
CR – SO / AC Chair Reports
Friday, March 16, 2012 – 08:45 to 10:15
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you'd take your seats, we'll be ready to begin our reports, SO/AC chair reports. Please take your seats so we can begin.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much for reassembling. We are starting.

In consideration of schedule conflicts, we're going to start with the GNSO report, Stephane Van Gelder. And Rob Hoggarth is going to manage the interactions.

Oh, my goodness. You've redone the slide already. I'm impressed.

So let's get started.

Stephane?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Steve. Appreciate your entertaining that conflict. Thank you very much.

Welcome. Hello. Good morning.

I have a very short report that I want to give you on the GNSO's Costa Rica working week, so let me work this thing.

Just to give you a quick focus on the work that we did over the weekend with a number of sessions -- I'll let you read through the slides -- a number of sessions on the weekend.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I just wanted to give you a heads-up that we have attempted to refocus the GNSO weekend sessions towards more work on actual GNSO issues rather than just updates from GNSO working groups and drafting teams.

So what we're trying to do is to make sure that the council is more involved in actually working through its own issues, problems that it has on its plate, and making sure those sessions are real work sessions.

We work on the agenda about two or three -- say two months in advance. It takes a lot of effort.

The GNSO vice chairs, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen and Jeff Neuman, are extremely involved in that process, and we have a GNSO Council Leadership Team that provides great help in making sure that our weekend agenda is as effective as it can be for the GNSO community.

So we had our open council meeting on Wednesday.

During that meeting, four motions were considered. Three of the motions that we considered were approved.

One is to launch a PDP on thick WHOIS, but there is a consideration of time and of the GNSO's work schedule in that launch, so we are not committing to doing so now.

We are always mindful, when we take on new projects, of the GNSO's workload, and we are looking at that more and more carefully as we progress.

So when we come to a new issue now, we take great care to look at whether we are able to deal with that issue immediately or not, or if the

issue requires some urgency, what other issue we can put on the back burner if we need to in order to be able to tackle the work.

We also approved a charter for locking a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings, and we have a group that's been working on cross-community working groups in order to try and ascertain what the GNSO's basic position might be with regards to those groups.

We've been involved in some of them in the past and we found we needed -- or we wanted, at any rate, a framework for how to be -- how to get the GNSO Council involved in those groups. So we had a group working on that.

There are recommendations from that group that I, as GNSO Council chair, sent to the chairs of the other SOs and ACs yesterday for consideration.

This is a GNSO initiative to try and share our own conclusions and see if there are some -- if there is some common ground or if there are some conversations that we may have with the other groups in order to try and determine a common position, if there is one.

You have there a list of the ongoing projects that we have.

As you know, the GNSO is involved in several policy development and other types of projects. I will go through them extremely quickly.

We're working on -- we have ongoing work on WHOIS. We discussed that at length at the GNSO. That is ongoing at the moment.

I just mentioned the drafting team on cross-community working groups.

We have a working group on competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, which is currently in a comment period as a result of the definitions established by the working group.

We have an outreach task force drafting team that is currently discussing those aspects.

The IRTP is the inter-registrar transfer policy. It's a five-part policy development process or PDP. Work has started on the third part, Part C.

We have a drafting team on fake renewal notices, with a final report there.

We spent a lot of time in recent weeks working on the issue of Red Cross and Olympic Committee names and had some extremely fruitful collaboration with the GAC on this.

I wanted to highlight that. A recurring theme throughout our discussions this week has been how pleased and -- yeah, how pleased the GNSO's been that there's been such collaboration with the GAC on this issue.

The issue itself is complex and the GNSO was unable to come to a vote on it on Wednesday, but we have scheduled an emergency meeting in the next few days to look at this motion on the protection of these names.

The motion -- there was a request for deferral of the motion at our Wednesday meeting, so we will be considering it very soon.

And we are also working on the RAA, with an issue report that was presented by staff prior to -- just a few days before the Costa Rica meeting.

With that, I will conclude my presentation with some thanks, first of all, to the hosts and the meeting planning team.

I want to convey a particular thanks to both the hosts and the authorities of the country that we are in. This is a message from the GNSO Council as a whole.

Some of our members had a few problems in the -- when they got here, and these were treated with extreme efficiency, with great care, and there was a strong desire for me to express thanks to both the local hosts and the local community in this regard.

So those thanks are strongly felt.

And I also want to extend my personal thanks to the GNSO Council support staff.

They are under a lot of pressure and they are put under a lot of pressure by us. We have some outstanding staff. I won't mention them by name. They are David Olive's team, Glen de Saint Gery as secretary. They are simply outstanding. We couldn't do anything without them, so I also wanted to thank them.

Thank you very much. That's my report.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

And Stephane, I know that you have to be elsewhere, so if you have to just walk out, any interactions?

Anything in the public? Yes, Judith.

JUDITH VAZQUEZ: Stephane, I meant to do this yesterday and to put it in the transcript. There is a recommendation that in the ICANN.org Web site, that a page be created on what's hot and what's not. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Judith.

I hope you're not disappointed.

[Laughter]

Don't feel unloved.

[Laughter]

We move on to ALAC.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and I'll pass this report over to you in order to try and save a couple of seconds.

So I'm going to try and make this as brief as possible. Steve told me I had two minutes. I'll see if I can do it in slightly less than that.

Quickly, the At-Large organizational diagram. Quite a straightforward structure, although I'm still a little baffled that some people are confused between At-Large and ALAC.

ALAC is the At-Large Advisory Committee. It's the committee of 15 people that sits together and discusses matters.

At-Large is the wider community made up of the At-Large structures and the regional At-Large organizations.

So that diagram is something you will see every single time we'll make a report because I think it's really helpful.

Okay. Moving on swiftly, we had 33 At-Large meetings at this meeting. Yes, 33! Which is pretty insane, may I say, because our staff had to sometimes run two meetings in parallel, our volunteers were split among the meetings, and there was virtually absolutely no time to think.

LACRALO Costa Rica events took place. We had the LACRALO capacity-building program, a LACRALO showcase, a LACRALO General Assembly, and two LACRALO working sessions, and all of these were actually organized within one month of this whole meeting taking place.

So it's been an absolute roller coaster ride for them, and really a round of applause for that.

[Applause]

We've had three cross-constituency meetings, and one of them was with the ASO and I have to thank Ray for having made this possible. It's been really, really helpful, and certainly collaboration between the RIRs and the RALOs is something that is forthcoming.

A few highlights.

Between the 42nd and 43rd meeting, we had some policy development statements that came out. 14 of them. Three communications. Just letters to various -- various processes. We had, of course, activities in other constituency working groups.

The CCI, which is the -- the customer -- what is --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

Consumer trust and --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

Yeah, competition, et cetera. The whole -- you know which one it is.

So there's one which was the consumer trust. There was one which was the DSSA, which is the DNSSEC security and stability analysis, and I just have so many of these acronyms in my head. They took place and there's been a lot of progress on that.

There's a continued increase in the number of at-large structures that we've had. We've reached 144. It's not enough. We still haven't reached the aim of having at least one per country in the world. So that still needs to -- to move on.

And then in parallel to all of this, just as if we didn't have enough work, we've also had the improvements project which needed to be completed and we're reaching that stage. We're still a short distance away from it.

A task force held a workshop here and they worked on the next steps.

Most of the work has now been completed. The remaining work has been punted over to working groups which have been created, and in fact, one important thing is, in order to work smarter and not harder, we've managed to slice up some of our membership into working groups so they can all work in parallel, which might be the reason why then we ended up with 33 meetings here.

Anyway, the whole meeting can be downloaded over from the Web site, and I expect all of the board to download it and to read it.

It's quite a few pages --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

It's quite a few pages in the report, so take it on a flight and read it back.

I'd like to thank -- absolutely thank our staff for having done an incredible job at this meeting. That's of course Heidi, Sylvia, Matt, Gisella, and Natalie. Really, really incredible.

[Applause]

And finally I'd like to thank also all of the LACRALO ALSs for having come over here and spent the whole week. They've benefitted an incredible amount. I've only had positive feedback about all of the community --

all of the building of the community and especially getting people to understand that ICANN is a very special animal. You cannot describe it on paper. You have to experience it to know what it's like.

Thanks very much.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much.

We next have the ASO report. Louie, take it away.

LOUIE LEE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'll be the one to deliver the ASO report today, because the topics I'm covering fall primarily within the defined responsibilities of the address council within the ASO.

In the interest of keeping my report tight and terse, I will dispense with the usual introductory information about the ASO structure, the status of IP address allocation and other material that is covered in the ASO workshop held this week.

I will focus mainly on this week's activities, ASO review report, the policies under development, and public comments that folks can engage in.

This week, the ASO and ASO AC held meetings with the ICANN board and the GAC for updates and exchange of ideas. We also attended an

ALAC meeting to introduce ourselves and invite the RALOs to our regional Internet registry meetings. Thank you very much, Ray, for facilitating that interaction.

As we have done so for over a year now, we have been holding our workshops on Wednesday afternoons.

We enjoyed attendance and participation by about 15 to 20 newcomers to our workshop this week.

We are in the midst of our process to appoint an individual for seat 9 of the ICANN board.

We have four candidates for the seat 9 of ICANN board: Thomas Eric Brunner-Williams, Martin Levy, Bill Manning, and Ray Plzak. We are welcoming comments either publicly or privately for these candidates and you will find a link to post your public comment on our Web site, aso.icann.org.

The ASO review report was published this week on our Web site, aso.icann.org. You will also find on our Web site a link to the ICANN public comment process, where we are welcoming comments from everyone on this report.

The NRO/ASO will reply during the comment reply period.

Several years ago, the IP addressing community recognized a need for a global policy to provide IANA a mechanism to receive recovered IPv4 addresses and redistribute them to the RIRs for use by the global Internet community.

The third version of a policy proposal to address this issue does so by establishing a recovered IPv4 pool for all addresses -- all address blocks that are returned by any mechanism, and then reallocating these addresses evenly across all the regions on a regular basis.

The global IP addressing community has finally reached consensus on this latest version of the global policy proposal.

We notified the ICANN board as such this week, which kicked off a 60-day clock where the board may either accept the policy proposal, reject it, request changes, or take no action.

If the board takes no action, then by previous agreement, the policy proposal will automatically be ratified.

ICANN has opened a 21-day comment period which will close on April 4th. There's a link to it on the ICANN homepage, and the link on the ASO Web site will be available soon.

There are a total of 17 policy proposals under discussion around the world today covering a range of topics from technical matters to governance issues such as IPv4 address transfers and WHOIS.

For today, I will just briefly cover the policy proposals that are currently under discussion.

For proposals that were adopted or abandoned since our last ICANN meeting, please refer to our presentation material from our Wednesday workshop.

All three policy proposals in the Asia-Pacific region relate to IPv6 reservation and allocation.

It is a little early in the PDP cycle right now in the African region to have any new policies to be officially proposed.

Of the six policy proposals under discussion in the ARIN region, I wanted to highlight the three that relate to IPv4 addresses.

Two of them will govern how IP addresses can be transferred between registrants, and a third proposal will modify the requirements for requesting more IPv4 addresses.

Three of the five policy proposals under discussion in the Latin American region would be of interest to the ICANN community. Two relate to how IPv4 addresses are allocated and one relates to expanding the information captured in the region's WHOIS database.

And similar to the Latin American region, the RIPE region in Europe also has two policy proposals on IP addresses and one for its WHOIS database.

I will again note that the IP addressing community welcomes input from everyone for both regional policy proposals and global policy proposals. Unless you live isolated in international waters or off-planet, regional policies affect you just as global policies do.

We already enjoy participation from some government representatives, law enforcement, civil societies, operators, and end users. Our invitation to RALOs at the ALAC meeting this week was received enthusiastically.

We continue to extend the same invitation to everyone else. We are not -- you are not even bound by your residency in one region to participate in another region.

And if you cannot participate at open meetings either onsite or via remote participation or even be on the open mailing lists, there are other e-learning opportunities such as Webinars and online learning modules. And if that's not enough, staff from regional Internet registries can send training materials and even come on-site to provide workshops and seminars or collaborate in whatever training events you have organized.

The NRO continues to do outreach with international organizations such as ITU, OECD, APEC, CITELE, and CANTO.

Finally, a new umbrella alliance will launch in about two weeks. The seed alliance is being created to develop innovation and social development.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Hello. Take it away.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And, yes, I am having business cards with that written on it made.

Louie, thank you. And I just wanted to not so much ask a question but ensure for the record that this moment is marked. The opportunity for ICANN with bringing in the RALOs are 144, and growing, number of ALSs into ASO processes. The strengthening of the multistakeholder model, this is actually a landmark event in my view.

And I wanted to thank you and Olivier and Ray for making this happen. But, wow, now it's going to happen. Just what goes next is very, very exciting. I want everyone to realize, this is not just a one line in a couple of reports. This is actually a pivot point and a very, very dynamic and very important one right now in the Internet ecosystem. It is really a huge strengthening of ICANN's rightful place. Thank you.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Any other comments? From the net? No. Thank you.

We move onto the ccNSO report. Oh, I'm sorry. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Steve. It is Olivier for the transcript. Just in the face of the perceived or possible threat that this organization might face soon, I think this is something which everyone should do. We have to join up forces, and I'm extremely pleased that we've managed to join forces. And we are well on our way to join forces with the ASO. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Okay. Did I miss anybody left to right? Good.

Okay. ccNSO report, Lesley Cowley.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Steve. Good morning, everyone. I have some highlights from the ccNSO meeting. Firstly, the finance working group who have conducted a survey to gather insights to better understand existing ccTLD contributions to ICANN and also to address which future contribution models may be acceptable.

After an initial analysis, the preliminary findings were presented to the community this week, in addition the ICANN board of directors and the GAC.

And the three initial findings of the finance working group are that, firstly, the cc's that use the least amount of ICANN services make the largest financial contributions.

Secondly, the financial contributions are independent of any formal arrangements. There is no correlation between the financial contribution of a ccTLD and any formal agreement between ICANN and that ccTLD.

And, thirdly, the ccTLD financial contribution -- (poor audio) -- which were disclosed by ICANN we feel are materially less than the actual financial contributions made by the ccTLD community. And, actually, the working group will present a full report to the community in due course.

Next, the FOI final report on consent. The Framework of Interpretation Working Group has submitted its first set of recommendations after a series of five. The final report on obtaining and documenting consent of an incumbent manager for delegation and redelegation requests was presented to both the ccNSO and the GAC to seek their endorsement for the guidelines in the report.

The final report was presented to the community this week, unanimously supported the recommendations. And following this, the ccNSO Council endorsed those recommendations and thanked very much the working group for their hard work and progress to date. We await the next chapters.

Next, volunteer capacity. The council and the chairs of the ccNSO working groups reviewed, updated, and agreed on the ccNSO workplan for 2012 to 2014. It is a big work plan.

We noted that the ccNSO is at full capacity of its volunteers. Therefore, we need to find ways to better balance our anticipated workload and capacity, for example, by prioritization of work or by engaging more volunteers. And we have set up an informal study group to advise the council by Prague on further steps to address that issue.

Next, chair and vice chair election. At this meeting, the ccNSO Council appointed myself from dot uk as chair and Byron Holland from dot ca and Keith Davidson from dot nz as our vice chairs.

Lastly, a welcome and some thank yous. The ccNSO Council welcomes Margarita Valdes from dot cl as our newest member, and thanks Hiro Hotta from dot jp for his service as vice chair of the ccNSO over the last

year. We especially thank Patricio Poblete from dot cl, ccNSO Councillor for the Latin American and Caribbean region from 2004 to 2012, for his outstanding work in the ccNSO. And, finally, the council on behalf of the community thank our wonderful ccNSO secretariat, their hard work and also the host of the San Jose, Costa Rica meeting, nic.cr, the manager for dot cr, for hosting our meetings and their very warm and welcoming hospitality. Thank you.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much, Lesley. When we finish this round, I will make a comment about the general structure of the SOs and ACs.

Any interaction, comments, questions?

Excellent. Thank you very much. We move on to the report from the GAC, Heather Dryden.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Good morning, everyone. First of all, like my other colleagues, I would like to thank ICANN for all the support to this meeting that allowed the GAC to work and produce the communique that I'm about to read to you this morning.

The Governmental Advisory Committee at ICANN met in San Jose, Costa Rica, during the week of March 10-16, 2012. 47 GAC members attended the meetings and three observers. The GAC expresses warm thanks to the local host NIC Costa Rica, National Academy Of sciences, for their support.

In terms of capacity-building, the GAC held the capacity-building session in which new members and guests were able to receive information and updates on the role of the GAC at ICANN as well as learn about various work streams and topics currently being discussed within the GAC.

As a result of recent outreach efforts, the GAC has four new members: Turkmenistan, Samoa, Paraguay and Nauru. During this meeting, Ecuador, Bolivia and REGULATEL attended as guests.

The GAC considered and accepted the request of the World Trade Organization to become an observer of the GAC.

The GAC continues to increase outreach to the regions in advance of meetings as well as utilizing increased travel funding and simultaneous interpretation during GAC sessions at ICANN meetings.

The GAC continues to build on this and will continue to work toward receiving simultaneous interpretation as well as document translation in all U.N. six languages and Portuguese this year.

Regarding new generic top-level domains, a series of questions were posed to the ICANN board by the GAC regarding each of these topics in Costa Rica. In addition to the exchange with the board, the GAC looks forward to written answers to the questions that were posed which have been annexed to the communique.

Regarding defensive registrations -- and by this the GAC means "defensive applications" -- the GAC looks forward to the end of the public comment period and the subsequent summary and analysis of the comments received as well as the final decision from the ICANN board on how to handle defensive applications.

Regarding the International Olympic Committee, Red Cross and Red Crescent, the GAC advises that the IOC, Red Cross, and Red Crescent names should be protected without delay at the top level so that these protections can be applied as part of the first round of new gTLD applications.

The GAC and the GNSO held a focused exchange on the efforts by members of the GNSO community to develop proposals to protect the IOC, Red Cross and Red Crescent names at the top and second levels. The GNSO drafting team provided an overview of its proposals to ensure effective protection is available at the top level, which the GAC concurred with.

If approved by the GNSO Council, these proposals will be forwarded to the ICANN board. In that event, the GAC urges the board to act expeditiously on these proposals to ensure that the IOC, Red Cross and Red Crescent names will benefit from full protection at the top level.

During the exchange, the GAC confirmed the rationale for its consensus proposal to protect, IOC, Red Cross and Red Crescent names. As this rationale is not outlined in the applicant guidebook, the GAC notes the need for clarification of the underlying criteria.

Regarding intergovernmental organizations, the GAC welcomes the request from the board for policy advice in relation to new gTLDs and the potential additional protection for intergovernmental organizations. The GAC will consider this and respond at the earliest opportunity.

Regarding root zone scaling, the GAC had requested to receive a report on root zone scaling before the launch of the new gTLD application

window. The GAC expresses its concerns for not having received such a report -- (poor audio) -- as of today. Furthermore, the GAC expects the board to promptly furnish this report to GAC members.

This report should include all supporting data used to develop the conclusions of the report as well as the description of the monitoring mechanisms that would be used to identify potential problems in the future.

Regarding batching and early warning, the GAC looks forward to receiving from ICANN the final decision on how it intends to handle batching should it be necessary once the application window closes.

The GAC raised concerns that a set of criteria or a process for batching has not yet been decided on. With regard to the batching process and GAC early warning, the GAC appreciates the board's consideration that should batching be necessary, early warnings could also occur in batches. However, with no formal process or criteria for batching, it is still unclear to the GAC how batching will affect the early warning process and its feasibility.

Though, the applicant's due diligence reports will not be happen, the GAC expects if an applicant does not meet the criteria or the report is not satisfactory, the application will not be allowed to proceed.

Regarding applicant support, the GAC welcomes the Joint Applicant Support Working Group's efforts and appreciates the call for expression of interest for the applicant -- support applicant review panel. However, the GAC wishes to point out a few areas that need additional consideration.

Plans for a charitable foundation should be in place before the end of the application process to carry out additional fund-raising functions and to enable needy applicants to make use of the support provided. The GAC received an update from the board about ongoing communication strategies regarding support for needy applicants and information about how the funds will be managed throughout this process.

The GAC and ALAC also discussed applicant support, and the GAC is concerned about whether the publicity surrounding the applicant support program has been effective and reached those who need it.

Regarding the second round of new gTLD applications, the GAC requests from the board an update on the current plans for second round of new gTLD applications, including a request for timeline for receiving the work plan as well as what might be covered in such a work plan. The GAC looks forward to the board developing this plan and working with the community in order to ensure that an evaluation of the first round is adequately conducted and achieves positive results before any subsequent application rounds would move forward.

Regarding the trademark clearinghouse, the GAC noted the staff proposals for communicating awareness amongst rights holders of their need to populate the database. The GAC looks forward to the ICANN report, expect it to be published at the end of March regarding the operation of the trademark clearinghouse.

Regarding applicant guidebook text on sensitive and controversial strings, the GAC offered in its Dakar communique three types of

language that would be used for GAC advice in regard to new gTLD applications. And this text was published in the applicant guidebook.

During the exchange with the board, the GAC sought clarification of the additional language that was inserted by staff in the last version of the applicant guidebook without notification to the GAC. The GAC expects that the added language will be deleted.

Regarding GAC law enforcement agency recommendations, WHOIS and contract compliance, in its meetings with the At-Large Advisory Committee, the GNSO, the WHOIS review team and the board, the GAC discussed an range of overlapping issues relating to ICANN's contractual compliance and governance structures.

The GAC notes that there are two components to an effective compliance system: Clear and enforceable contracts and effective and proactive enforcement.

In terms of contracts, the GAC stressed the critical importance of implementing the GAC LEA recommendations for improvements to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and confirms its interest and availability to assist with the effort to conclude the negotiations for RAA amendments as soon as possible.

The GAC encourages the board to consider the RAA amendments in conjunction with the recommendations of the WHOIS review team. The GAC broadly supports the WHOIS review team's draft recommendations and will closely monitor the board's response and subsequent implementation activities.

In terms of compliance, the GAC requests an update on the status of the law enforcement recommendations that relate to due diligence activities by ICANN.

More broadly, the GAC emphasizes the need to ensure that ICANN's compliance activities are based on best practice principles and have a clear and appropriate lines of reporting and accountability, that they can be pursued proactively and independently of other interests and are given appropriate priority with independent and expert oversight.

To better inform future discussions on these issues, the GAC requests briefing from the board at the Prague meeting on the structure and contractual arrangements in the domain registration industry and on ICANN's role as an industry self-regulatory organization.

The GAC noted that a common factor between these issues is whether ICANN adequately oversees, manages and enforces the obligations contained in its contracts with contracted parties.

The GAC agreed to provide some examples of how organizations with similar self-regulatory responsibilities have separated their regulatory and operational responsibilities. The GAC believes an effective compliance machine will benefit all users of the DNS.

Regarding the board-GAC Accountability and Transparency Review Team recommendation implementation working group, the GAC and the board agreed on the definition of "GAC advice" which is posted on the GAC Web site. The board and the GAC agreed in principle on the proposed approach developed by the working group and staff for the GAC Advice Online Register. (poor audio) -- details of implementing the

process. For example, confirming how to confirm the contents of the register remain to be addressed.

In relation to Recommendation 12, the GAC believes that further analysis must be undertaken regarding the different work methods of the GAC and the SOs engaged in policy development as a first step.

As such, the GAC requests the board consult with the GAC prior to proposing joint work between the GAC and SOs, pending the results of this analysis.

With respect to the ATRT Recommendation 14, the GAC agreed that convening a high-level governmental meeting is one means of raising government support and commitment to the GAC process. Accordingly, the GAC will continue to work toward the possibility of holding such a meeting during the next ICANN meeting in Prague.

In addition, the BGRI working group presented proposed milestones for implementing the ATRT Recommendations 9 to 14 and would welcome comments on the proposed milestones by March 31st.

Regarding ethics and conflicts of interest, the reform of ICANN's ethics and conflicts of interest policy remains an issue of critical importance for ICANN, the GAC, and community relevant stakeholders. The GAC, therefore, acknowledges the recent announcement of progress made in this area.

At the same time recognizing the complexity of the matter, the GAC notes the delay in delivering an updated policy which the board had planned to adopt during the Costa Rica meeting. The board indicated that this work would be completed by Prague and the GAC looks

forward to future public posting of commissioned reports on the topic. The GAC will continue to monitor progress closely.

During the week, we met with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization. The GAC had a very useful discussion with the ccNSO Council. The GAC received with interest an interim report of the ccNSO finance working group on actual contributions to ICANN and looks forward to the publication of the final report.

The GAC also received an update on progress of the study group of use of names for countries and territories. The GAC agreed in principle to the report on consent provided by the framework of interpretation working group, noting that final approval depended on oversight and review of all chapters of the final report of the working group.

We also met with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. So the GAC held yet another informative and valuable meeting with the SSAC that focused on an update on the SSAC's recent activities. The update included the SSAC report on the delegation of single-character internationalized top-level domains and a second SSAC report on on dotless domains. The SSAC chair also informed the GAC about their ongoing work concerning deeper views on the issue on DNS blocking.

The SSAC chair described a report that proposes -- (poor audio) -- a uniform WHOIS taxonomy and a structure including a roadmap that is currently available for public comment.

The chair further described the advanced analysis concerning the impact of new gTLDs on the stability of root zone file management with new gTLDs. In the discussion after the information provided by the

SSAC, the GAC informed the SSAC that it is still very interested to hear more about the potential harms of blocking at the top level, I.P. addresses and also WHOIS-related issues.

The GAC expresses its gratitude for the work of the SSAC and showed a high interest in further dialogue with the SSAC.

Meeting with the ASO, the GAC thanks the ASO for the productive meeting regarding the ASO review status and for providing an update to the GAC on IPv4 depletion and IPv6 adoption.

Regarding the GAC secretariat, the GAC discussed roles and responsibilities of the secretariat and has agreed to form a task force to look at improvements to the existing model and appropriate governance arrangements with a view to taking a decision at the next GAC meeting to ensure that the GAC is adequately resourced to meet the challenges which will be imposed by the demanding schedule for processing new gTLD applications as well as its other activities.

The GAC warmly thanks the GNSO, the WHOIS review team, the ALAC, the SSAC, the ccNSO, the ASO, and the ICANN board as well as those among the ICANN community who have contributed to the dialogue with the GAC this week in San Jose.

The GAC will meet during the period of the 44th ICANN meeting in Prague, Czech Republic. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you for that very complete report, Heather. And the breadth of the issues that you are working on makes it clear that the GAC is working extremely hard.

Andrea Glorioso.

ANDREA GLORIOSO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Andrea Glorioso speaking on behalf of the European Commission. I have the impression that there might be an error in the transcription concerning ethics and conflicts of interest. "The GAC looks forward to the publication of commissioned reports," so the reports that ICANN has commissioned to other consultants. The GAC is not looking forward to reports of Commission, to the publication of commissioned reports, not reports of the Commission. Just to be absolutely clear.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm not sure I completely understand the question.

ANDREA GLORIOSO: In the transcript, at a certain point I think I saw that the GAC was looking for to the publication of "commission" reports. The GAC is looking for publication of the publication of reports that have been commissioned by ICANN to other organizations, not to the publication of reports of the Commission. Just to avoid any misunderstanding.

STEVE CROCKER: Now I understand. Thank you for adding that to the record.

Any other comments? Thank you. We move on to the report from the Root Server Advisory Committee, Suzanne Woolf.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And as usual, by the end of an ICANN meeting, I'm losing my voice. And as I think we all know, everyone here knows, RSSAC is composed of DNS root server operators and interested others and exists to provide advice to the community in issues involving operation of the DNS root in particular and infrastructure of the DNS more generally.

When I was putting together my update for this morning, I realized that there are a number of issues outstanding, a number of items on RSSAC's plate that should see some decisions and some advice offered in the near future. It will be easier to talk about them once the milestones have been reached.

For example, I expect us to provide some feedback on the SSR review that just came out when there has been a chance for people to read that. But for today, I'm going to limit the agenda time I take and commit to a more formal and comprehensive update when appropriate.

However, several members of RSSAC have been here in Costa Rica and my colleagues have been working very hard, largely under the radar, to make contributions of some of the efforts this week. So I wanted to highlight that.

RSSAC members this week have been participating in SSAC activities, the DNS risk management framework working group workshop, the variant IDNs projects and workshop, the DSSA working group, the

Security and Stability AoC review team, board activities, myself as liaison, and DNSSEC workshops and a whole bunch of discussions, open and closed, on network security, technical aspects of root scaling for new gTLDs, IDN deployment, and a number of related technical topics.

Also, need to note for the record, that I am under the conflict of interest rules of the board conflicted in regards to new gTLD matters. The source of that conflict is my employment with the company that offers registry services. So I have not participated in closed discussions on new gTLD issues in my capacity with RSSAC.

I have, however, participated in public this week as a member of the community. And I have been pleased that my colleagues were also able to do so.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much.

And the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, Patrik. Oh, you want the controls?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. SSAC had this week, as normal, had a number of internal meetings in the ongoing work parties that we currently are running, looking at rolling the key of the root zone for DNSSEC, further studies on DNS blocking use and domain names, and also the membership committee.

We have had public meeting briefings on the work plan for 2012 and the documents that we have published recently.

We have also had meetings with ICANN board of directors, the ASO, even though it was not mentioned in the ASO report --

[Laughter]

-- GNSO Council, ccNSO and GAC. We also had a very good meeting with law enforcement agency representatives. And I can report back that we will probably see more formal connection between SSAC and the law enforcement representatives. So, hopefully, we will actually have a good contact there between them and ICANN.

We also participated in the DSSA working group meetings and also had a normal sessions on Wednesday regarding workshop for beginners which we would once again like to thank Steve for having had the time to help put together.

I also would like to thank the ICANN staff had a has been helping us, and also mention this week, