

**ICANN Costa Rica Meeting
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 13th March 2012 at 09:45 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.

Tony Holmes: ...I mean, just so in terms of the breakfast certainly my experience at the breakfast was the fact that that was the first time we've actually done that with the GAC. We didn't actually need a script. The dialogue just flowed and it covered a whole range of things which was really at their behest.

So I think that was a plus and something that we should do again. And...

Coordinator: Please go ahead, the call is now being recorded.

Tony Holmes: ...just wrapping up that session I'd also like to - certainly on behalf of the ISPs and (unintelligible) the ISP as well, thank you for your work in organizing that. It was a great effort, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: You're only allowed to thank me for organizing it if you thank Benny. And I think we owe her a round of applause.

Tony Holmes: Here, here. J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: I was simply going to thank Benedetta for all her hard work and for Marilyn for organizing. And I have to say I thought it was one of the - most positive

exchanges we've had to begin and kick off this meeting. And it shows that even with differing views we have common interests and we are all committed to working together towards common solutions.

And I think that was something we all recognized today. And it was positive. It was a positive meeting with a positive tone. And I think that's - the way we need to go about things here is we need to be positive about things.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to encourage us all to take that tone very strongly when we meet with the Board. They're under a terrific amount of pressure and there's a lot of negative press. And sometimes some hyperactive, over stimulated perhaps not fully thought out blogging going on. Is that a good term?

And - no - and it may not even be fair for people who do not work at ICANN to pop in as a member of the (unintelligible) state and share their views to get a headline. That's not what we're here for, right? We're here to build.

And I think if the Board can hear that message from us that that will help the Board feel the support they're going to need to go through the next several months as they're looking - making the final decision on a (unintelligible), making sure they don't disappoint us or themselves again in that realm and figuring out how to deal with the huge challenges that we all face.

Are you - have we started the transcription? So, guys, we are being transcribed so you'll - and that means this is an open meeting. I am going to turn this over to Tony and Steve to talk with you about something you find interesting while I go see if I can find Xavier.

Steve Metalitz: Okay just briefly on our agenda for today we will be having the presentations from - both on the budget and on compliance.

On the budget we've been working as a - we have a working group that Chris Chaplow of the Business Constituency is coordinating to try to have common

comments on the budget framework. We were not able to do that in time for the initial comment deadline but we may be able to do so in the next round.

But there are a number of questions about the budget. I think probably the best way to focus this will be on some of these general budget questions more than on whether we - our constituencies are going to get the money that we ask for for ICANN support. There is going to be a meeting on that later this week which all the constituencies will be represented. So hopefully there'll be some information about that then.

With respect to compliance there are - there's an extensive presentation. And we have very limited time so we identified a few questions that we wanted to make sure we're focused on and these include what - whether the contract compliance team is being given the tools that it needs to actually do its job both off the shelf tools and custom made technology.

We want to focus on what is the role of - of the compliance team in accreditation decisions because of situations in which new accreditation may have been used to try to resolve problems with existing registrars, registering for their own account.

We wanted to talk about - excuse me - about the new - the RAA amendments and what role the compliance team has played in those negotiations, which we have very little insight into although there's been a status report on them without any questions.

And we want to know whether the negotiators are getting input from the people who would actually have to enforce the agreement that's being negotiated.

And there may well be a - other issues - oh the other of course is preparations for the new gTLDs and in particular how are they handling the

IDN issues and dealing with enforcement of Whois obligations in a non-ASCII environment and so on.

So those are some of the topics that we wanted to raise. And we've given those to Maguy and I think she will focus on that in her presentation and hopefully we'll have - well we won't have as much time as we'd like; we'll have some time for questions and answers.

And for dialogue. So let me ask if there are any questions or comments about either of those two topics before we have those presentations from ICANN staff?

Coordinator: Excuse me, Mr. Chris Chaplow joins the conference.

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

Chris Chaplow: Steve, it's Chris joining - Chris Chaplow.

Steve Metalitz: Oh okay great. Chris, I don't know if you heard my brief introduction on the budget issue but we're waiting for Xavier to arrive. But we will - if you have anything to add on the budget questions that would be great. Okay.

Do we have other remote participants that can identify themselves? Anybody else on the phone? Okay.

Benedetta Rossi: We have Ron Andruff and Ashley Dumouchel.

Steve Metalitz: On the Adobe?

Marika Konings: They must be on mute.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. Welcome Ron and Ashley. Okay well again while - Tony, did you have anything you wanted to bring up? If not I had one topic we could just discuss but...

Tony Holmes: No that's...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'd like to talk about one issue that has come up quite a bit during the two days that I've been here and that is the question - the new gTLD questions - the new gTLD implementation questions I should say and in particular the issue of batching.

We've all heard the proposal that the staff has put forward for how they are going to batch new gTLD applications if more than 500 applications are received. And I don't know if any of you had the same reaction I did - which first of all I've heard it described two or three times; it's been different each time.

But, second, it doesn't strike me as a very well thought out way to proceed. It sort of combines the worst features of a land rush and a lottery in one. And I think we can - I think that ICANN can do better.

A number of us have put together a proposal on this which we are sometimes using the shorthand of IDN's First. But the general idea is that there are certain categories of new gTLD applications that are identified on the face of the application.

These include IDNs, geographic, community applications and geographic applications all of which have particular, you know, questions that they have to answer.

And it makes sense for us to start with those first since those seem to be the - if you look at it those seem to be the types of new gTLD applications that offer generally the greatest possibility of actually contributing something positive to the environment.

So there are a number of other reasons that we've deduced for this but this is not a formal proposal from our constituency or from the CSG obviously. But I would certainly be very interested if anyone has any thoughts about this and if you agree with that I think this really is a decision that's up to the Board.

It adopted a resolution in December that said they're going to use a, quote, secondary time stamp, unquote, for batching. That's the genesis of the staff's proposal. And again I think we think ICANN can do much better. And this is a missed opportunity if they don't take something - a somewhat different approach.

So I just wanted to throw that on the table. And I certainly invite comments, questions, concerns, about the whole batching issue.

