Question over here.

Woman: Yes I want to ask a question, maybe it's not a right question but as a new member I can do maybe wrong question, yes. The question is, if I become a member of this working group then I will be working as a representative as a participant of the BC or I will be working on my personal capacity or on behalf of my organization? Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: That's a great question, if you join a working group it's open to everyone at ICANN and if you were to join the working group you would join on your own, representing your own interests or those of your company. The BC endeavors to place at least one additional member on every working group who will also carry the Business Constituency's official position and report out. Sometimes we only have one person on the BC and who will volunteer for group and in that case you might ask them to please report back and to make sure they convey what the BC's positions are on the working group itself.  
But are you interested in joining one?

Woman: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic, which one catches your eye the PDP - the PDP for locking?

Woman: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic.

Woman: We both are.

Steve DelBianco: Well I'll get your names afterwards. That's great did you want to make any comments on that?

Woman: Well I will make a comment on that because one of our interests in UDRP is very specific and we are trying to figure out - well we already think that it's a need for provider that will come from our region for UDRP, so we are very interested in that because now our companies, they don't use the system. Like if you do a simple investigation of Latin American companies participating in UDRP process, you'll find that there's not a lot of them and only the big ones are participating. Or maybe when they are not respond- they are responders, so we are here also for that for developing these dividers. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic thank you, Phil Corwin.

Philip Corwin: Yes comment here and then question Zahid just for the BCs on record for last year and a half is not favoring accreditation of any new UDRP providers until ICANN develops and implements a standard agreement with all UDRP providers, so it's not against having more it's just that they should be on some kind of a standard agreement that's enforceable.

Man: So I hate to ask you to repeat, what was origin of this - where are we - a charter for PDP on this UDRP lock - what was the - where did that come from?

Philip Corwin: RAP, it was one of our motions from the DC that initiated this. We supported a list of things - recommendations that came out from the Registration Abuse Policy recommendations and this was one of them.

Man: Okay so the origin - it came out of the RAP, okay thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. Without questions on that let's turn to the third item up here which is a vote that will occur tomorrow on a motion - there's a vote tomorrow

on a motion to address protection for donors and consumers and protection for the actual organizations of the International Red Cross and Olympic Committee. And the context of this is this is something that was requested by those organizations who claim to be subject to a significant amount of fraud when it comes to donors who give to something that they expect was the Red Cross turns out not to be - or the Olympics.

It's also a concern they have as a nonprofit being forced to purchase defensive registrations for all their different monikers and all the different several hundred new generic top-level domains. So they then appealed to their friends at the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC because virtually I guess perhaps not every but most countries are signatories to international treaties pledging their support for Red Cross and the Olympic Committee when it comes to protecting their brands and most companies in their national laws recognize those two organizations for trademark protection.

So that was seemingly a somewhat unique combination and the Governmental Advisory Committee last year asked ICANN's Board to please move forward with ironclad protections so that no one would be able to register at the top level Red Cross with a K or Olympics with an X, as well as the Board - most of its requests had to do with getting protections at the second level, so that a whole list of strings in different languages would not be registrable by anyone else, thereby saving them a lot of money and reducing the amount of fraud in the new software names.

This is a moving target that has been discussed extensively this week, the latest drafts of the motion that they'll vote on tomorrow were just coming into my email as we were talking. Zahid and I are both on the drafting team for this and I was going to turn Zahid to give any more explanation of the kind of motion we'll deal with tomorrow.

Zahid Jamil: So the motion is still being sort of redrafted and there are proposals going back-and-forth, but for the most part it has three limbs. The first limb is - basically says that - and before I even start, let me talk about what the preambles are. The drafting team has decided that this should be restricted - so let me first explain, this only for first level protection - top level protection and not for second level. Secondly they said that this would only apply in this unique and exclusive circumstance of the entities of IOC and RCRC because they have as Steve said, special protections in international law and national law, the protections, so forth.

What you would have is the names of these organizations and their various in a sense translations on a modified reserve list. It's not like a GPML but it's like a reserve list - the reserve list will be modified and their names would actually be included in it. So if there was for instance an application made by somebody who was Olympia, Olympics etc., the first thing we would do is in a string similarity review there would be a conflict and if it's identical as I just mentioned, it would not go through.

But if it was similar than the option would be with applicant to basically try to either go to IOC or RCRC and say, can I get a no objection from you, I'd like to apply. And that's really up to the two entities to figure out. Otherwise what they can do is that entity that's applying can claim to have a legitimate interest in the string and demonstrate that they basis for their claim and explain why they're using TLDs not confusingly similar etc. Sort of like a reverse UDRP process and that's a process.

The second limb of this motion relates to the languages, would just be English and Roman characters, would it extend to other IDNs? And there was a lot of debate about this one because initially in the guidebook there's a short list for each organization that is supposed to be covered or protected, but recently on the drafting team list a very extensive list was provided by both organizations and it reads a lot of concerns among people that there was a lot of words out that would then get blocked.

So that compromise was reached just yesterday, Steve was in the room at 7:30 in the morning, so was I and we actually reached a compromise and what IOC and RCRC said is, "We will withdrawal our lists and we will reserve our requests only to the list that's currently in the guidebook and that's it." So that seems to resolve that problem, so they're not extending the list, they're just keeping it in the form that exists currently in the guidebook.

The third limb of this resolution is that this protection should apply not just for this round but should permanently also apply for subsequent rounds, although with the draft team said this may require certain policy processes and developments subsequently but nonetheless they've accepted that this is a permanent protection provided to these unique organizations for subsequent rounds also. The current situation is there are certain tweaking going on and - but we think that this will probably go through, hopefully as far as the CSG is concerned, the contracted parties (houses) are concerned.

The greatest amount of challenge we are facing today in the council from the NCSG non-commercial stakeholder group who do not in principle accept that this prediction should be granted to the IFC or the RCRC, so we'll see how the voting goes out. In the meantime the BC has seconded this notion in the form that was there earlier today. Thank you

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Zahid, and it's important to show support for what governments have asked for here, it's something that's highly protected with consumers, the Red Cross seems to be appreciative of the flexibility that Zahid described and finally this does get us moving into the real meat of that matter which is solving protections of second level. So this drafting team will have to stay together and work harder over the next several months at second level protections which the BC is very keen on.

Any questions on that one? Please come to counsel tomorrow you'll really enjoy the discussion on that. The last one on here is a discussion - a report

will begin on fake renewal notices that some of you may have received from a registrar claiming that it's time to renew and the idea is to induce you to agree to that and they will transfer the name - and it might even be a registrar who doesn't transfer that name but simply takes the money. So they're going to give a final report on that, Mikey O'Connor of the Business Constituency led that team, he's the one giving that report tomorrow and he said to me how he would summarize this report.

The report went into this topic to say is there smoke hear or is there fire - is this really a problem? And Mikey said in a word, there's fire - this is a real problem, it's substantial and their reports should be interesting tomorrow.  
Sarah?

Sarah Deutsch: Okay, we've been tracking this with you internally for a long time because our business executives keep getting spammed mostly from renewal requests from Chinese/Hong Kong registrars who are not ICANN accredited but claim, you know, such and such name must be renewed and then make it panicked because they don't know what it is and so then we forward the request to that Hong Kong telecom that's already in the Federal Trade Commission and then we write a cease and desist letter to everyone. We've tried to get all sorts of groups interested in it and it's just exasperating and the problem doesn't go away.

Steve DelBianco: It's a lot like a phishing scam but it happens to use your renewal of a domain name as the context to get the money. That's great there's only...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Got it - Jim.

Jim Galvin: There's also - and I just want to ask if this is the same issue or it's just similar - there are emails that say that a particular strain is about to be registered by

some party and you're given an opportunity to register it because they are telling you that you seem to be the owner of the intellectual property.

Man: And let me encourage you because Chris Chaplow for instance and when counsel discusses this final report tomorrow, they'll be an open microphone after each segment of the topic. When they get to the open microphone there please, I mean Sarah, Jim - if you have particular stories that can reinforce the plate, that's a great opportunity to go to the mic and explain it.

Zahid Jamil: It's Zahid, I hear the name Bill. Great point you just made because in fact it's also part of slamming not just phishing and this is mentioned in the report that even search engine optimization sort of offers are made and authentication data is being requested and solicited. So a lot of people are saying how it's not just about registering a domain or transferring them or buying them, but in fact it's also about, "Well can I get my search engine optimized," so that sort of stuff is also happening.

I just wanted to very quickly mention the various solutions that the report actually mentions Steve if I may very quickly. Well one was at the top of the list it should just be inserted into the RAA and there's other stuff like should this also be involved - I mean should there be a complaint procedure as Sarah mentioned with the FTC which was supported by this drafting team as well. So I encourage people to look at that report, but various solutions have been mentioned and please be there tomorrow at the counsel, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Zahid, Bill and then Scott.

Woman: So one of the things I've run into is in recovering domain names - sorry, recovering domain names - I will transfer away from a registrar into our corporate registrar and the losing registrar never updates their database and I keep getting painted, yes. And so - well I don't pay them, but then you're going, you know, you get an email when you have to double check it takes a lot of time, so I was wondering if that was addressed in this report?

Man: I've glanced at it I haven't seen that here, no.

Woman: Okay.

Man: You need to read the report.

Steve DelBianco: Bill and then Scott.

Bill Smith: Sure, so I have no doubt this is an issue I'm just wondering how ICANN can address it in a meaningful way for entities that are outside of ICANN's sphere of influence. If they or aren't accredited in any way - and so is ICANN the right place to address this or is it something that needs to be (done) elsewhere?

Steve DelBianco: Not for us to answer here, please if you can't be there tomorrow please do take a look at this report. And again Mikey wrote it so question such might have you deal with get right Mikey O'Connor. Scott.

Scott McCormick: Sorry not push things here but Jeff and Patrick just walked in and are here to talk about SSR and to answer any questions on that, so.

Steve DelBianco: Great and we started late because of NomCom so the last channel is called the policy channel, next slide - I'll give you a preview. I think we're going to have an opportunity to discuss this tomorrow at I believe 12:30 in the (Heliconia) Room, so Marilyn we'll send out an invitation to everyone indicating the topics that are going to be covered at the public forum - that's on the board in front you. And we'll meet for roughly an hour - hour and a half to discuss what particular things the BC will say, who is going to make those statements to public forum which happens on Thursday afternoon.

And I'll be able at that point to recap this defensive application and registrations. Now that session is at 12:30 is in the same room right after

John Berard and I are doing a presentation on consumer trusts, consumer choice and competition. So please attend that session and we'll just stay in the room in segue to the next session. Okay, I think that wraps up policy for today, we'll pick it up tomorrow at 12:30, thanks everyone.

Man: There was a marathon on policy and it's a really important opportunity. We will do more tomorrow on policy, anything that you guys haven't finished as well as preparation for public comment, we will make sure that we spend time on it tomorrow. I'm really pleased to have the opportunity to reintroduce you and to introduce some of you who are new to Jeff Moss who is Chief Security Officer of - heads the Chief Security Office of ICANN which was a new office when he came in.

He came in and met with us right after he joined and we owe that word of thanks to Patrick Jones for continuing a relationship with us and for ensuring that Jeff knew that we were important. So with that in the interest of time I'm going to turn it over to Jeff and to Patrick.

Jeff Moss: All right thank you very much, I'm not sure how close I have to get to these microphones but so this will be the second time I've met the group since I started - I think it was right in Singapore my first meeting, yes. But I really didn't know what was going on and ICANN and now I've been here for a while and so now I know too much. So just wanted to talk just a little bit sort to what security does and some of the things we've been working on then give you guys a chance to ask us questions and tell us sort of what your concerns are or if there is a certain project you think maybe we should be involved in, or your own projects you'd like advice on, that's what we hear to do.

So one of the first things I'm sure that's consuming all your oxygen as well is the new gTLD program and so the role in security is sort of split into two - we have an internal function, we have an external function. And internally it is making sure that the task system and all IT infrastructure is secure and so that has been taking a lot of the security teams focus. And we've also been

doing - working on normal upgrades right, we are working on improved email security, improved corporate communications infrastructure upgrades and security.

Because what we're finding is, you know, the ICANN of two years ago is not ICANN of the future - now we're handling personal identifiable information related to these gTLD applications that we didn't have that before. We're handling large sums of money that before people wrote us checks, now it's sort of the other way around and now there's a larger global focus from governments on how are we doing, is it best practice and are you a good repository to hold this kind of information? So our game is changing and we've got a step up our IT practices. And so that's going to be the focus of security for the next year or so is growing to meet these new challenges, new responsibilities.

And I think it's a proactive way to show the community that we're taking this seriously right, we acknowledge only accept this responsibility. And then there's the large external focus and that's where the community we do a lot of outreach and we do a lot of coordination with other bodies with things that we don't control, we just observe and we participate with other people. And part of that Patrick and myself and some other of the team members have been spending a lot of time on DNSsec adoption, trying to drive awareness around that - trying to understand why companies or adopting it or not adopting it.

Sometimes we find it's more interesting to realize why a company's not adopting DNSsec then they are, and so for a lot of companies this is a year of ITV 6 for them. And I say, you know, we recognize DNSsec is important, but we're on ITV 6 this year - that's totally understandable and that's really interesting to find out how companies are prioritizing. We also write spot pieces and try to share information and insight and so an example of that most recent one was Dave Piscitello's collaboration on domain seizures, best practices document that's been getting a lot of attention lately.

And then we've also been growing our interactions with law enforcement and operational security communities and so these are communities that have special needs generally were around Whois, they want to understand they are serving a subpoena how do they even find out who to serve the subpoena to. You know, what are the practices for take down or notification and so they've come to ICANN and to the security team saying, "Can you help us meet other people that know answers to this?" So we'll find them space at a meeting, we'll let them get together with their peers, we'll be happy to help write papers for such as domain seizures to answer some of their questions and that's been growing activity I think since I've been here.

And it also we've been working on our security stability resiliency framework for the fiscal year '13 which is just an evolution of ours from last year and that lays out priorities and what we're focusing on so, do you want to talk about that a little bit and then we'll take questions?

Patrick Jones: Yes sure, so I've talked to this group in the past about our SSR framework and tried to provide some early engagement and opportunity to understand what it looks like and get a chance to get some feedback from business community. So it's coming around to that cycle again and after Costa Rica we'll be making an effort to publish the FY13 version. It's going to retain the same structure of the last year, so the Part A is an echo system view of what ICANN's role is in security, stability and resiliency and how it fits with the rest of the structures and players on the Internet echo system.

And second piece is more of a - targeted for FY13 what are our main priorities, projects, activities. And there's a new piece and I think maybe I missed Jeff's update on the SSR review team's work, the third component is going to look back and provide at least our assessment of the scorecard of how we've done on the previous frameworks and projects that, you know, show the community what we've done against what we said in the previous years of what we would do.

And so that's coming and there'll be an opportunity to interact and really hope that the business community takes that as an opportunity just to really tell us that's either in line with your thinking, something needs to be changed or use that as an opportunity to target that ICANN's role in security fits with what your understanding expectations are.

Marilyn Cade: This might be a good time to actually introduce the topic of that meeting that we had previously talked about, it's Marilyn speaking. Several years ago when DNSsec was first being discussed I hosted a meeting with Steve Crocker and with several other people with the - a number of the big corporate and big ISPs - and I do mean several years ago and I think it was a very helpful and we included the government markets, BP and a couple of companies because they were being faced with what the - learning about what the position was that the federal government would take about DNFsec in relation.

So I'm kind of thinking Jeff we could work with Patrick about the idea of convening a meeting in Washington and schedule it so that we can have remote participation. Not all of the BC members will be the right people that is, you know, (Susan) might want to find additional people that Facebook or, you know, (Martin) will want to plan it so that we're not out of sync in terms of our European participants. But I really think maybe and I might ask Jeff and others who are on the SSR review team if we could work with Patrick and construct a useful agenda, make it invitational so that we could include some of the companies we're not reaching and we are not - we only reached the association.

So that sounds like something that our members would be interested in, I'm going to ask more technically oriented members to probably help contribute to whatever we would talk about it such a meeting.

Man: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Does that sound...

Man: I think that's something you'd...

Bill Smith: Sure Bill Smith, so I think doing something like that is an excellent idea, the forum - choice of forum ones who to invite becomes if not problematic just something to think about and to point out if we look around the table there probably aren't that many people who, while they can't spell probably or wouldn't know what it means or why it would be a good thing to do and there's nothing wrong with that right that's a good thing actually. But - so it's something I think it's a good idea it's something ICANN or we can somehow help facilitate but we need to reach out beyond sort of who we currently are and that maybe part outreach efforts.

We have implemented DNSsec, okay - I'm doing a brief overview of it tomorrow at the, you know, the time times a year Steve Crocker panel on DNSsec which is a great thing. I know nothing about DNSsec, so anybody that shows up don't expect me to tell you much. All the information came from other people in the company and I'm just kind of going through it and basically the message is it's not all that hard, but you will find problems. You should start earlier and also start doing things as you change IT infrastructure otherwise consider the move that you're going to need to make, even if it's a couple years out plan for and then it will go as smoothly as you can.

And that's kind of a message I think that will be a good thing to get out to folks generally is it's not, you know, it isn't impossible right, but it's an issue for us, we had something like 1100 domains right - we have to sign them all. Most of them do nothing, but and then we have marketing going on creating ever new and interesting improved domains - 100 I think is what we have - that's what - maybe I - that's the message I got, now maybe it's 11,000. I should talk to you because you know - I'll check back anyway but it is it's something that would be good to get a message out.

One question for Jeff others, it's good to hear that you guys are upgrading your security systems, if there's anything you can do on some of the things that touch the volunteers okay, implement HTTPS or something because there's a lot of PII being in thrown around and it's frightening.

Jeff Moss: My agenda is, you know, HTTPS should be the standard for everything. And if we can get there, that's one of many things that we should be doing. But I'm right there with you.

I think ICANN kind of lives and dies on communication. And so that needs to be very secure. Now granted everything we do becomes public anyway but that doesn't mean the background conversations shouldn't at least have some privacy around them.

You know, I've been paying attention to what groups like anonymous are doing and they like to grab email dumps and put them out there with no context in the world. And I'd like to prevent them from being able to do that, so, you know. I should be controlling whether or not something's dumped, not them.

I actually just wanted to reiterate the importance I think of having these discussions on DNS security issues. You know, we have been very alarmed that the FCC has started working groups on DNSSEC and - or to get with protocol security.

Now Steve Crocker was chairing the DNSSEC Working Group so he's being very careful about it. But I've talked to him and I've talked to others that the more we can have work going on somewhere else, the better it's going to be to, you know, keep not just the FCC but other telecom regulators and others from wading into these areas.

And I also think it'll produce better answers. And our position has been looking at botnets or (Board) (unintelligible) and only focusing on ISPs is not a smart approach anyway.

And I would also say, you know, we are more on the skeptical camp of DNSSEC for some of the practical issues that you raise but I also think, you know, we need to really get as much good thinking and coordination on this area as possible to figure out what are the things that we can do.

And I think there are some things - practical ways to help create the incentives for DNSSEC given, as you say, we're dealing with a lot of transitions and challenges at the same time.

Bill Smith: Yeah. That - Bill Smith. I wanted to echo Jeff's comments about the FCC in particular. I happen to sit on the (SISREC) where - with Steve and others who - where we've done some of these security things. They are - I will say they're voluntary intentionally so.

But it is of concern I'd say that the FCC is picking this stuff up and moving with it. So we're - on the one hand we're concerned. On the other we're actually glad because something's moving forward. So and we already have botnets and other security related issues that frankly haven't been moving anywhere.

Patrick Jones: So Bill I have a question then. If there are - and we have an ICANN representative on one of the (SISREC) working groups but if there are other international efforts leading up to Internet governance events later this year where you or other businesses are participating and you find some assistance in having our subject matter expertise to help, it would good to know what those events are and to share and ask, you know, is this something that someone from ICANN can, you know, participate in because it might be something that, you know, we would be interested in and available to do that.

Bill Smith: But that's nice to hear. Okay. And yeah, we'll - we should - I don't have anything off the top of my head right now but as - I think Jeff was pointing out and what I'm saying is there's a little concern about a regulatory body, right, coming in and moving into that space.

At the same time PayPal, we - so the ISPs feel an obligation as an example to participate in that activity. We, PayPal, deal with the ISPs in other areas. And so when we get asked to join these things, we tend to look at it and say, okay, well we know these people and it has to be there.

We can help them by participating. So it's - but it's a concern. And if there was more being done elsewhere and it was visible and being supported, we might not see the regulatory bodies - formal regulatory bodies picking this stuff up. Okay. So encouragement, do more please. Get the word out about what ICANN is doing in these areas and actually become active. Okay. Not that you aren't but it's - the perception here is important.

Patrick Jones: That fits with one of my objectives for the upcoming year is that I'm a little concerned that when not just security but other groups go out, there's a bit of an echo chamber sometimes. And I'm trying to find new audiences so we're not just always preaching to the converted.

And I think the business audience at least from a security standpoint might have been underserved. And so that's why we're asking because we want to reach out to that community and be more visible.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to ask (Scott) for a comment but I'm going to ask you and Patrick a favor that I know you're going to say yes to because I prearranged it.

Man: Never ask a question you don't know the...

Marilyn Cade: Hey. I'm well trained. For those of you who are members of the BC, you'll be able to interact with Jeff and with Patrick tonight at the reception as well. So if you have some individual questions you want to follow up with them because we got about three more minutes but I want to be sure that you and (Lonnie) will be joining us as well for the reception as a guest.

Scott McCormick: So with the - this is Scott McCormick. With the adoption of obviously of DNSSEC being pushed out and trying to champion that, I would hope as well ICANN will take the stop forward and as we bead the dead horse on this trying to push IPv6 with IPSEC and getting people to understand that both of those together are a great opportunity to push forward with versus just DNSSEC or just IPv6 roll out, so.

Patrick Jones: No. I agree with that. And we find that people are upgrading their networks with IPv6 are fixing problems that would have been problems with DNSSEC packet size and view size. So there's - it's funny how complementary all these new technologies are. I mean this is fundamentally the first sort of Internet upgrade in 20 years. And it seems to be all hitting within a couple of years. It's an exciting time.

Marilyn Cade: Any closing comments or any topics we haven't touched on Patrick that you guys were going to mention - that you wanted to mention?

Patrick Jones: So maybe one other topic is that on Thursday there are a set of open sessions from the SSR Review Team; the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group and the Board level working group on DNS risk management that unfortunately they're all around the same time.

But the topics that they cover overlap quite a bit and it would be - it's the opportunity for those that are here at this meeting to weigh in and provide some guidance to those groups particularly the Board level working group that's posted a charter and will be looking for community feedback on a broader DNS risk management.

You know, what kind of methodologies should be used and what are the greater risks to the echo system and to the DNS that should be examined. So hopefully we can...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Patrick Jones: Yeah. Not just technical but also from government interventions to other things that may impact the DNS. So that's a good opportunity...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Patrick Jones: Okay. So the - as a reminder, the DSSA Working Group was an outcome of the community reaction to the DNS-CERT proposal. And I think Mikey would say while it's been on a really slow road, they're starting to make very good progress at identifying the reps to the DNS and providing some kind of framework on how the group is looking at them.

The Board level working group is taking it from a different approach and yeah, I mean - one is community driven, one is from - at the Board level. There should be an intersection between the two. And I know that the Board members that are part of that are listening and are interested in making sure that those efforts - yeah, exactly.

Bill Smith: This is Bill Smith again. I'm just going to throw something out and may be (provocative). Generally we like to see ICANN sort of narrowly focus on, you know, what its mission is around DNS. On security I'm wondering whether we might ask ICANN the corporation to go a little broader.

Yes, we can about DNS security - security of the DNS system and all of that. But that security depends on other things. All right. At PayPal one of the things we say is yeah, we implement the stuff we can in the chain and we encourage other things. But as an example, we don't go do, I don't - secure

VTP. That's just, you know, we could but somebody else in the community has to do that.

We do work on things like PLS. All right. Or HSPS. We put people in there even though that's not, you know, you might not think that's something that is important to us but it actually kind of - it touches consumers in some way so we kind of feel it's in our remit - our group - the small group we have.

But I'm just wondering if other people have any ideas but would that be something that ICANN or you might be interested in? Would it be appropriate? Because it's something we are running into - I certainly run into is the reason a lot of this stuff happening in some coordinated fashion is just, you know, individual companies show up at different things different times. And if ICANN could help with that, that might be a good thing. Right.

And it's not specifically within the DNS but it is going to help with the overall security of the Internet and therefore trust in the Internet. So might be something to think about.

Jeff Moss: So maybe talk to us separately about these types of things because we - the security team does have an engagement an hour facing effort and promotion of training, not just at the ccTLD level but now also with law enforcement, operational security community and a more broad set of just general DNS training. So tell us more about that.

Marilyn Cade: So standing invitation. We're going to make sure that Jeff comes back and visits us on a regular basis. We'll put together a team. I'm going to ask (Scott) and call on Bill and Jeff and maybe ask (Martin) to contribute so we can put something worthwhile together.

I think the meeting should be broader than DNSSEC. We should pick two or three topics so that we can use it to try to seduce some of those companies that having it big enough and each join the BC that were of interest. So we

really appreciate your coming and talking to us and you'll probably hear from some of our members during the reception.

So join me in giving a round...

Man: Seven to 8:00?

Marilyn Cade: Seven to 8:30. And (Benny), do you know where it is?

(Benny): (Romelia).

Man: (Romelia)?

Marilyn Cade: (Romelia).

Man: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: It is for the members so we thank all of you for coming and joining us as observers and guests but we're not going to let you have any of our alcohol tonight unless you've received a special invitation. I know a couple of you have.

Okay. Thank - join me in thanking Jeff and Patrick.

We're just going to do the rapid session. And while we're doing that, I just want to warn you that you need to be packed and ready to leave this room at around 4:30 I think or is it 4:45. What time is the GAC?

Woman: We're leaving at (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Okay. The GAC and the Board meet from - beginning at 4:45 and we're - they're over in the other building in the GAC room. And in order to have any

chance of getting a seat, that means you have to get out of this room, get over there and be standing in front of the door when the door opens.

So please Jim.

Jim Galvin: Which may be nowhere near the announced time but you still have to be standing at the door.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sure we'll be okay today. Yes. Ron, I know you're going to have to be signing off but I'd like to offer you an opportunity before you do that to make any comments.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Marilyn. Basically I understood that you just wanted me to kind of reiterate what I was saying in my intervention today about compliance. And I think that the key here, and Susan Kawaguchi and others who are part of that group certainly know this better than I.

But the bottom line is that it's simply unacceptable for the CEO to say now for almost two years -- that six meetings we've had in two years --- that he's done all this wonderful stuff in terms of compliance but yet there are 15 slots available in terms of the budget for this year for compliance and we don't have 15 capable bodies on hand.

Whois review teams comments, you know, letter to the head of compliance after the Marina del Ray meeting, which I note and it's noted in this document that I just circulated to the group a few minutes ago is that they even had someone from legal sit in on that meeting which obviously did not allow for an open and easy flow of conversation.

And the review team noted that the staff work hard within their meager resources, that's a quote. It says they regard their toolbox of available sanctions and actions as limited and see a need for progressive remedies. And the fact that the compliance team is small in number, currently over

stretched on its current workload and without a significant injection of resources and more strategic focus on priorities, ICANN's compliance effort will continue to fall short of expectations.

This is not right. This is not what we should be having right now. And I think it's really incumbent upon us as the BC to make sure that this point is driven home.

The CEO got off light today. Unfortunately I was not physically there to get back to the microphone to challenge him on his statement. But the fact of the matter is by saying that he's hired a qualified person and put them beside (JJ) does not satisfy the goals of the BC. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Ron, I would like you to please plan to submit that comment or be prepared to make that comment into the public forum on Thursday. And...

Ron Andruff: I will try to make myself available for that Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. So let me talk about a couple of things that I really need for you guys to be thinking about and stay tuned on what the procedure is going to be on how I'm going to propose that we address it.

You were all in the meeting with the Board that we - the discussion we had today. We are roughly a year away from a Board mandate, a bylaw mandated process to review. It doesn't necessarily mean a restructure but to review.

It is possible that the Board mandated the - bylaw mandated review could be postponed for a period of time by a Board resolution or it could be designed in stages by a Board resolution. So I'm not panicked at all in this.

However, what we need to start doing is we need to start thinking ourselves about what the right structure is for business for the policy development

process at the gTLD level that we participate in for the role that we want to play more broadly.

SSR is not a gTLD issue. It is a broader issue that cuts across all of ICANN. So I say that so that we remember we're going to be affected not just by - it may be okay for the gTLD registries and registrars to focus on gTLD policy but that's not who business is. So we're affected by gTLD policy but we have larger issues we need to address as well.

What I'm going to do is arrange for the CSG Executive Committee to sit down together briefly before we leave and to try to come up with a process by which we begin to look coherently at the questions and start having a organized examination of some of the questions.

What I don't want to have happen - there's some constituencies who want to rush into a this is who we want to be in the new restructured gTLD space in two years. And I don't think that's where business wants to be. I think we want to look a little more holistically.

And the - I am going to ask the structural committee - the Board's structural committee to sit down with us at the latest in Prague and if possible earlier to talk about any work that they will be doing because they will actually be responsible for designing the review process.

Typically the review process includes external evaluations and a list of criteria under which we are reviewed. Some of the - some of the things we will be reviewed on are already in place like do the constituencies have a Web site. Is it current? Are the increasing their membership? Do they publish and do they - are they open and transparent? Do they have a ballot election process?

So some of those things are already established. But the larger issues about who we should look like in a restructured world, that's the conversation that

we're going to want to begin to have. Not a panic situation and don't let any contracted parties buy you a drink and seduce you over to their thinking on this.

But it is going to take up some of our time. And we're going to have to do it in parallel to the - to our work. But it's not - and it's not as urgent. I think what the two Board members are trying to convey is don't just stand around and ignore it or it will be done to you as opposed to being done with you.

Any last questions before we head out to stand in front of the Board door and watch the Board and the GAC demonstrate how much they're improving their interaction with each other? Yes (Tera).

(Tera): Just an update. It seems that the GAC is on schedule today, which is amazing. I have inside information.

Marilyn Cade: I didn't hear him.

(Tera): Just to repeat is that the GAC seems to be in - on the schedule today, which is amazing.

Marilyn Cade: Oh. Yes.

Woman: And just wanted to tell you something that we need to tell before that (Celia) and I are both fellows. So want to thank ICANN for the possibility of being here and also fellowship program. And to tell you to support this program whenever there's a possibility for you to do it. Thank you very much.

And of course, thanks Marilyn because she captured me in the first - in my first fellowship in Cartagena. She came to me, she talked to me and she invited me to the recent meeting so that's why I'm here. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Well I had a lot of help from (Chris) who at every other meeting was going like, no, no, get back in here.

So a real quick thing. I want to remind you guys that tomorrow morning it's a complicated - you have a memo from - email from me but let me remind you of what's happening tomorrow morning.

At 7:15 if you are an officer or a councilor, you really need to show up and have breakfast with some of the ALAC folks. I would welcome other volunteers but it's - that's voluntary. We will be at the Tropicalia Restaurant. You'll be buying your own lunch and just having an informal get acquainted breakfast - get acquainted session with some of the ALAC folks.

From 8:00 to 9:00 however we have a formal CSG meeting. It's on the schedule and we are going to be trying - we're going to talk about topics of mutual interest.

Let me suggest that you not engage at a debate about our view about the ALAC's proposal for an academy. First of all, I haven't briefed you on it. But it's - we are very supportive of outreach and participation. I'd like to focus on areas of commonality.

What does it mean for ICANN to act in the public interest? And what are the broad areas of concern and interest that ALAC has? Right now ALAC has outreach activities. They are sometimes approached by business but really we want business to come to us. So we're going to have to think about how we are able to be accommodating in that and how we can then support the businesses who do find us interesting.

An opportunity to get acquainted with the ALAC folks. They have a range of views and it will be really helpful for us to be able to talk to them. But in general on the gTLD Council, the ALAC votes with the BC. We are - we have

a lot in common. Concerns about consumer trust and competence, very high on their list as well.

And then tomorrow at - what I'd suggest you do is go get a sandwich and then come to...

Woman: (Caliconia).

Marilyn Cade: ...(Caliconia) and we will spend an hour preparing for the public forum and dealing with any leftover policy issues. But you can buy a sandwich and bring it. I'm not able to provide lunch. The room's pretty small. But we do need to work tomorrow in that hour.

So if you could be there by 1:00, that would give you 30 minutes to either grab a sandwich outside and then come in and we'll break at ten minutes till so you can be in the 2:00 sessions. And it is closed to members only.

Anything else? Well it's been a fantastic working ICANN session so far. We did - we do have a commitment from the Chairman of the Board. I know that when the topic came up today about how difficult the agenda and the lack of materials - I know the CEO said he was not aware of it but actually I think I've already conveyed the problem in another way and there is a commitment from the Chairman of the Board that we will not have this experience again.

Thanks very much. I'll see you all in the GAC meeting. And then the reception is at 7:00. So you'll have a little bit of time between the GAC meeting and - we're not telling you where the reception is. Where is the reception?

Woman: (Romelia).

Marilyn Cade: (Romelia).

Coordinator: Thank you. You may disconnect the recording.

END