

ICANN Costa Rica Meeting
Internet Service Provider & Connectivity
- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 13th March 2012 at 14:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

(Michael Rogers): My name is (Michael Rogers) and I representing the (unintelligible) Association and the (unintelligible).

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken))

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken))

Man: Good afternoon (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: My name is Mikey O'Connor. I'm almost (unintelligible) constituency. I represent the Minnesota Internet Cooperative Exchange. And I serve on a number of working groups here at ICANN.

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken))

Man: Thanks (Tony). We actually got some changes to our agenda as we work through today. And I will ask (Tony) to try and help to move everybody along.

But the first thing we have today is to introduce our guest, which is (Linda) and (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). And we thought it would be a good idea to provide some time for both of them to explain a little bit the workings of a (unintelligible) to seek some input from this constituency to (that) process.

So (unintelligible) turn over to (unintelligible) to (make mention) is that maybe he should do it in English and Spanish. And maybe you can do the Spanish one first.

Woman:

So thank you for your time. And the idea is to facing the ATRT that we had this time is some commitment to (unintelligible). And we have done right here asking for members of the community, what they believe about the profile that should be the best (round) for the board members.

And the idea here is today is to come back to you with the (resume) that we got all the information from AC and SA. And we have commentaries and (unintelligible). To have this resume also reaches the (batch file) that the community is believing that (unintelligible) our guidance to choose the best and the (unintelligible) board members. So that's (unintelligible).

((Foreign Language Spoken))

So the idea is to really, to continue to (just forward), not mine. (Unintelligible). So it's just to remember that we have three members from the board to choose this year.

One member for our CCNSO, one member for the GNSO and two ALAC members, two - one from Europe and one from North America, that's our task today.

Of course, the most difficult issue is one of those is from the board must be from Latin American Caribbean area. So that is the most important task because we need a (good pool) of candidates to select the best.

So because our bylaws states clearly that we cannot have zero members from one region, and for the other hand not over five from another region. So the candidate that represents Latin American Caribbean area, this year we ran his term in October.

So we need to replace with someone from our region. I say our region because I'm from Brazil. So are the others. So it's a good idea to have more candidates for that region than usual.

So there is somewhat timeline. So we started last year. We have this window closing 2nd of April. And then we're going to start to have two sides. One is interview and the base about how we're going to view this, you know, diving into the candidates and to select them.

And make a small pool to send to a contracted part that's making the (tenants) review those candidates. And they give us some feedback about here, you know, you remember (haver), other issues that we can know as not expecting these issues selected.

So we have a (unintelligible). We need to have a small group of candidates for the board and for the others. And we're going to drive them. They say for the board members, candidates to join us in (Braha). They interview face to face those selected, you know, block of candidates.

And after the meeting in (Braha), we're going to have a retreat in some place. You know, our - out of any (lobby). And we go deeply on that. And in this final of two days, normally two days and a half, we need to reach consensus in some methodology that we're going to publish.

For the benefit of the whole community, we are publishing almost everything, of course not the candidates, not the names. And keep it private, but not close it.

So we're going to (publish) this information that we are sharing with you after this meeting is going to be post. And what have we selected from the last year is experience.

What we expect, community expected from the board member, experience, (spec info) is not really to have a (deep) knowledge about all technical issues. But needs to have a general view of what we are talking about.

Second, policy - must be well aware about many policy issues. But also the same time be certain that they are not supposed to do (policy). That it's not their job. It's community job to prepare (unintelligible) by the board.

Governance - not only manage the skills, but experience (unintelligible), the board experiencing similar or larger of the organization. That is our problem now. We are growing as ICANN organization.

And we need more and more experience people sitting there. So ability to easily communicate in English, but more and more other language (inside) the process.

We have become international. So more and more we need to touch community in their language. The more members of the board that can express issues in the language of this general public in each region would be better for the (company).

General skills - ability to listen, able to build relationship when the board's communicate with the communities (unintelligible) diplomatic skills to face the (base) with the (governance) within the community (unintelligible) my decision make.

We need people that needs to simulate quickly many information and make decisions in (unintelligible) independence. We need to add independence for that and confidence but not arrogant.

We don't want people that sit over there and face the community like a (unintelligible). So it's more, you know, confidence but a more (stringly) approach.

So a factor, public (unintelligible) with elegance because the communities is allow them to (unintelligible). So people in the board needs to (whisper) and (factor them) and when we act. We act with elegance and respect for this comment in the community.

Ability to delegate because it's not their job to (do think). (It's term) understanding the reasons ICANN (work stake) model because we cannot return a company that has a mission and a model and a vision if you don't believe in that.

Understand that clear communication with the community is important part of this concept we're building. And time availability is really (helada).

So what we want for you is to sit back from that is this is something that is (unintelligible) representing your thoughts about that. What do you suggest to add with all that's not important, that's (unintelligible). Thank you.

Man: Okay thanks, so for now for some quick comments.

Man: Sorry (unintelligible) if I can just take a minute. My job is a little different here. I hold for the first time the position of Chair Elect, which didn't exist until this year.

So in the past the non-commented and the past chair and through the ATRT recommendations it was suggested that you wanted to have actually a Chair Elect that could learn the job and then chair as opposed to walking in and having to do something that - with no experience.

So my job is to get ready for next year. So I'll chair the 2013 nomination committee. What differences you'll see coming from me are I would be shortly after this meeting asking you for your appointment to that committee.

So often we would wait until closer to it. I have the advantage now of being able to plan ahead and start to marshal resources. That committee will meet for the first time at the Toronto meeting in October.

So before Prague or shortly after Prague we'll be asking you to go and get your candidate to use through your own internal process. And so you'll see an official request from me.

The other big change you'll see is we're starting to make it much more transparent. So in the past I think the secrecy rules around candidates. So the one thing that really must remain secret is the candidates names and personal information and the debate we have internally about them.

But that seems to have extended to a lot of our procedures and processes and documents. And it's my goal to try and reverse that. There should be nothing un-transparent or secret about a lot of what we do.

And I think that we're doing a disservice to (Section A) by trying to extend that secrecy. So you'll see me working hard (unintelligible) this year and next to try and undo some of that to be much more transparent about what is the actual process. And what does the (non-com) actually do.

So I'm happy to take comments and questions throughout the next year and half. But you will be hearing from me actually through our candidates for next year. My role this year is simply to support them and get ready for next year.

Man: Okay thanks.

Man: Yes (unintelligible) speaking. Thank you and (unintelligible). I have some - two questions. You were talking about, you know, one of the requirements is to (have) experience. What does it mean?

If I look to boards existing, there is a reality of different kind of boards everywhere in the world. Is it more specified? Or does it really (unintelligible) because we have (unintelligible) board, you have the (little) board (unintelligible).

So there's been one person I have. And the second person is (unintelligible) time commitment. It is, as you mentioned here that, you know, you sometimes remember there was a kind of (declining) of (unintelligible).

I would like to hear from you, from your experience with (unintelligible). Thank you.

Man: Well really the commissioning in the board is (shish). Is we have in the application that is about (bringing) our (recall) or something like that. And it's assured.

So it's not really an easy task. And because of that if you remember last year board approval to be compensated and make some kind of payments for those (dates) they (dedicated), it's not a big amount of money.

But it brings together other issues. We don't want people that will apply just for the month because this is not the job.

Second, so it's really a huge commitment. And you'll need to have time to travel at least five times a year. Dedicate more than ten days at a time and five days in the other. But then we (relief) like myself.

You know, in the south part of the world to reach more or something like that, but (today). So it's - we need to account council with that. So it's not an easy task. But is by challenge.

And a lot of people believe that this is quite a (helavent) in the learn curve that is making it more and more easy with this (unintelligible) issue that is available now from the newcomers.

So why is important some kind of experience. Two, because each year (unintelligible) issue. New it start to interfere like the tasks that should be done. Or interfere with the task with the community that is polishing issues.

So you need to have a more clear line. What is board position? What is executive position, (unintelligible) position? So whatever board will have this, this is a source lesson that you learn that delivers clear line with the board and the executive function in any kind of organization.

So whatever is the board. It's not the (real event). It's technical (unintelligible). Need to get from (downgrades). Needs to have clear distinction of the function and to make this easy for both sides and here in this organization for the (three sides) that our organization is about, community, (unintelligible).

Man: Thanks. We'll (unintelligible) of that. What we heard from board members in the past is it's not just 20 hours a week. It's more like two or three a day because you can't store it all up and then go.

These are active mailing lists going seven days a week. So most of my members are doing emails for a hour, hour and a half a day at the minimum

just to keep up with the discussions. Because you can't kind of go away from it for seven days and then put in a whole day.

And so on your other question, I think the important part of (under) statement is of like size. So ICANN is currently a \$60, \$70 million company, arguably it would become a \$100 million.

Board members that sit on boards of \$100 million companies tend to have very different characteristics than on a board of a million dollar company or less.

So I think for me personally it doesn't matter what the company or industry is, whether it's profit or non-profit. It's that they've signed a board that is managing something of that magnitude.

And I think you'll find that there is, you know, certain skill sets of, you know, being able to learn something quickly if they don't know it and make a decision based on evidence and work within a structure. As opposed to key qualities like he's a lawyer in a town (derk) or that type of thing. So I hope that answers your question.

Man: Okay. Can I just ask a quick question about...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Before, when we were talking with you before. You were (thinking) about everything that was listed there, is that everything that was offered? Or did you go through an exercise of thinking what was relevant, what wasn't relevant and this is the result? How is this compiled?

Man: Well certainly it's not - whether we cannot find people that have all the skills together.

Man: That's where I was heading.

Man: Yes. It's - what is here is the reason from all the new (unintelligible). What (ACRT) demands to us is in the end of this year, we need the (non com) (unintelligible) that those are the demands from the community.

And those are the people we should. And that is the (matching) of that because certainly if some are more (helevant), for instance depend on the (unintelligible).

So we have enough (with the map, which is over there) (unintelligible). It's not (certain) event like financial or something like that. So this year it's important to compare those demand from the community with whether it's lacking inside the board to (unintelligible).

Man: Okay. I understand.

Man: Sure, we started with the board scorecard. So they have a scorecard where they evaluate themselves internally every year. So they give that to us and walk us through how they do that.

It was clear from that that we then went out to the community and showed them a lot of that scorecard. But we also took off things off that scorecard of specific key skills.

Like I mentioned board has been pretty clear that they're not looking for a lawyer specifically. They're not looking for an accountant specifically. So although they measure those skills internally just to get a sense of who has what for what committee that's not what they're looking for.

And then it was through the community I would say this is not an exhaustive list of everything the community gave us. But it's certainly all the commonality ones from more than one part of the community.

Man: That sounds fair.

Man: Yes thank you. My last question and then we have to move on. My very last question is (unintelligible) diversity. I remember (unintelligible) local or regional (unintelligible) diversity. So is general diversity an item covered in this board?

Man: Yes and no. So the only bylaw for diversity we have to follow is we can have no more than five members from any region on the board. And we can have - we never allow zero.

So (unintelligible) that year because the person coming off the board is from Latin America. We must put at least one back on from Latin America. And we can't ever allow more than five for one region.

That's the only bylaw stipulation. Do we seek to be more gender diverse and, you know, of course we do. But the committee, and I think one thing that has frustrated past committees that I've been on is we only can deal with the applications we have before us. And we're always going to pick the best of them.

So, you know, does a committee have a discussion, a debate? Absolutely. Are we going to pick based on gender a secondary candidate to the best? I would say that I've never seen the committee do that in my experience.

So, you know, we do our work now to try and get a broad, you know, diversity and gender and nationality and, you know, across many spectrum. But we do not discriminate in any way. The only bylaw or requirements we must meet is the regional one.

Man: (Unintelligible) depends.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken)). Thank you very much for your time.

Man: Thank you for coming and joining us.

Man: The questions that we have we'll send to you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: This process and (perhaps) I really like the approach you've adopted with the openness and it's already...

((Crosstalk))

Man: And I'm going to send this presentation to you.

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you. Thank you for your time.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay so back on to the agenda. I mentioned earlier that there had been some changes from the published agenda. And part of that is because we were due to look at the security and stability committee report.

And that hasn't been concluded. So that's something that we'll put in our agenda for the next meeting in Prague. I think it's nice the constituency, some of the issues that have come in under that study are very close to home and so we would need some (go into).

So we have been through the first item (unintelligible) introductions and welcome and (unintelligible) committee. And the time now is to turn to the - this report and recommendations.

And it's something which a number of our (finished) constituency have spent quite a lot of our lives being engaged in for the past sessions at ICANN. (Tony)'s probably the longest on (unintelligible) committee for about five years.

And we found progressing those studies incredibly difficult. So as a result of the (ATRT) issues, accountability issues that surround the ICANN (unintelligible). One of the recommendations that came out of that was that there should be a report put together on this policy.

And that report is now being published. And it recognized a couple of things. One was the (inconsistency) in finding a clear (conscience) for communicating to this policy. Which considering this is a fundamental requirement of a number of operatives in ICANN (unintelligible) system, I found quite surprising.

It also recognized that (overall intentions) between constituencies. And that was something which was particularly frustrating I think from our side because, as I mentioned, trying to progress the work on (here) in the past was incredibly difficult.

So the public comment for this particular report closes on the 19th of March. And having had some discussion with some of the (unintelligible), I think it would have been (unintelligible) of us as a constituency if we didn't actually submit some public comments back on this report. Having put so much effort into this issue in the past.

So with that introduction, I'm going to move on and look at the report. But (I like) to this are some studies which have been (confirmed) in the past and for the GNSO.

And to give us a little picture (unintelligible) I just ask (move forward) to bring us up to date with where those studies have been discussed within the GNSO currently (stand).

Man: (Unintelligible). So actually we have four studies on - in the (LLCs) going on and we have a different level of performance what has been done so far. And so you can go to the Web site available on the ICANN Web site. It's under the GNSO and where you can find those studies.

It's also believed that one is about the who-is (issues) and so the question behind is (unintelligible) to examine to what extent the information on the (world) data is (unintelligible). The (current date) information for GTLD domain names, and so that is (advancing).

And over the last year, so a lot of this (is custom) within the GNSO how (unintelligible) GNSO studies and those studies have been conducted by institutions, by private institutions in this case it is a - the university (ALAP) in the University of Pittsburgh which is (posed well) to perform this study.

And while we are (unintelligible) to receive the results of these studies and (unintelligible) up to date information we have is (in need) of 2013. We shall have (unintelligible) study to (determine about them).

The second study (unintelligible) identification study. And this is one that we already expect to have the result of that in late 2012. And we have a study of - about (revenues), of privacy and (puncture) services which is also a more or less long term studies which is - asks for (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, (unintelligible).

Man: Okay, and this is - this study is expected to have results early 2013. And then we have another study I'm (unintelligible) in the (world) survey. It's very - (represents) the one in the most - (unintelligible) expected to have some results here in early 2012. I was told early means it could be in April when we can have the first results and (unintelligible).

So before (unintelligible) identification study, who's privacy and (unintelligible) at (risk) and the other one is who is privacy and (proxy) in a survey. Now these are the four studies on the - which are conducted.

Man: Okay, so (where are the studies that are canceled)? And what I was saying is the (unintelligible) study (unintelligible) survey. (You know, the GTLD reports).

This is within (a list) of (unintelligible) that has come out of the (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, so we can (report) back so it is in the whole constituencies is (accurate data) is one of the high priority items but to (take an interest) in that way to say ICANN should take appropriate measures to reduce a number of (unintelligible). I'm asking that but also does he mean how can it be more specified? I'm not sure about that in this report and what does he mean appropriate measures.

For example, do we have ideas, for example (unintelligible) because it's a recommendation as - do it appropriately.

Man: My answer to that is that I believe that this is one of the recommendations that the study's had real difficulty getting agreement on. So the language was put forward in this way because some of the (policies) were not in agreement to what those measures could be.

Man: (Unintelligible) is it needs to be (jammed) up in terms of the language then (unintelligible) but I wouldn't have problems in making that response back,

particularly as you quite correctly mentioned that all of our activities before from the United States respective have been to improve better accuracy and that's one thing that's been at the heart of all the (unintelligible).

So if everyone's okay with that then we could make a reference back on this particular recommendation. Okay. Number 6, publish (ambly) and accurately the report on (which would) reduction in unreachable (unintelligible) registration (again). It seems just a fundamental requirement which has been missing in the past.

Seven - publish status reports at least annually with figures on its progress towards achieving goals set out by the team. Eight - again, to ensure there's a clear unambiguous enforceable chain of contractual arrangements with registries, registrars (unintelligible) to require the provision of (unintelligible) accurately restated.

Is everyone okay? Number nine - ensure that requirements are accurate who-is data are widely and proactively communicated to current and prospective registrants and to ensure the registrants (rights and) responsibilities are proactively, permanently circulated to new registrants.

So why don't we move on to data access and privacy services which is really the issue that always was a stumbling block in making any progress whatsoever, one of the issues discussed at the GNSO council level.

And the first recommendation in this section is that ICANN should develop a system of clear, consistent and enforceable requirements for privacy (statuses) consistent with (mission laws) balancing between stakeholders with competing but (with enough) interest.

So this takes account of law enforcement and industry requirements as well. Also that these should include (new entry), must clearly label that this is a private registration privacy services, must provide full contact details. In other

words, trying to make sure that access is achievable in some - (in more) of the other was providing these privacy aspects.

(Unintelligible) actually in having the technical use of who-is has become particularly challenging and of course it's used for much more of interest technical issues these days which is what it was originally designed for.

So Number 11, ICANN should be graduated in (unintelligible) series of (unintelligible) but privacy service providers who require (lengthy) requirements. Something that doesn't exist today.

Moving (swiftly) - data access, proxy services - ICANN should facilitate the review of existing practices by reaching out to (proxy) providers to create a discussion that sets out current processes followed by these providers.

Thirteen - registrars should be required to disclose through ICANN their relationship with any affiliated retail proxy provider service. If you have any issues with these, this is your opportunity in the meeting to object before we compile the response back from us.

So 14 - ICANN should develop a separate (unintelligible) best practice guidelines consistent with (ignition) laws, again, striking a balance between stakeholders and their (unintelligible) interest.

Fifteen - ICANN should encourage any (unintelligible) registrars to interact with (retail) service providers. Sixteen - and we're getting towards the end - the who-is policy should include an informative statement that clarifies a proxy in a relationship in which the registrant is acting on behalf of another.

Man: Sorry (unintelligible) so coming back to number 15...

Man: Okay.

Man: At -does anybody have an idea what this means - ICANN should incentivize registrars?

Man: We...

Man: Mikey has a - sorry, (Mike).

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. I think what they're talking about is the aging of the registrar accreditation agreements, registrars around the 2001 agreement around, you know, progressively (unintelligible) and I think that we're grappling with the issue of how to bring people into current - and they're trying to use a carrot (unintelligible) to bring it. I think that's the incentive they're talking about.

Man: And (unintelligible) is (unintelligible). Thanks (Mike). So data access - we're down to the bottom of this now.

Man: So - let me roll you back to 16.

Man: Okay.

Man: One of the things that's not clear in the document - this is just a longer version of I think a statement of support and I don't think it needs to go into this dialogue but one of the really difficult things in this document is the definition that the terms privacy provider and proxy provider, and so I was pretty involved in writing the comments from the BC and one of the things that we were going to put in the comments from the ones that (unintelligible) clarify those definitions.

And I just thought I'd highlight that because it gets pretty confusing in this document what they're talking about so I just thought I'd tie up that.

Man: Okay, that's helpful. Thank you. Actually, I'll come back to you in a minute if I might. So moving on to get the end of the recommendations - data access, common interface - to improve access to the newest data of dot com, dot net, the (thin) registries where this is specifically focused in registries. ICANN should set up a dedicated multilingual interface Web site to provide (fit careers) data (foreman).

And there's an alternative here. And this is part of the particular process seeking (input back on). The alternative is to make (newest) data more accessible for consumers, ICANN should set up a dedicated multilingual interface Web site to now unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete (needed) information and to provide (thick) who-is data for (TCLD) domain names.

And this is the minimum recommendation that I think we really need to look at specifically and decide which of these options is the most appropriate. So tell me, (unintelligible) who-is taskforce that is (unintelligible) in the past this constituency to (hook) up particularly on 17.

Man: This (unintelligible) in my recollection of the previous discussions, this is the first time I've seen this myself. And I think it should be highly controversial. Number 17, right?

Man: It is highly controversial, the one recommendation that is highly controversial.

Man: Because basically I think registrars from the years of discussions (with under) the table are very jealous of the data that they handle. And basically this is taking the data out of their hands and putting it somewhere else.

So it doesn't look like something that would go down very easily in a (BI) kind of environment. Mikey wants...

Man: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. One of the interesting things on the IRTTP series of working groups is that the registrars are actually at - for example, (Paul Diaz), when he was at Network Solutions - he's now not, but he was on this working group - changed (player) from Go Daddy in the (unintelligible).

We're actually quite all right with the (who-is), an interesting shift in the position that historically has been quite jealous. And, in fact, both the larger registrars seem to be supportive of the idea of encouraging (unintelligible) to switch over (unintelligible) primarily because of the operational issues that the (unintelligible) present.

And so there is sort of an opportunity right now to move that forward. But the way that I read this one was that this wasn't an either/or choice but we could support both and maybe express a preference. Bu if - and again, I hesitate to speak a whole lot in my very first meeting.

But if (their career) is appealing to you, this is perhaps a chance to move that forward. If you're thinking that you prefer not to have by no means should you do it on my (account).

Man: Well, as your constituency, it's fair to say that (unintelligible) to support the (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I think then that one way to structure the respondents would be to say absolutely we support the (careers) but that we also - if that's unavailable as an option that we also would support the (other one). In a meeting yesterday between who-is RT - I guess it was their public meeting and we put (Keith Drasak) from VeriSign on the spot and said, well, would you support the (careers)?

And I think he started to dance around the issue and didn't come up, you know, so I said, "Well, I have to talk to people." He didn't say but there had

been quite a few conversations especially on IRTP because (Barbara) (unintelligible) from VeriSign - (Barbara Nate) I think.

We'd been talking to her about that a lot in the working group and where is the openness to that in VeriSign. So this is sort of an influx fluid moment that might be in an opportunity to give them a nudge.

Man: It's (unintelligible) that background because I think a number of (unintelligible) elected to go into the governance issue that was (really needed) at the same time. So they decided to track that at that time.

(Tony): I think this is an interesting initiative. Unless you resolve the accuracy or the data, they're just making available, you know, what there is and the centralized database would not be collecting the registrant data. That will be done by whoever signed the domain name.

So we're really back - we haven't achieved an awful lot by doing this except by, let's say, provoking the NCUC to take up arms because it's unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete who-is information which is something they would fight with - tooth and nail.

But getting back to my initial comment, I mean, it's still data doubtful quality which you would be centralizing in a database. It would be nice if you could fix the whole thing.

Man: But don't forget, (Tony), the accuracy issues were tackled further (out) than this. So those things should go together. If it's (simple) in this approach then it makes sense to go in the (unintelligible) which we don't (unintelligible).

Man: Absolutely.

Man: Okay, but you should send me (additional) comments on that. So then getting down towards the bottom, we hit the issue of IDNs. And 18, the ICANN

community should task the working group within six months of publication to finalize in coding modifications through the (data) model and in commercialized services to get double access gather, store and make available registration data and to influence registration data.

And it should report no later than one year from (information). So this is quite a really required step up even in the road certainly with the push for the (economic) GLTD so what's going to be IDNs. It seems this is less than timely but desperately required.

Nineteen - (unintelligible) services should be incorporated and reflected in registrar, registry (requirements) within six months of adoption but the working group's recommendation. Well, yes please, otherwise the whole thing is getting to be worthless.

Twenty - requirements for registration, data accuracy and availability in (local) languages should be finalized and similar efforts, especially in translation or transliteration of data. It's stipulated and (make that) an international registration with data.

So these are the core recommendations and something that isn't on here is the fact that the other call that was made from this report is that there should certainly be a really close scrutiny when the next (unintelligible) reviews in this set up of implementation of these recommendations and that's just something I'd like to specifically suggest that we support when we make our response back on this not just supporting what's listed here.

And I hadn't heard anybody speak against any of the recommendations which doesn't surprise me as we spent so many years talking about noise in this constituency. And indeed, in some of these constituency meetings, that we take that line.

But actually putting something in here that really acts that level of support for the ongoing activity is probably just as important. It's no good (acting) and just publishing recommendations and reports and we find it takes forever to implement without some form of review.

So with your agreement, and what I'd like to do is to take (on board), a remark sort of been made today particularly on recommendation 5 and 17, draft a response. That will go around the ISBCP (explode up), but if you have any issues with it, I need you to come back very promptly so that we can actually get this in by the deadline. (Alan).

(Alan): Yes. I think we can support most of the recommendations or all of the recommendations but we have to think about what is not (here) and that needs to respect to be. Another issue is (I think enough) frustration for me is that all the discrimination we get that to GTLD.

There is a (unintelligible) ccTLDs and a (unintelligible) to (put in the IPDC) area. I (understand the relevancy) of finishing the (conference) but we need to ICANN policies and CTLD in the GTLD space. It's not ICANN policy because this is national policy (unintelligible) and in policy (unintelligible) related to the (unintelligible) policies.

But (unintelligible) that all IP addresses are controlled at the (regional) registries and I've been a bit frustrated that if you (unintelligible) compliment request because in the (unintelligible) review to be (unintelligible) with it addressed by the (unintelligible) team.

So if there is an issue, a very, very good (unintelligible) two days ago that (unintelligible) in the (unintelligible) space. And (is it enough) to say? (He will say) that why the (new team) was (unintelligible) only a (unintelligible) around that (only issues related) to the new GTLD space and going further.

Man: Where is (it in the) current presentation (Alan)? When was it in current...

(Alan): It was yesterday I guess (unintelligible). It was in the...

((Crosstalk))

Man: In (unintelligible) but there was some (unintelligible) of these - (implement of)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Right. That wasn't the work for (unintelligible). That was the addition of his workshop.

Man: (Unintelligible) related to the (regency meeting). It was a workshop we're getting - the (currency) of (agreement in positions).

Man: I think we need to (cancel) here. If we don't, we'll muddy things up too much. So my suggestion would be that we keep our comments on the report that's come out and the recommendations that they made initially. But what we could do is include some reference to take a - I certainly wouldn't want to make a reference against CCs. But we could make a reference to the accuracy of who-is and the comments of who-is related to (might be) addressing.

And the need to study that may be in the following study is perhaps - can we do it that way? So we make the point but we make it as work that still needs to be done rather than the criticism of the...

Man: (Unintelligible) because it's specifically referring already two months ago and it - especially refers to ICANN policies.

Man: Yes. Okay, well, what I'll do (Alan), so I'll suggest that - I'll work on the draft and then we can have a dialogue offline to pick up your point and include it in

the focus for further studies. Okay. Great. We've got (entered) that something that we can actually move forward on so thank you for that. To...

Man: Actually we have not too much time, you know. I think the (deadline is) (unintelligible) next time.

Man: Yes, that's what - I think we had to do it this way.

Man: Yes.

Man: It's going to be done (whilst) we're here. So I'm very aware of that.

Man: Yes, (there's a chance for that). Well, I appreciate it very much if you take over that, you know. And then let's say if there's time enough for you to share that, because...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) it means I've got to cut it out within the next hour or so.

Man: Okay, good, great. Thanks.

Man: Thanks. It's better than you taking me out to dinner tonight.

Man: Clearly you were asking me.

Man: I'm sorry. I should hear someone. One of the real issues of contention certainly -- maybe not to this meeting -- was the Registry Accreditation Agreements. And I believe that it's in discussion of this over the weekend in the GNSO session. So, if I could ask one of you gentlemen to bring us up to date, the information you've got on that situation.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible), thanks.

Man: Just being to the point, the - you remember built in from the last ICANN public meeting this - it is tunneling between GAC and then the GNSO, which you can actually (unintelligible) I can be (unintelligible). In reference to the RAA -- to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement -- and it specifically fit the requirements the GAC strategy with regards to law enforcement items.

So there is - has been a lot - has been done in between. So that - I think that task force of the original - it's (unintelligible) by a religious (unintelligible) - by Reverend Cole and together this GAC, they had the most discussion and they had discussions with law enforcements agencies and the (unintelligible).

So they really put a lot of work to an item and they are - it's status is - they - I think they have some age or I think that was a bit - some people wasn't in already or is it going on, so maybe - I couldn't attend that yesterday. So they just gave us information over the - the status for what is going on there.

So it is - it seems to be also after having had the discussion with the GAC on Sunday and with the Board -- the GNSO -- you know, the costs discussion with the (unintelligible) on the Board and the GAC. So that - both at the time being are - have decide that the status of this work and this underlying work.

However, I think - I feel that we have the ritual to wait for the outcome, for the last outcome of that so that it is out - so contentious items and that it's on the way. So, we personally serve from the ISPs. If we didn't have any, let me say, ICANN schedule to discuss that or if it were contentious from our point of view. And that's - in that respect so, yes, but I'm really open if there is from the community here something to decide to disregard.

(Tony): The issuance of France was that I think the rule around all this time when there was the GAC in their discussion of this particular issue and an

expectation that was given that a lot of the outstanding issues would be resolved. And, as you said, that hasn't actually happened at this particular stage -- certainly not before this meeting.

And (unintelligible) in their meeting today finishes at 4:30. They still have people to participate or certainly observe before a meeting between the GAC and the Board. And I certainly expect this to be on that agenda, to some degree, once again. So the question I've been - that's posed to France now is do we wait and see what the results of that discussion completed or as a constituency are we at the stage where we should be offering any concern to the fact that this ongoing issue, which affects primarily on ICANN at a time when ICANN is, let's say, coming under some amount of pressure to deliver things. Is something we can accept or something we should make some response on?

And it is a highly charged political issue. But I think it's one that we should actually think about -- that it's best to stay silent at this stage or whether, as a constituency that certainly has an interest in the survival of ICANN and ICANN's reputation, we should actually be expressing some concern and urging the owner reservation at these discussions.

Man: Yes, literally, (Tony), so the timeline and the schedule was - it was expected or it was, you know, in the requirements from the Board's eyes -- how the GNSO were to come up, to have this problem solved here at the time of the ICANN meeting here in San Jose. But it came out, so that's behind them. It helped them in their discussions and there must be more discussion on that. And this is understood -- that's came out from the discussions with the Board and with the - and the (unintelligible) -- that it's understood from their side as well.

So, it seems to be that the pressure was good, yes? So - and the - that the stone is holding and it's (unintelligible) at the end it's showed - achieved, you know, its goals as well, you know? But at the time being, I don't think that

from our point of view there should be put more pressure on that, because - so - I personally, I don't have - I wouldn't see a better alternative than I did at the time being.

Man: Can I suggest maybe a way through it for this would be to observe what happens across the rest of this ICANN meeting, including the session that's going to follow between the GAC and the Board. And that we have this on our agenda for our first constituency conference call after this meeting. Because at that stage, then we may have a fuller picture and decide what we're going to do at that stage.

(Tony): Thanks. So going into the GNSO issues, we come to the issue of outreach and there are some conflicting views as to how outreach -- which is certainly required -- is going to be processed from here on in. And this also, you know, it's a link in some ways to the next point on the agenda, which is the report from the COC budget group.

And one of the things that I should probably mention as we get into discussion on outreach is that we have put a submission in for funding from ICANN for constituency support, for some travel requirements, and also covers outreach. And that request takes a similar approach to the other constituencies in the commercial stakeholder group. They usually fit in with the (unintelligible) who will be well aware of what's happened here. And everyone should assume the submission that -- the constituency or the members -- should assume we - the submission - that it was put forward from the INSPC bid.

But I just want to make the point at this stage that we have put in a substantial bid to ICANN to assist the constituency with outreach. And if that should be, it's going to put a number of additional demands on the constituency. One is doing what we said we were going to do, if we get the reserves. And the other is putting in place all the controls required to actually

see that all those actions are fully accountable and we have a method of recording the activities and the cost of those activities that we undertake.

So we have discussed in the past what we need to do as a constituency to improve outreach. And I think that the limited resources that we've had, we haven't done a bad job in the ISP world. But it could certainly be improved. Now, counter to that, there are a number of discussions that are taking place in Council to actually set up a working group through Council to cover outreach as well. And before we go any further, perhaps I could ask one of our counselors to explain where that discussion sits.

Man:

Thank you, (Tony). And I just told the understanding of those who are (unintelligible) close to that discussion, outreach is an item for all communities within ICANN for a longer time. All these groups, they are claiming heavy workload to overcome this and more volunteers or whatever (unintelligible) of doing this workload and so there is some point that it's just to be discussed how to get more people involved in the ICANN community as a whole. And then, specifically, the different constituencies take over this to participate and also to invest - yes, to invest activity in the ICANN.

So that (unintelligible) that and so the GNSO especially, they have some -- two years at least -- of I would say a working group if you know that, to making proposals how to deal with that.

And they came up with a proposal, as (Tony) mentioned, to set up a so-called outreach task force, ATF, to deal with that item and to come up with a strategic approach within the GNSO in contact or in connection to other groups in ICANN, how to deal with outreach and to make recommendations on that.

So, it went that the Council did not - the GNSO Council did not yet accept to do so, because they were posing a different approach coming up which said - - okay, outreach should not be allocated to a over-arching group within the

GNSO, given the right item - all of them that the different constituencies -- stakeholder groups -- should deal with that item by themselves. They even - that was - okay, that we have so different kind of stakeholder groups and in the GNSO, in the commercial side and the non-commercial side, in the registrar - registries and besides. So that's - and working group and overarching working group would maybe not in the position now to balance, let me say, the requirements between the different groups and to understand the requirements and conditions.

So these are the different positions we have. And again, so there is no - nothing came out from the Council. The Council was not in a position there to decide the one or the other. And at the end, they - we had a discussion this weekend on Saturday morning or Saturday afternoon where to - which is discussing potential approach of compromise -- so potential approach.

So they - if there was no compromise on the table and to be discussed, but we would like to find a compromise. And there's a small group set up. It's registered (unintelligible) and it's (unintelligible) the Council and its budget ethics in the Council and there is something else concerning the issues of the (unintelligible), but they're trying to (unintelligible) from BC. And also, want to think about that a compromise might be possible.

So what I - because - my approach in that driving that a little bit is I asked all the participants there to use the contingent today to -- if there's time enough, you know -- to re-open the discussion about what there they are giving -- that there is a potential approach to by themselves to compromise on that item.

So I do hope that our constituencies -- stakeholders -- do their jobs in this gathering to discuss that. I had in mind before that to bring it up at the CSG meeting, but the CSG meeting was over -- but this I (unintelligible) overall I had a task, yes. I was - but I would like to bring it up to CSG again, you know, in order to find - to get some statements from CSG or from the different constituencies what would - that could be done, what should be done.

So if there is - they'd like to find a way to say -- okay, there is a compromise solution or there is none. Or let us - that - they (unintelligible) about and that is why I would like to bring it up. And, especially I am really happy that (Maite) is here, because she's part of the BC discussion as well as in the past. I think so. And it was very contentious, I think. They have a very strong position. Maybe - I'm not sure about the latest - this is the last position they have or not.

So, yes - so I personally - I would like to get some input here from this community about it - which could be the way to do. It could be you could have different opinions about this. I am really open to that. So my personal opinion is that I would like - I think that there is - a lot of work has been done and been put on this working contingency outreach task force. The outcome of this strategy recommendations - the shape of this outreach task force, I would say, is not the optimal one, maybe. Because this could - which they have in mind - is a one - a really one - so they're talking about 40 members from different groups. And I'm (unintelligible) and thinking about strategy -- about outreach -- I - so I don't think that it's manageable. But that is my only concern with that, so I look at personally - do not have anything about any kind of proof dealing with that, if that balancing could see the different stakeholder group -- it settles in it on that group. But it shouldn't be so big as it was designed.

I would like to hear from some of the others whether there is an idea about that or not. Thank you.

(Tony):

Thanks. And just for, you know, for comments on that -- there's another element of this that probably needs to be explained as well. And that is that within the commercial stakeholder group, we had some discussion at the CSG Exec level about outreach. And one of the things that came out of that discussion was a recognition that even with the three constituencies in the

commercial stakeholder group, there are different demands in terms of outreach.

Certainly, the BC have done considerable outreach to the business community, particularly where ICANN meetings take place. And they do that in a specific way. For us, there's only experience. We've actually done outreach in the areas where we've had ICANN meetings, but only facilitate that with dealing with the regional or local business.

And those requirements are not for certain. And, I mean, at that dialogue and also with the IPC -- they wanted to reach out directly to their associations as well. So in that idea of what we need to accomplish, but there isn't a common way of doing it. And the view, in the CSG, quickly came to conclude -- if we have different methods and different requirements, how is that ever going to get addressed by one particular group probably said by a few people which represents a greater representation of the ICANN community?

Man: If I may, (Tony) -- is - well, to understand more clearly in this - in the recommendation of the OGF or its task force dealing with that working team, it is never anticipated that these groups would take over a specific item which are really specific to the different constituencies. They cannot do this. So it shouldn't be a kind of - it should not be a management group who manages outreach, you know, who manages outreach. This is up to the constituency. It's no doubt about that.

They're about to find this travesty, which also incorporates ideas from ICANN level as well, and then there's this (unintelligible) because outreach is done and is just passed on -- all different levels in - that's in ICANN at the time being. And so to some extent, it seemed to be not more understandable why all these different groups have their - on their agenda all the same level of discussion and means about finding a strategy about ICANN or GNSO outreach.

So - and let me - and that's one thing is - they've done nothing about yet. One criticism was again, that was okay, that's your group. You sponsor it really. Use all the budgets. And that - it seems to be that that's about what they did need to be even higher as issued - just count one to the other, so the requirements as a different constituencies.

I would say this is in very early stages - it's a general discussion. If you were able to prove that or to indicate by, let me say, by some examples around this is really what it is about, so then we'll be careful. Because, I think, at the end it will come up again when it comes to the budget discussion here within ICANN. You will see if it's (unintelligible) the ICANN roof. Everybody is asking for the budget allocation for outreach. And then you start to compare, you know, how much this will do, how much that will do.

It's a nice discussion coming down from ICANN staff telling here (unintelligible) so many members you have in (unintelligible), so many members claiming why they shouldn't be. And we will have discussions more and more about that. So I wonder really that's a good - more specified is budget - and it's just this budget issue in this respect to outline -- okay, it is - it may be more in line if it's coming from the budget point of view to allocate it constituency by constituency rather than by allocating a more global - globalized budget.

I don't have any idea, not yet. But it should take it into consideration.

(Tony): Any response on that? Does anyone have a - you mentioned the compromise specifically before it, but currently, as I understand it, there isn't any proposal for a compromise, is there?

Man: No, there is not. That's because there is no specific mandate how to come up with a decision, with a specific compromise. I don't see a compromise, not yet. But there may be sound ways, you know, to - if both sides and - if both sides are willing to go into - dig out a little bit deeper in the concerns the other

side has, yes? So really - so for example, if the (Chemawa) constituency in Oregon (unintelligible) and to look into that and maybe to pick up some items where they cannot do this and rather than - which are more of interest for them, so it would be helpful, rather than to have just two blocks and say -- now, it's just the one way and not the other way.

So that is what they're going to try to find out -- if there's a way. If not, okay, then in the end the Council will come back, because the Council has to answer that question to the Board, about - because it was mandated by - the vote of a GNSO was mandated by the Board . And we have to answer the question -- what are you - how should we do this outreach for the future.

(Tony): A mandate on the GNSO is only really to consider outreach. It didn't have to be in a unified approach, was my understanding.

Man: Yes.

(Tony): And the proposal's that have come through it, certainly from the commercial stakeholder group constituencies, have a look to meet that requirement. It meets it through their own attempts, through their own means. So that's the personal view. I'd welcome other views, certainly, on how we should do this as a constituency in terms of what is best to meet our needs. Anybody else have any input? You don't have to be on that same one.

Because otherwise, if we don't agree with strategy, then all we can do is what - watch what evolves and today the discussions in Council, which appear to be far from providing an answer at the moment. Your understanding, (Mike), at the BC position is that you have a pretty hard line on this. And that hard line is that updates from my discussions at the commercial stakeholder group level, there's a firm view in the BC that they would like to control their outreach themselves. Am I going too far with that or is that a fair...

(Mike): This is (Mike). I have to admit that the outreach issue isn't one that I've tracked at all. But my impression is that there are a couple of leaders in the BC that have a very strong opinion and the rest of us aren't engaged at all in this. I've talked to -- in a different context, serving on the DSSA -- I talked to alleviate governmental bonds. And the ALAC has an interesting conversation going about something they call the ICANN Academy, which they probably should have socialized a little more, because it sort of sounded like it was an ALAC thing. But they really want it to be an ICANN-wide thing and...

(Tony): I'm aware of some of that.

(Mike): Yes, and he sort of collided with some of those strong opinions. And I think that's a missed opportunity, but I'm not really focusing on that and so, in terms of a BC position, I think the way I'd characterize it is there are a couple of people that feel very strongly about that and the rest of us are sort of going, you know, whatever. I was quite surprised actually. I sat through the GNSO meeting on Saturday or Sunday when this topic came up and was quite mystified by the Board position. So I got nothing for you on that, unfortunately.

Man: Thank you, (Mike). It is - that's quite helpful so - because that's my impression as well about this year, you know, so to understand that. Just to give you an idea of what group that could happen on Council. It happen - it could come up that the (unintelligible) motion about the ATF could be reentered, could be, let me say, in a just small (unintelligible) way, as a good year end.

So I recall that when it came up last time, maybe I am (unintelligible) with the - I think (John) was asking for the fellow because of ongoing discussion that - if any - and that is - and on the process in the GNSO then, if it always is accepted. And also the - and the registries or the (unintelligible) and how they track it back. So, I must be - the first one and then it was asked for the second time, the fellow. And then this - the NDSC was again said that there

was - okay, and under certain conditions it was also accepted by the (unintelligible) because it was said that the recommendation of the ATS is something which should be in detail investigated and notifications would come up. That was the understanding, but it didn't. It came up - it came back with fully different approach, yes, diversity - educate. And therefore, it could happen if the (unintelligible) was going to be the (unintelligible) that when we contact the party, it would be accepted. So, that could be, so and then if that is the case then there would be (unintelligible) because, you know, you didn't have not anything achieved because you didn't have (unintelligible) precision (unintelligible). Could not would not be (unintelligible) accepted. So to (unintelligible) as the stakeholders and they wouldn't be any notification of the (unintelligible) approach; which I would be in favor of.

So we should think from that point of view, what to do but we should be prepared for that and if that comes up, it will come up in one of the next conference sessions. Then immediately I think I would suggest that (unintelligible) should be angled toward that position on that; which means okay, in that case we would try to amend the existing recommendation to find (unintelligible) that's from a more (unintelligible).

Man: Well we mentioned (unintelligible) on this, and one of the fears I have is that the request for constituencies or from constituencies for funding in this particular aspect it's one of the elements we put forward or budget on. But it could actually get held back until this is resolved, and that's my fear. I wouldn't want to see that happen.

In terms of the remark you made (Mikey) in ICANN Academy, I think that if that were something of a compromise and again that isn't part of the recommendations that have come out of this ICANN group. But (unintelligible) what was going on there from the MCUC on Academies.

My understanding is that that's targeted towards a set audience of let's say identifying younger leaders for ICANN. That's where that would set in. And I

think that's a great idea. And certainly I think that's something we should support if that could be part of the compromise that would be good. Because that - if the focus was towards Olivier's proposal (unintelligible) ICANN Academy that identifies and nurtures and brings on young leaders, that's a really good thing to happen that we should support as well.

But it doesn't replace the real needs that we have at the constituency levels. So I would suggest what we can do it at this stage then, if we don't have an agreed way forward, is to wait and see what comes out of the budget discussions, the submissions from the constituency. To wait and see what come up at the next council report from that group, and then review any constituents - or any proposal that is going to impact the constituency.

And I would also like to say that if the Academy issue is pushed by the NCUC, we could certainly offer some support for that, because that just seems to make sense.

Man: (Unintelligible) the very last points (unintelligible) is the answer to that question so (unintelligible) so (unintelligible) if we could succeed in getting (unintelligible) for the constituencies, yes, so we (unintelligible) constituencies is that the position that could (unintelligible) okay.

In that case we could think about to agree to an OTF which is budgeted in a different rate, budgeted in a different way, so take into consideration that the budget is allocated to the constituencies but (unintelligible) custom form about the general strategy, not a general strategy doesn't mean will be detailed in that on that level and kind of OTF take - which takes into consideration not only prospect of funding constituency as we are doing here; so that could be ejected whatever way.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) representation on that OTF.

Man: Not yet, so (unintelligible) if it is going to be established (unintelligible).

Man: But we don't have any - sorry we don't have any representation in the group that's looking for a compromise?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) I would like to get that by today.

Man: Okay that's fine (unintelligible).

Man: Just to build on your idea I think that, sort of a hybrid idea that there's coordination and collaboration in the planning and strategy development. Maybe even in developing materials. But even so far as sharing the techniques where the business constituency does it one way and the ISPs doing another. You know, we do it through the local ISP community and these two budget through the local business community.

If we could share strategies at some level above the constituency at the CSG level probably, so we all get more effective in it. But then, have some flexibility so that each constituency can do this their own way and build their own constituency.

You know maybe that's just an element to throw into the conversation, I don't know if it helps or not.

Man: Yes it is helpful, because I think we need to at least have something posted that sums up our approach towards this currently even if it's in the interim position. And that sort of thing would be helpful, because at the moment I think they (unintelligible) discussions. These two guys have been dealing with

another. And we're not back to a (unintelligible). So we should get something on the record.

Okay, now we talked about going - budget issues a little bit, and I mentioned that there's been submission from this constituency to cover outreach in case of trouble and other support activities including secretarial support it's been an issue for us for a long time. And we have a meeting tomorrow; representatives of the CFG are meeting with some of the budget guys to actually discuss what was put forward.

And depending on what's in the ISP (unintelligible) should be aware of what we submitted and obviously we'd need to provide an update when we have that session tomorrow as to where that request stands and whether we look like being successful or whether we need any further discussion or action on that. So that's something to report back on the list after this meeting.

The other work that's gone on in the commercial stakeholder group - budget group has been to look towards the bigger issues of the FY14 budget proposals that have come up from ICANN and strategic plan. I mean it had, I think it's three calls on that altogether, and it's been quite difficult to progress because if you actually take the budget and try and put elements of that against various aspects of the strategic plan, it's not a particularly easy thing to do. You can do it at the top level, but if you try and get below it which is what the aim of that group was then it becomes really quite a difficult exercise to do.

So we decided rather than spend any more time trying to do it together, the chair of that group, Chris Chaplow from the BC; he's in the process of actually splitting up the strategic plan into elements. And those of us in that budget group agreed to take various elements away. And then we're going to pool our knowledge and look at getting some response back from that.

So, it isn't a complete picture at the moment, but it should be by the time we get to Prague that work should be done. And that would then enable those three constituencies to ask much more detailed and compelling questions of the financial team in ICANN than we've been able to understand before. It will also help us make sure that when resources have been allocated we have a full picture of what we can actually come to expect and where there are any weaknesses in the current budget (unintelligible).

So it will become a little bit of a black box over the years as the budgets increase. So, it's not only the commercial stakeholder group that are looking at this there's another team that's working from the CC community and what we agreed with them at the last ICANN meeting is that when we get to the stage when we actually have a good understanding of the budget fit with the strategic plan we will sit down with the guys from the CC team and see where we have common elements of interest for further discussions with ICANN.

Man: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Two things, one of the questions (unintelligible) budget group, I think it (unintelligible) three constituencies (unintelligible)?

Man: It is.

Man: (Unintelligible) and it means if (unintelligible) budget, you know, then you talk about the budget. Does it mean you talk about three dialogues of budget?

Man: I would say this is the budget as posted by ICANN for (unintelligible) and it's set with the strategic plan because it is not easy to understand how these three things relate.

Man: Yes.

Man: And if you actually try and track the funding through as we've done it in that group especially for (unintelligible) and say well what amount of ICANN budget is under pinning that activity. It's really difficult.

Man: Okay. So if that continues, so yesterday we had a GSO we had a meeting to elevate a (unintelligible) and we got information because (unintelligible) two years I think they are in contact. They have a budget group as well and they are...

Man: That's the group I referred to.

Man: ...and they are in contact with ICANN and in details they have really got experience how that works. And it is - really it seems to be a mess on the ICANN side, you know, regarding the organization and the - how they manage (unintelligible) financial issues. And so it can alter this (unintelligible) and nobody knows really so (unintelligible) allocated in this way from one financial point of view.

So it keeps - it gave me a (unintelligible) that we have really to take - to be careful with these customers ICANN or it could out (unintelligible) budget requirements to get lost there because they don't know how to do with it. So I would really ask you if this group (unintelligible) did you have already contacted ICANN did you (unintelligible) have issues with (unintelligible) consideration that there are people they may not know exactly, but they are talking about.

Man: Okay yes, we've had a call with the CFO from ICANN and he is well aware of what we're doing and what he initially tried to do was to help us step through the budget elements against the strat line. But the more detailed that conversation got the more difficult it became because it was trying to link the activities that works in the plan to the budget. The information isn't there.

He did give us answers but if you try and look for the information in terms of what's set out for the budget then do a paper trail, it becomes incredibly difficult. So one of the focuses that Chris Chaplow's put in this is to actually identify those areas and then we can have that following conversation with ICANN and say well, we know you have an answer to this, tell us what it is. And then when we get to FY13 we want to see this information just stated in a different way. So it adds the element of transparency.

And that's a similar approach that's come out of some of the work in C6.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So, we've actually got just under half an hour of our meeting left, and we're down to ALB and there's a big issue under ALB which we need to kick off the discussion on and that's what come up this morning about the structure of ICANN - or future structure of ICANN.

The future structure of (unintelligible) I think is just a small part of that, but I think everybody should be aware that this question is really - was raised in profile by Ray Plzak who suggested that there's going to be some significant impact from introduction of the new top-level domains gTLDs and a number of the constituencies that make up the GNSO, identifying that they have people within those constituencies who have very (unintelligible) interests and certain (unintelligible) focus interests in our parts of the organization.

And it does really go beyond the GNSO so there is heaps of future work to come on that, today when we had the session - CSG session with board and I'd like to open up for comments on how we should look at that.

Even getting as far as identifying what were key issues for us, what the risks are of a constituency, and what potential benefits are would be a starting point. So that I can actually see some activity spinning off on this and we need to be in a position to react to that.

So let's open up and just have an open discussion as to what our views are.
Tony.

Tony: Well probably first of all I would, I don't know what the expression would be (unintelligible) yet the London School of Economics does not undertake the new renovation process. Dealing with them was like talking to aliens; started in New Zealand, I think, remember? And Tony and I were talking to this expert from London School of Economics and I still can't figure out, you know, what we were doing that day.

But aside from that, my personal opinion is I would like to see the ISP constituency perhaps develop some terrain of its own and not be viewed as a, let's say, a defacto ally in all matters with the BC and the IPC. At least in the last couple of years I've had a lot of diversions of things they have been doing. That's just my opinion of course.

Man: Oh, my queue?

Man: Just (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: So I personally - I'm still a little bit - let me say not so confused although, let me say in the expect - (unintelligible) expectations to view the future expectations (unintelligible) that ICANN (unintelligible) because I hear in the discussions, for example, Christina pointed out just this morning, (unintelligible) TLDs and they would have a big impact.

Yes, they have a big impact on the registry side. So we have the other ICANN which you were leaving, (unintelligible) integration ICANN, so this may have an impact as well in the future.

With this, the only question is that impact that it's just impact. (Unintelligible) house for the (unintelligible) housing. And can they (unintelligible) with their existing tools. For example, charters, (unintelligible), whatever they have about membership, about voting and all these things. So it seems to me that two things are of major interest to think about. This is membership and voting about because everybody likes to get entrance and power here in these communities. So, and because (unintelligible) how it in that (unintelligible) of all that.

So I don't feel that we have to expect everything unexpected. Yes? So which means so all the newcomers coming in which we don't know about so, I think there are also groups and the groups are of whatever and they are given this GLDs and all these things about. So it's not mostly unexpected.

And I wonder in the - and you mentioned Tony the (unintelligible) began at a time if I recall that (unintelligible) has already been in the heads of the people to be discussed about so, I wonder whether these items (unintelligible) item has never been taken into consideration. So all the discussion about the improvement process (unintelligible) under gun (unintelligible) the very last four years.

There was one thing; so we have to think about whether - I would compare the (unintelligible) and then we have different apartments in the building, different housing estates, (unintelligible) constituencies and we have (unintelligible) building the question is whether these type of buildings. The type of building for my opinion is designed well also to cope with the future.

Maybe there are some modifications with them in several rooms (unintelligible) and the policy how those rooms are governed. So I wonder whether I'm glad in this in the opinion or (unintelligible) aspects to take into consideration (unintelligible) them.

Membership and voting aspect, only these two in the future so this over to Charles major interest.

Man: I guess one of the things that's appealing to me about being here opposed to being in BC is the clarity and the crispness of the definition for what we are. One of the things that was - that's been very difficult for me in BC is to try and figure out what the BC is. And I think that this is an opportunity to sort of reinforce that clarity, and say, you know. So for example, earlier we talked a little bit about the WHOIS study and we said well what about the accuracy of the WHOIS numbers?

Now that's a perfect example of an ISP issue. That no other constituents would think to raise really, certainly not many that would care about that.

Come on (unintelligible) you're just early. That's all, that's all right. We're the ISPs and you're just a little early. Come on in.

So those of you who don't know her, this is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, queen of ICANN, note the stickers on her lanyard, tri-colored DSSH stickers, a colleague of mine from the BSSA.

Man: Has she come to the (unintelligible)?

Man: She's coming for next...

Woman: I've come for the (unintelligible)...

Man: It's not - she's early. She's early.

Man: Did you think that we would then (unintelligible)?

Man: We'd have to take a vote on that.

Man: Yes, thin ice, we're talking thin ice. So anyway, just to wrap that comment up, you know, I think that this real or talk that's in the air is a huge opportunity for the ISP constituency to comment, clarify, amplify, move ahead, and for those of you who don't know me enough and wonder who the heck I am and what's going on, I'm essentially in the middle of a transition from being a part of in BC to being in the IPC. I will not be in both. (Unintelligible) there are issues with that, I've got to make that clear, it's just that this is the meaning. (Unintelligible) that transition and you know, so in terms of the reorg that would be my thought.

Man: Yes, I agree very much with Mikey and from what I was saying previously I think we have always had a very low profile as a constituency within ICANN. As far as - as in making a lot of noise and splashing everything, but one thing I think is pretty evident to anybody, we're the enablers of the Internet. I mean, if you don't have somebody who gives you connectivity you're not on the Internet.

And the companies and organizations that participate in this constituency provide services invest in bandwidth and different technologies and basically, I don't know, I think we deserve to be a little more recognized, taking up on Mikey's point anyhow.

Man: Well I'll ask for indulgence from the chair since I'm just an ICANN employee and observer here, but I wanted to pick up on Mike's description of how important this group is. Specifically in my little world I, you know, it's - well actually it's important to the ICANN board is (unintelligible) like adoption. And that's something that I don't hear a lot about. And I'm sitting in this room, and I'm not (unintelligible) topic, not that important. But it is a main goal for the ICANN board and a goal for many others, ISOCK is pressing you, everyone else, and boy you know, I would love to be able to just say, go.

Who's got plans in this room to deploy (unintelligible)? If you ask a simple question like that in the simplest - well, in foremost (unintelligible) even simple

like that would be very valuable and I think would raise some of the visibility I think when you're walking in and talking to others inside ICANN, including the CFO.

Man: (Unintelligible) message from (unintelligible) that the other day and that was something that (unintelligible) home to me. And one of the elements of the budget submission that we send to ICANN was that if those budget requests were agreed, but issues like that and omissions for instance, of the potential problems we have with reservation of the new sublevel domains, we would then be in a position to actually go out to the (unintelligible) community and get some answers on that. And certainly engage, and promote that view, it's if you want to use (unintelligible) words...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Or not, I mean you know.

Man: Yes (unintelligible), it's really hard to have that dialogue i.e., with the concerns and a lot of that will be resolved from that and I think some of it floats towards the new structure could actually facilitate that as well. So I really think that's a good point. What Mikey?

Mikey: I have to leave so I just wanted to let you know that I don't hate you, I have to go up to (unintelligible) on DSSA, so thanks a lot for having me, and I'm looking forward to (unintelligible).

Man: In fact thanks for your input, I mean just before you go I was going to make just a quick sort of summary as a starting point because this is an issue that we need to have some more dialogue on, we will be having that on our conference calls. We may even need to set up a smaller team to try and build that.

But what I'd sort of picked up on as the starting point and if anyone has an issue with this, then we'll take it off the list. But the first thing was that the starting point for us is that we need to ensure that we don't have consultants up with the answer from the start; which is what we suffered from before. It's always difficult to unpick when one of those studies has taken off.

The other - the next point (unintelligible) they need to be proactive in this area and start getting our own thoughts together. We need to ensure there's a place for ISP-specific knowledge and a place where ISP issues are specifically addressed and that relates to the last point.

In terms of voting the representation in voting is an issue and always will be but it's not the starting point. We shouldn't be thinking about voting when we're thinking about a structure, let's talk about structure and then think about the voting after that.

I'm certainly not in favor of ignoring it and in the past (unintelligible) we were told by some of the people who (unintelligible) don't know about voting at all, and that came back to bite us. So we don't want to discard that in any way, but not have it as the number one point. And it's best at this stage we're not wedded to any structure at all; and are open to considering what is going to be the best moving forward.

And the other final point aside from that list and this comes from some of the discussions other people have been involved in around this table. What one - and we wouldn't want to see is the ISPs be put in a position where they purely become advisory. So we want to be in a position where we're an active part of the community, not just an advising role.

(Unintelligible) those points as a starting point, then I think we're in a position to start having further discussion on this. So this is another item that should go on our list for the next call.

(Unintelligible) Charles is going throw us out soon. Dates for the next call, I'd like to propose it's either Wednesday the 11th, or Wednesday the 18th of April. So if we could do quick calendar checks on that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: No, no, no.

Woman: It will be but (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: We're the ISP constituency, are you an ISP? Do you want to be an ISP?

Woman: No, I don't want to. (Unintelligible), I think you are not this person.

Man: They're following, ten minutes time, so just stay here for ten minutes.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Yes. Okay so at this stage, no discussion over that, let's go for the 11th.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And the time we've traditionally had has been; it's 3 - 1500 GMT.

Man: What day is the 11th?

Man: It's a Wednesday.

Man: What time?

Man: Fifteen hundred GMT. So that's like (unintelligible).

Man: GMT (unintelligible).

Man: GMT is UTC?

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) of it.

Man: He's bad.

Man: He started it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) always says it as UTC.

Man: Then it's UTC.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay thanks. And thank you for your participation, and I'll look forward to talking to the members on the next call. Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

END