Tony Holmes: Just a question around that, Steve, and we haven't had time to discuss that in the constituency meeting. But with the proposed (unintelligible) - a couple questions. One is is your intention to try and solicit some support for that and provide (unintelligible), is that where you're actually going with that?

The other question I had is that if you adopt the approach that (unintelligible) first then we're a stage currently where we don't know whether that's going to be enough to land the whole (unintelligible) process that may be required because we don't know the number of the applications.

So it's our initial thinking that you would take that approach and if it didn't meet the requirements from batching you would fall back with your ICANN proposal. Have you got something that would go beyond those categories?

Steve Metalitz: I'm glad to give my response and others who've been involved in this can do so also. We'll put Ross in the queue. I think we should put this forward in the public forum and we - or I did put it forward yesterday in the plenary when the new gTLDs were being discussed.

I think we have to be flexible because we'll know a lot more on May 1 or whenever when we know how many applications there are, how many then fall into these categories. So I think we do have to be somewhat flexible.

I hope we don't - I'm not sure - I hope the ICANN staff does not approach this with the idea that there must be 500 applications in the first batch because I think the calls from governments and many other people to have a slightly more phased in approach are well taken.

But they may take that view in which case they would have to aggregate something. But we won't really know - I mean, we can all speculate but we won't really know until May whatever how many there are.

Also did anybody else like Phil - anybody else want to be in the queue on this? Was there someone else?

Tony Holmes: Phil is one.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, Ross, Phil and Tony. Okay. Okay Ross, go ahead.

Ross Rader: Sure. I had sort of the same reaction that Steve did over the weekend when I was listening to Kurt explain the time stamp scenario. And it seems a little bit bizarre to me.

The batching proposal that we were - that we're putting forward here seems to be doing a bit of the job for ICANN in a way that brings some rationale to it. The IDN's First is somewhat shorthand and it's been a lot of the justification for the real benefit that would be brought for expanding the Internet space

into many languages that can't currently be typed in through ASCII characters so there's real justification there.

The other thing that is in the proposal also suggests that there can be community applications and dotGeos that would come in also. So to the extent that there's a requirement for closer to 500 if there aren't going to be 500 applications in IDNs alone there can be the inclusion of those other applications first.

The idea also being that as these batches roll out with these applications that have the greater justification for the expansion you will be able to test out some of the protection mechanisms that are in place as those roll out so you can be much more comfortable by the time they roll out dotBrands or dotGenerics toward the tail end that these protection mechanisms are either working or can be modified at a later date.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Phil.

Philip Corwin: Yeah, Steve, I thought your description of a cross between land rush and lottery with the worst aspects of each was well put. Just some things that may be helpful that I've kind of picked up over the last few days; one, people I've been talking who claim to have some inside insights into the total number of applications it seems like they're pretty sure there'll be a minimum 1000-1500 total applications so there will be a need for batching.

They think that some defensive dotBrands may not care about being in the first queue may kind of pull back. But the people I know in the domain industry they say it reminds them of what happens when variable domains are dropping and people want to - are racing to pick them up and basically they know how to create software applications to - I don't want to say game the system but to think - but to be first in line.

And they think that people will - those who either create that type of software or have access to it will get to the front of the line in this batching system. I hope those comments are useful.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks very much, Phil. Tony Harris, did you have a comment? And I'm sorry, did anybody else want to be in the queue on this point? J. Scott.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: I think I understand what's being proposed. Actually it's difficult to separate my comment as a constituency from my own personal point of view as I'm an applicant; I think most of you know that.

I'm just wondering if it's entirely fair to shove some applications, which are not controversial, come from nonprofit associations such as mine, into the back of the queue because we may not be an IDN or a community-based application. That's just a thought; I'm not saying that you're thinking is wrong.

But I do have some reservations about the equity and the fairness of what's being proposed.

Steve Metalitz: J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Well, you know, from what I've heard one of the fundamental problems that ICANN is having is the fact that the technologists that know the industry can't participate in any of the implementation discussions with regards to how this is going to work because they're all conflicted out under the conflict of interest policy.

So the idea that the batching that they're coming up with is going to be fair or smooth or correct when the - I've also talked to people who are putting in applications and they can't even get their applications into the system.

So I think the best thing about this particular thing is it categorizes people based on what I'm calling the traffic light system where we start with green and we move to yellow then we go to red and then we go, you know, orange and then red. So we know where the problems are going to be. We know that it's in the dotBrands and dotGenerics that are going to have the most problems.

Now there will be problems in the others very similar but it won't be at the same scale. And right now ICANN is not handling the scale they have. So that's another reason to do this is to give them some ability to handle the volume that they're already having a very difficult time handling.

Because as we move further into implementation people's investment in this program grows and so we need to make sure that we give them processes that they can use to make this a much fundamentally more fluid system.

Steve Metalitz: Marilyn, is this on this point or - okay go ahead. Who else wanted to be in the queue? Kristina. And then is there anybody on the phone - excuse me - that wanted to be heard on this? Okay. Marilyn and Kristina.

Marilyn Cade: You know, I am - I made a comment yesterday about the fact that I personally did not think it was possible in an organization like this. I'm not saying that anyone has to agree with me at all and I know there will be very different views.

I don't think in an organization like this that you can have a Board that is totally non conflicted and that you have an organization that cannot utilize expertise whether they have to hire it at the appropriate time and then make sure that the people they hire do not have conflicts.

But I think we are - the systems that they put in place simply do not scale. They're not ADD compliant which is a problem for some other reasons. They have - from my discussion about them with a very senior technologist who

works in a - in the financial sector - he has no faith at all in the algorithm or the approaches that they're taking.

And I think we've all seen the human factor problem that this organization has. And I'm sort of of the view that we can give them suggestions about ways they can tweak a relatively - a system that seems to have a lot of flaws. But I think we also - and I said this yesterday - they need to make sure they - they may need all that money in order to be able to continually and consistently fix the problems that happen along the way.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I have to say that I was generally supportive of the proposal before I got here. And after sitting through the GNSO Council session and some of the other sessions I'm even more so simply because I think we are all in agreement that this is - the ICANN community is one in which if there is any conceivable way in which something can be gained there are people in this community who will figure out how to do it and to do it successfully.

Whether that is having their applicant be an entity organized in Egypt as opposed to Australia or whatever. So from kind of a deterring gaming perspective I think the proposal has very significant advantages in that regard because even if you were to say that someone would hypothetically say okay at this point I'm going to become a community applicant so I can go into the second batch those are requirements that they are going to have to live within their contract.

From the other perspective what I have been hearing here is that there seems to be increased willingness to consider the adoption and implementation of additional second level protection measures.

And while I'm certainly speaking in my individual capacity at this point it would seem to me that if this proposal is one in which - is one that will facilitate the

introduction of those additional measures it would seem to me that that is the tradeoff that hopefully many brand owners can live with that in exchange for getting additional protections that they are willing to go farther back in the queue.

Steve Metalitz: Tony.

Tony Holmes: Well I just wanted to go back to a fundamental point at the start of this conversation because (unintelligible) introduced he said that he'd spoken to a few people have heard a number of variants than what's actually proposed.

When Tony spoke he began by saying I think I understand what's proposed. And I think if you were to actually move around this room and ask people to explain what they understand by the proposal you may get some pretty mixed views at the moment. I don't think we have an agreed or clear understanding of exactly how the proposal is going to work. Is that something that's shared or - Tony.

Tony Harris: Well that's one thing. I was just having second thoughts on the fact that IDNs are being proposed as the forerunners in the batching system. My reflection on that is very simple; you probably have more bad eggs in that basket than in any of the others.

Marilyn Cade: Tony, sorry, it's Marilyn, but I kind of have to intervene. I think that actually none of - all of us may have concerns about certain applicants. But I know that there are many highly qualified IDN applicants.

Tony Harris: Well I know there are many qualified applicants that are not IDNs.

Marilyn Cade: Fully agree with that. But my point was just - I guess I have concerns about the - the scalability of the proposal and how to - sorry - and how to get by in it. I'm - I mean, I'm hearing an idea put forward that we haven't had a chance to

thoroughly understand or talk about or think about the consequences to different groups.

And I'm not sure that I feel individually as a BC member or as the BC Chair I don't quite - right now until I talk with my other officers on the BC I don't quite know how we would approach taking a decision.

Steve Metalitz: Steve - I'll recognize myself. Again we're not putting this forward as something for the CSG to adopt formally its formation because (unintelligible) participants in the CSG are active on this.

I think - two things we know - well, one, we're pretty sure there's going to need to be some batch methodology because (unintelligible) system process 500 or so at once and they're going to get more than that we think. So (unintelligible) someone is going to go first and someone is going to go second and someone is going to go third.

And, second, it's not - something that I think is going to be decided at this meeting - I can't - it's hard for me to believe that the Board would say oh you, you know, what the staff has put the forward is fine since as we've talked about there are a lot of uncertainties about what the staff has even put forward.

So it's not going to be decided here. It obviously has to be decided soon but, you know, I think once they see how many applications have actually come in it might be a little bit easier to do that. But I'm not - I'll just emphasize we're bringing this up for information.

I understand that Xavier, the CFO, will not be joining us this morning.

J. Scott Evans: Shocking.

Steve Metalitz: Well disappointing. But so - pardon me? Okay go ahead. I'll yield to Marilyn. And let's also make sure before we go too much farther see if there's anybody on the phone that's wants...

Marilyn Cade: Well that's what I'm - that's why I'm intervening. We have remote participants and I want to both announce them and note that they would like - one of them would like to speak. So I'm sorry for intervening but I thought we needed to do that.

(Fabresia Vara) from the IPC is on and Angie Graves from the BC and (Fabresia) would like to make a comment.

(Fabresia Vara): Thanks, Marilyn. So I just - on the batching issue I just wanted to both support kind of what Kristina especially Russ and J. Scott mentioned. But, you know, from a basic level I just wonder why we wouldn't batch things IDN community first specifically - and most fundamentally because this is exactly what ICANN said was the purpose to the expansion.

The fundamental purpose was to serve the next million users who didn't have accessibility in their own languages. All the economic reports that we've seen including - and most specifically those provided by ICANN have actually said that the most benefit - although hard to gauge benefit - the most benefit that is likely to come about and most obvious are IDNs and communities.

So from a very logical, basic and fundamental standpoint I would think that this would be a concept that's easily to grasp and should be supported if nothing else by the documentation we have in the economic reports that we've all been clamoring for.

And I understand that we didn't get exactly what we wanted but every one of the reports I've seen either privately, polled or through ICANN have supported this type of model. So why not introduce what's going to be most beneficial.

And as J. Scott - and I loved his example of the traffic light - use that kind of green, yellow, red to bring things in. It seems to align perfectly. So thank you guys, for that input.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, (Febresia). I think Sarah Deutsch wanted to be in the queue. Did anybody else want to speak on this? Sarah, go ahead.

Sarah Deutsch: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to ask Phil and others for a bit more information about the type of software you said that could be used for gaming. I think we should try to find out a bit more about that and shine some light on it in advance to make sure that these applicants should be banned from using such software. If they're found to use it they should be thrown out of the (unintelligible).

Phil Corwin: Let me say all I know on that is that people I know who are in the domain investment industry and have long experience in trying to catch domains on the drop when domains are not renewed and they're going to be available to the public and there's a rush when it's perceived to be a somewhat valuable non-infringing domain multiple parties want to acquire it.

And successful domainers have developed their own proprietary software to do well in those drop-catching. Now they don't tell other people what their software consists of because they do well with it. But the people I know in the industry said what ICANN has proposed reminds them of domain drops and they're sure that there will be people who will attempt to design software to get to the front of the line in the batching system.

Steve Metalitz: Okay I think Nick Wood wanted to speak. Did anybody else want to say anything on this topic? Nick.

Nick Wood: There is a session on Thursday so - at one o'clock on defensive registration. And I believe the batching idea is going to be on the agenda so it's going to

be discussed in a bigger public forum. So it would be good if people with strong views attend that. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: That's an excellent point. And this is not the only issue that - regarding new gTLD implementation that is being discussed here. And so I would agree with Nick that that's an important thing to encourage.

So if we don't have any further comments on that I think we are expecting our briefers from compliance in the next few minutes. I want to make sure we're not missing any other topics that the CSG needs to discuss so let me ask Marilyn if she has any such topics?

Marilyn Cade: No I really apologize for our chaotic approach to this morning. We had a very short period of time. A couple of things, I need to remind people - none of us have been - I'm Marilyn Cade - none of us have been saying who we are when we speak so the transcript is going to be Woman speaking. Generally when I speak it says Man speaks but anyway.

But - so pay attention to introducing yourself. We also have people on the phone. You all can see yourselves visually so I'm just going to go to the conference phone and ask them to quickly introduce themselves.

And then on the topical thing I will just go back to the room and ask if there are any topics. But just procedurally on the phone can you introduce yourself?

Ron Andruff: Ron Andruff.

Ashley Dumouchel: Ashley Dumouchel.

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow.

(Febresia Vara): (Febresia Vara), Time Warner.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Marilyn, do we have any further - should we talk about the meeting with the Board and how we're going to - how that's going to be structured and the questions?

Marilyn Cade: Sure, let me just also apologize; Xavier sends his regrets. He was trying to change a meeting that did not get changed so we will find another time to have 20 or 30 minutes with him. And you'll see all that by email through your CSG folks. It will not be today.

The meeting with the Board we have given them questions. They sent us a question and that is the question of what - how does the - how do you see the impact of the new gTLDs on your constituency and on ICANN?

And I want to be sure everybody understood that that question has legs; it's not just one leg. So it's not just on your constituency or your house or the GNSO but also on ICANN.

I think we also need to be prepared to talk a little bit about the ethic issue. The room cleared out when the ethic session started. And there were - luckily - I generally count everybody in the room in meetings I'm in. I advise it as a tactic. There's about 72 people in the room. And it looked really different to the ICANN staff and to the Board members chairing to go from a really full room to go to a room that only had 60 or 70 people in it.

I think there's a misunderstanding that I want to be - I want to clarify for all of you. If you don't understand that the code of conduct and the conflicts and ethics documents apply to you individually then read them again; they do.

So some of us made comments about it's too layered, it's too sophisticated, it's too - go for a more principled approach. But be sure you do take a look at them because they do have - and they should have implications for us.

The - thank you. I think our next guest is here. But before I step aside I think we might have one or two questions quickly and then I will move.

Man: Actually just an update. We had our discussion yesterday with the a - couple - few Board members, about four of them. And the discussion sort of went around the IOC and the RC and obviously that's going to go through; that's not a problem at the top level.

The Council has just received a letter with respect to the IGOs asking for protection. So the discussion was should this be done on an entity per entity basis or should this work in the Council be done on the basis of a principle where all these people are considered together and the Council should come up with some sort of principle.

It was interesting because some of the Board members even suggested, right, you could even put into that victimized brands and maybe protect them and give them some big brand certain protections.

So I thought I'd just share that with the group. And if maybe one of the things that could be brought up with the Board, I don't know.

Marilyn Cade: No.

Man: I know. But I just wanted to share that this is the - even the Board would be willing to accept a possibility where in those principles where you have maybe NGOs, maybe IGOs, maybe even big brands we could work on something in the Council. I just wanted to bring it to people's attention.

Marilyn Cade: I think that's a great update but not a Board topic. We've got to stay at a higher level with the Board. If they ask a question about things like this then maybe we could offer to take it back to our constituencies. But to the extent we can let's try to stay at a very high level with the Board.

But you may get those kinds of questions so it's a great update to be aware of that some Board members may want to ask granular questions.

Our guest is here. I'm going to move and turn this over to Steve. And...

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: We're pleased to welcome Maguy Serad and Pam Little from the Compliance team. And they have some slides. Welcome. And I think Elisa is going to run them, right? Okay. So you can verbally ask for them to be advanced.

So I know you have many, many slides and I know you'll focus this on some of the questions that we circulated to you so let me just turn it over to both of you and welcome to our Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Maguy Serad: Yes good morning everyone. Thank you for this opportunity. As you will see on the slide deck we did receive four specific questions from this group. And we will address those in the upcoming slides.

I did however add two additional slides for your information just so you see how we are taking something, for example, data, in the past we report volumes. We wanted to share with you how we're doing some data mining, analysis and trending with - and moving forward and some additional reporting and activities.

So unless - so with the 30 minutes we have we will address the questions and then open it for open discussion.

Oh man I can't see that far. I have reading glasses they're not...

((Crosstalk))

Maguy Serad: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Maguy Serad: All right the first question was about an update about our technology and tools. I do realize it's a busy slide. We attached at the end several slides that speak to also another level of details.

So what we wanted to share with you is as you know already - and we also have a GNSO report on uniformity of reporting that's going to be published soon.

But the idea is to show you our current state. You already know we have separate ticket applications. They were created over time based on the needs. In 2006 generic consumer complaint ticket system was created. Later on Whois became important. That created another system.

Later on UDRP came and they create another system. I do not know why the approach - I cannot speak to history. But our current state is the following.

So what we're working on today is - in the short term is to enhance our current system to allow us to improve and integrate the data, the collection, the analysis and to be able to perform our job better by consolidating all these areas.

We cannot consolidate the systems immediately; it's a long term strategy. But for the short term strategy we are taking the data, consolidating it in a different way and trying to do our analysis and trending and tackle the different complaints.

The mid term strategy is over this coming year is basically we are completing the definition for the consolidated system. The requirements - we've heard I

think from this community when I was in Washington DC one of the requirements was allow me to enter more than one complaint per complaint. So they wanted to add like multiple complaints within one entry.

So we're collecting all kinds of requirements to help us bring forward future systems. We're also - in the upcoming tools also we're going to include in the short term phase additional requirements for allowing us to do some of the audit and risk assessments.

The long term strategy is definitely the full blown consolidated system. But it does not happen overnight. We don't need a big thing overnight. So we're trying to do it in a phased approach to allow us to manage and to proactively address the complaints, volumes and the changes in our environment.

On the second - thank you. On the second question - Pam, can you see that far?

Pam Little: Yes, I think the second question was about compliance involvement in the accreditation process or decision making.

And as you can see that the new accreditations and renewal reviews are both managed by ICANN's registrar liaison team. However as part of that review and that process they seek input from the compliance team.

So for example if they are renewing existing accredited ICANN registrars RAA they will check in, say is everything in good - is this registrar in good standing? And we will provide a up to date compliance report for them to take the new account whether the registrar will be eligible for renewal.

And in terms of the new accreditation or application for accreditation we don't get involved but the registrar liaison team, again, would ask us to check in if the applicant had some common controlling interests with existing ICANN accredited registrars.

Then we check the standing of those existing ICANN accredited registrar and provide the compliance report like we did with the renewal situation. So that's the extent of our involvement.

So I think the question was if not why not. I think (unintelligible) currently works quite well so really is - if the committee sees that we need to be more involved then maybe that's a - kind of a debate or discussion to have.

Maguy Serad: Next slide please.

Pam Little: What - this question is about our role in the amendment - the RAA amendment negotiation process. We are not in the room, you know, at the table negotiating on behalf of ICANN with the registrars; we're not doing that.

But we did, back in 2009 and all the way to 2010, recommended some changes we thought would provide clarity to the existing contract language and enhance our enforcement or enforceability of those provisions. We did do that and that was our involvement then.

And currently, as you know, the negotiation is under way so our review team would also provide an update on where they are in terms of the various proposed changes or the proposed contract language. And we review the proposed language to see whether they will work from a compliance perspective again with our clarity and enforceability perspective.

Next slide please. How we are preparing for the IDN. So I am assuming the question is about the IDN Whois environment or not? Can someone clarify that for us? Because the question is how is compliance preparing for the IDN.

So are we assuming maybe it's related to Whois? In terms of Whois we are saying we can only enforce what's in the current contracts - in the registry or registrar contracts. And so you know there's nothing in the registrar

agreement but there is something in the registry agreement, right, about the obligation to publish the IDN guidelines.

And in fact there are only two registries currently have that requirement which is the dotNet and dotXXX. But this requirement will also be in all the new gTLD agreements.

Steve Metalitz: Perhaps I could clarify the question because I think we didn't state it very clearly I guess. I think the focus is on Whois data that is on non-ASCII script...

Pam Little: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...and how are you going to be assessing, for example, the registrars' compliance with its existing RAA obligations assuming you have a registrar who is accredited to manage registrations in an IDN gTLD.

Pam Little: And sure. So, Steve, thanks for that clarification. And as you know they are the IRD working group they have just published their final report and made three recommendations. There will be protocols or standards to be developed. At the moment there is none.

So we are following that space very closely so that's our second bullet there or tick. We are following those proposed changes and the community discussion closely. But at the moment this is what we're doing in terms of first (tick).

And - but in other role like higher level we are also staffing the team - squaring the team sort of with additional language capabilities and subject matter experts in the Whois area. So that's really our goal. Either not just for Whois but entire team. So we can cope with maybe wider description of geographies in terms of new gTLDs.

The language - we found it really useful - the language capability. I for myself I am responsible to Asia Pacific, you know, compliance matters so I would pick up the phone talking to registrar in China. Very often issues are resolved with that one phone call.

And I hope someone like Paul McGrady will attest to that. We help some of the attorneys, you know, representing UDRP prevailing complainants and seeking ICANN's intervention and we did that very often and successfully on many occasions.

Next slide please. So that was the response to your question. So do you want to open the - to questions for the floor? Sure.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you very much. Let me just ask if there are any questions about what's been presented so far? I see Jonathan seeking recognition, David. Anybody else in the queue?

Ron Andruff: Ron Andruff online.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, Ron, and Mikey. Okay so let's - sorry, my peripheral vision isn't as good as it probably should be. Neither is my memory; who did I - who's in the queue again? Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, this is Jonathan Zuck from the Association for Competitive Technology and member of the IPC. I appreciate those initial slides about the technology that's coming. I'm just concerned that they're a little vague as to the specifics of what's really happening by when.

In other words when is there going to be a short term understanding of existing data? Is there an interim software solution, an incident management system that can be put into place in the near term?

The longer term one, when is the goal for that to actually be in place? Is there something that can be done to analyze the data that already exists with a bunch of interns or something like that?

Because my other concern from looking at that timeline is that the first time we'll have any baselines is some time in 2014 or something like that. And that seems too long.

And I guess finally I'd be interested in seeing the identification of some metrics and goals for those metrics maybe even absent the baseline information so that we have an understanding what the objectives of the team are in terms of how issues are resolved, the timeline for the resolution, Whois data accuracy, etcetera. I think setting some goals - concrete goals even if they're not met, you know, is - would be a healthy exercise.

Maguy Serad: So if you don't mind please going to the first slide on Question 1. Tried to put some months here with high level bullets. I understand they are high. But as I said at the beginning at the end of the deck we have three slides with more specificity.

We do have the incident management system today we have are the three combined. So for the short term, as I stated earlier, we're trying to see what kind of extract because we want to use and leverage what we have to help us still do our job. So we are putting metrics.

And in the deck there are slides in there that shows you how we are slicing and dicing based on the contractual obligations not just volume by ticketing system. So there are details at the end of the deck. But for the 30-minute session today, you know, take a look at them and I'll be more than happy to address them one on one, Jonathan, if you need to.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. I think David was next in the queue.

David Taylor: Thanks, Steve. David Taylor, IPC. A question to Pam there on the RAA when you mentioned about the compliance weren't directly involved in negotiations but you had made suggestions. I'm just interested were those suggestions taken on board?

Pam Little: I can't give you specific about which one were taken on board, which one were not. And I don't think it's appropriate even for me to do that at this juncture when the negotiation is under way. I would be more than happy to provide you an update when the negotiation concluded. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Okay next we have Ron Andruff on the phone with a question. Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Good morning. It's great to see all of the development that's gone on within your group and I'm very pleased to see that we seem to be expanding the compliance element.

But I'm still a little unsure - even though we've added a few people are there - how many more people still need to be added or are we at a complete - have we completed all of the hires for the immediate future? Thank you.

Maguy Serad: Okay yes since the Dakar meeting we have added four new team members. Our search has been very - very lengthy but it's just the requirements. We're looking for the right subject matter expertise with the right language skills but also the correct cultural background.

As you know with our role with the ICANN multistakeholder model we need to be able to converse and understand the different aspects. Sometimes English - we take it for granted we're communicating. I can personally speak - when I first came on board we had communication challenges even though we were all talking and communicating in English.

But when I flip to that native language - because I speak three - I was able to converse in that native language understanding the culture, understanding the nuances. And we took care of problems.

So it takes (unintelligible) resources. I'm really happy to have four on board which brings us up to 12. But you are correct, we do have three more open positions for staffing.

Ron Andruff: When do you think that might be completed?

Maguy Serad: We are actively interviewing. If you have good candidates send them our way please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks, Ron. Mikey O'Connor was next. Let me just see if there's anybody else that wants to be in the queue with a question. I'm going to put myself in the queue after Mikey. Anybody else? Jonathan, okay. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Steve. It's Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. You know, I'm into simple messages this week. I've seen a lot of slides with lots of bullets and lots of steps and lots of care and all that stuff.

But the message that I want to deliver is be (unintelligible) bold. I know that I share the stance of many of the large registrars when I say that the Compliance team seems to find a lot of good reasons why they can't do something. We don't have the tools, we don't have the people, we don't have the (unintelligible), we don't have the status, we don't - blah, blah, blah, blah.

The community really wants you more engaged. We want you a little more proactive. It's the constant theme but it's getting pretty frustrated. You're getting lost in the weeds. Thanks.

Maguy Serad: Thank you. I really believe in the keep it simple. That's why (unintelligible) anything we do. But what I'd like to mention - I can't read this. Please take a look through the slides.

We just came out of our - one of our stakeholder's meetings. What we're trying to roll out we shared with you last time is included in the deck is a one consistent process with very clear steps, very clear communication.

We (unintelligible) evaluating - and I'll talk to you more the processes when I first came on board. I'm very pleased to let you know that across all contracted parties, all contractual provisions we are applying the same consistent process where we go three strikes, where we give the contracted party the opportunity through first, second or third notice with specific timelines, specific facts.

This is that simple and bold and efficiency we're bringing forward. We are asking for facts up front to help us make fact-based decision before we evolve to the next phase. And immediately if we do not hear from them I'm pleased to (unintelligible) we are turning our breach notice into enforcement in two business days. In the past it would (unintelligible) few days to weeks.

Another thing I want you to know - I don't know if you've been keeping up - we also completed the suspension process which we got some resistance on but we completed it. We have published on the Website all kinds of frequently asked questions.

So we are trying to be bolder. But to be bold you have to have the standard operating procedures process and we are doing all these activities in parallel.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. I've got myself in the queue, Jonathan, J. Scott, anybody else? All right. I'd like to go back to two of the questions that we (unintelligible). One has to do with the role of Compliance in the accreditation process. And I think you said that you are consulted as to whether that - the applicant for

accreditation has some other problems or is under common control with and so forth.

One concern that I have is I think that it seems as though some registrars are looking at accreditation of a new (unintelligible) if you will as a way of resolving problems that they may have with - in their existing registrar accreditation; (unintelligible) in which they are registering domains for their own account in a way that would - that might (unintelligible) but they can create a new registrar and have that registrar accredited (unintelligible).

Without getting into any specific cases do you have a - it sounds like you're just kind of asked a question by the registrar liaison team then you give an answer and they go on to decide whether the accreditation should be granted. Is that basically right or do you actually have a recommendation as to whether a particular accreditation should be granted?

Pam Little: Steve, I think you are right; we are consulted in those circumstances. And - but the scenario you describe we don't know who that is obviously. But it could happen in other industries as well in terms of other licensing regimes.

But in terms of our process at the moment we really don't know how - there are checks done by our registrar liaison team. As you know that process is actually tightened in response to law enforcement concerns or requests.

So the registrar liaison team does carry about additional due diligence checks on the applicant legal entity as well as the principle or the (unintelligible) but there is a policy of accreditation. I think it's called registrar accreditation policy so the criteria are set out there and they make the assessment.

Steve Metalitz: And you're - so you're giving factual input...

Pam Little: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...into that process but they make that assessment...

Pam Little: Yes, yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...you're not making that. Okay that's helpful.

Pam Little: Exactly.

Steve Metalitz: The second question I had - if you look back in what we circulated to you some people within our constituency think it would be a good idea if each registrar designated a compliance officer or a chief compliance officer; someone who is on the hook for compliance, if you will.

I wonder what you think about that recommendation and how that (unintelligible).

Maguy Serad: Yes I would actually welcome that to become a reality as a compliance officer of ICANN but that, as you know, is not (unintelligible) spelled out in the RAA so therefore we don't have that arrangement.

We do have access to registrar's primary contacts which is really, you know, the legal entity we need to serve documents or notices under. We have access to that but we don't have a designated compliance officer.

I think I can see some of the pushback maybe from the smaller registrars. I've visited registrars that are very small like - there's one (unintelligible) so the CEO is also the compliance officer.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thanks. So you think that would be a good idea but it's not in the agreement now. Okay I think Jonathan was next and then J. Scott.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, again, Jonathan Zuck from ACT and the IPC. I accepted your invitation to look at the slides at the end of the deck here just while we still had you

here. And I see here that you have targeted by now to define the requirements for reporting analytics and to define the business requirements for consolidated solutions. Do those requirements analysis exist in a form that we could see them or?

Maguy Serad: We're collecting them. We have them in a Word document. What would you be interested in seeing there, Jonathan? Is it just a validation step that we are doing that?

Jonathan Zuck: No, not at all. I mean, the - I'm interested in seeing what requirements you are defining for your reporting analytics because I think they'll speak to the metrics you're thinking of tracking and how you're thinking of tracking them and I think if we want to have this conversation two years from now that the system isn't tracking information that people are interested in knowing.

The second question I guess then is is there something you can do very soon to talk about the kinds of metrics that you plan on tracking and some objectives you might have for those metrics?

Maguy Serad: Okay so I'm not sure what slide number it's on. If you can - can you go down a couple of slides please, Steve? So one of the metrics - you might back up - one of the metrics we're working towards now that we have improved the quality of our process turning it consistently while we are starting to track internally is how long does it take us to go from first to second to third to measure efficiency but also to put it in perspective with a different contractual obligation and the contractual requirements for the different areas of the provision so that's one of the metrics we're looking at.

The - can you go down a couple slides please? Okay this slide is one of the slides that we were not able to do in the past. But this is through our short term solution while we are in a parallel activity doing what you just stated about the new requirements.

We could not remain where we were every trimester until the new requirements and the new systems are built so we have a parallel track like I said of (unintelligible) this data. And we are pooling it - we have a group of ITs looking at that and bringing it forward to us.

What we're looking here is volume by registration, by registrars, by complaints. And if you go down to your slides you'll see where now we are concentrating on - this is a good one - back up please - where we are taking the complaints based on the volume in that registration space in that area and we are taking - while the process is actively proceeding to collect parts we're taking more proactive based on this volume.

We take the top 10 (unintelligible) and trends for those specific areas over the next few months. So we're looking at how can we report and trend on these metrics. We're also involved in the consumer metrics group that meets every other week to build - how do you measure the success of a new gTLD?

We've got the performance measurements and reporting, gentlemen, (participate) into that so we make sure we are hearing how that's being (composed). So to your point we don't find ourselves - oh we don't have this data.

So we're looking - if you have some great ideas on metrics and requirements please we'd be more than happy to engage in a conversation with you. We already collected a few based on previous conversations. But I'd like to see if we - there's opportunities and who would be interested.

If we want to engage this community in discussing what requirements would be valuable, what data would be valuable do we contact the chair of the Commercial Stakeholder Group? Is that fair? And then you can ask for volunteers or people to collaborate with us on that?

Steve Metalitz: Well I think we want to be as helpful to you as possible so we'll figure out the best way...

Maguy Serad: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...to provide that. And I think Jonathan has been very...

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...dedicated on this issue and I'm sure he would contribute to it.

Maguy Serad: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: We have a couple more people in the queue. Jonathan, unless you had a follow up - any follow up on that?

Jonathan Zuck: Just very briefly. I love this anecdotal discussion turned into a quick document in terms of what your current thinking is about what kinds of things you'll be tracking.

And again I hate to sound like a harpy but are you willing on any of these things to actually set objectives for them so that we know that whether or not those things are a success because a success isn't defined by saying well we said we would do this and we started doing it.

That's too much of an ICANN measure of success. And is there a way to say what you are going to try to accomplish for these initiatives so that you can tell us later whether or not that worked out?

Maguy Serad: Yes. Yes, may I - I do not have time and I can't see time on the clock. We do have an obligation at 11 o'clock please.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, okay I'm sorry. Let's move onto the - we have two more people in the queue. Tony has one comment.

Tony Holmes: Just one point, thank you very much for coming on today and providing us with this feedback. But could I ask for these groups Steve becomes the focal point for the interaction with you on this? And that'll be...

Steve Metalitz: At least...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...we'll do it that way and we may figure out a more efficient way to do it. J. Scott and Steve DelBianco and Kristina and then I think we'll have to let our guests go. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: J. Scott Evans with the IPC, Yahoo. First I want to thank Maguy and Pam for coming and for always coming and having discussions and dialogue. But I've got to tell you I'm scared to death. I'm scared to death that we're on the precipice of bringing so many contracts in and you're about five years behind the curve. It's not your fault because you need the resources from the Board and from your organization so that you can ramp up.

And I'm pleased to see the work you've done. You're five years behind the curve. You don't have - 12 people is not going to do this. It's not going to (unintelligible). Who do we need to talk to to tell them to give you the money (unintelligible) tools to fix this problem because it is a problem. We want to be an advocate (unintelligible). It's not a situation you have a created but it's a situation that you and this community has to fix.

Maguy Serad: All I can say - I (unintelligible) for you to see it but I can tell you and assure you I have all of our executive support and the budget. The challenge that, I'll be honest with you, it's not the tools. You can, with money, go - I've worked

outsource, in-source, in-house, I come from an IT background; I know what it takes for the tools.

But finding the right skill set is the critical step. And I admit, maybe we're nit-picking but it's very important skill set. We don't have the luxury. It takes up to three to six months to ramp up into ICANN - just first wrapping your head around ICANN takes a while let alone processing all of the stuff.

So I have the executive support. I have their commitment. But of course your voice is very important and you need to express it.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Steve DelBianco and then Kristina.

Steve DelBianco: Maguy, Steve DelBianco with the Business Constituency. But also on the working group who developed the draft proposal on consumer metrics for consumer trust, consumer choice and competition.

So as you know because I think each of you were on a few of the calls we've already got that out for public comment. There are 40 metrics in there and there are about eight of them that will probably come from your department where we'll need measures reported every year on the new gTLDs.

And we were very careful to cite exactly the source and to try to acknowledge early on whether there was difficulty (unintelligible) reporting what came in. So now is the time - and we want to hear from your department a thumbs up or concerns you have with everything we've got in there for you.

And (unintelligible) Steve, you know, copy of course but please reply online to the public comment period as soon as you can so we can design ways around your concerns if you can't measure the metrics we've designed for you. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Steve. Kristina Rosette has the last word.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you for coming. We very much appreciate it. Two questions and I guess the first one I think I may have heard you say something at the beginning that made me really happy but I wanted to make (unintelligible) really happy.

Is that there is in fact a tool being developed that for individuals and entities that want to file Whois data problem reports where all of the data is the same for the - except for the domain name that it could be one report as opposed to one report for each domain name is that right?

Maguy Serad: I took your idea from the Washington DC trip when I visited with you guys and I submitted that as a requirement, yes.

Kristina Rosette: Excellent. Thank you.

Maguy Serad: But this is why I asked earlier, I would like to come back and validate with this audience...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Maguy Serad: ...what are some of the requirements or areas of interest that will help you do your job better and will help us meet your expectations because...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Maguy Serad: ...it's all about expectations, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Well thank you. And I was just wondering if you had a - kind of a guestimate as to when that was going to be rolled out.

Maguy Serad: I cannot speak to that at this moment. We're finalizing the document...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Maguy Serad: ...and we're going to have to engage with different parties just to deliver those.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Maguy Serad: But it has to be a phased approach. And Jonathan and I have had many sideline conversations. It's not going to be a big bang theory; it has to be rolled out based on prioritization. And we will have a plan but I just need the right resources to take it and translate it into that.

Kristina Rosette: Sure. Sure. And the other - and it's really more of a comment going through the PowerPoint - and thank you very much for sending that ahead of time and for focusing on the specific questions that we raised.

The one area that perhaps does not seem to be addressed in the PowerPoint but I assume is being addressed by Compliance and I would suggest that perhaps this might be another area in which you could advocate in terms of what it is that compliance is doing is ramping up to deal with all the new registries and all the new registry agreements particularly given that I would imagine you're going to have a significant number that are going to want amendments that are going to seek exemptions from the registry code of conduct.

How are you going to track that? How's that going to get set up? You know, I think that's an area of kind of future concern as I think J. Scott alluded to. And I'm sure that you all have been very busy - okay never mind, stated - that I'm

sure you've been very busy and I think it would be helpful to us to have more information as to what is being done there because the lack of information I think is being assumed to mean, at least on my part, that there may not be any.

Maguy Serad: Okay so I have a question back to you but I would like to clarify when we spoke to the Compliance team being built I spoke to (unintelligible) risk audit and (unintelligible) measurement. The key role that I didn't speak to was the - is currently the core team that is focused on registrar and registry compliance.

You know, when I came on board I assessed the skill sets, the gaps, because we want to make sure we're not leaving anything unattended. And what we're starting to do is build up on that skill set to be able to be cross functionally able to manage volume requests, demands, community changes.

So what I'd like to know is - I don't know if it's today but if you can send me an email with a little bit more clarity for what you are asking me about what is it you want us to show you or report to you if you don't mind sending me an email on that?

Kristina Rosette: Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Maguy Serad: Okay yeah. And if you want to select inputs from the team send me one email on behalf of this community it will be great. Because I don't want to get emails that are conflicting then I will be in deep trouble here. Thank you, Kristina.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you - thank you very much. I want to thank again Maguy and Pam, you've been very generous with your time. We really appreciate you're coming and giving us such a thorough briefing on this so thank you so thank you very much.

Maguy Serad: Thanks.

Pam Little : Thank you for having us. Enjoy the rest of your day.

Steve Metalitz: Okay we have just a couple more minutes I think before we have to adjourn and move over to the Board meeting so...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...announcement. My job is apparently to be the administrator reminding all that this call is being recorded; this is an open meeting. And like all of our open meetings we have external guests here with us. We focus on the speakers being the members of the constituency.

The next meeting is a closed meeting and only members of the constituency or guests who are part of your company or your association can come to that meeting with the Board. It is however Webcast so you can still listen. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Okay and, Marilyn, do we know - has there been any change in the topics that we're going to be discussing or...

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Steve. So let me remind all that we originally had three topics. But we had expected that two of them would primarily be for statements rather than discussion. I'll just remind everyone of what they are.

So we had three topics and then the Board gave us a topic. So the three - our first topic was - and I'm going to - it was the implementation issues associated with the Guidebook that are of particular concern to these three constituencies.

And that's a code word for saying we're going to talk about the need for improvements in RPMs and other kinds of things.

The second topic - topic session - I'm going to skip it for the moment. And the third was the - it was we urged the Board to take us seriously when we say that we are a partner in dealing with the external threats and risks that the organization is experiencing.

Now subsequently there was an excellent workshop yesterday and many people were in it. It is not a - that does mean the Board is - has yet gotten over thinking that the staff can do all of that themselves. We'll make a statement about that.

The fourth topic is really the topic that I think we need to focus on and that is the Board's topic. And that is the topic of - so what does the new gTLD program - what changes do you expect to happen in your constituency, in your house and in the GNSO and in ICANN as a result of the new gTLD program - I would add and other external changes - other changes that may happen in ICANN's role.

So that I think is the topic they most want to talk about. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I think the other announcement topic was a matter of accountability and transparency is the Board satisfied with the preparations for this meeting and the compliance with these 15-day rule - or three-week rule for publication of documents and agendas for the meeting which we think was a serious flaw in preparation for this meeting.

I think - not to choreograph this...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...statement, right.

Steve Metalitz: Yes that's a statement. Not to choreograph this too much; I think we will - our plan is to call on these two questions the implementation issues of new gTLDs and the impact of new gTLDs on ICANN, if you will...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Steve Metalitz: I think we're going to have a designated first speaker on the first topic; that will be Stacey King from the IPC. And on the second topic it will be - you? Okay, all right. Second topic will be Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: However kicking it off so you guys do understand you'll be raising your hands from the audience. It's going to be - Tony, Steve and I will be there with Rod and Steve and maybe Bruce.

Typically Steve calls on the Board members and the staff and one of us calls on the community members because we're expected to know them. It's an hour and - it's an hour so I think we should pack up and get over there now. We're going to LaPaz. It's a large room but the reason it's a large room is when I turned in the RSVPs we had 70 confirmed attendees - just a minute, J. Scott - so it is a large room. Yes, J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: I just want to say thanks to our remote participants that we are missing you here and we appreciate you taking the time - whatever time zone you are in to participate because your input is very important. Thank you so much for being here today.

Marilyn Cade: And one quick thing; it is Webcast. Actually you guys will be able to follow it. And it's...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Okay - and so if you have a question if you could email it to Benny - BC-secretariat@icann.org she'll be able to raise her hand and can be recognized so we can take questions for you guys remotely.

Ron Andruff: Thanks to all of you. Appreciate it.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you to all the participants and those who assisted here. And we'll see you in a few minutes.

END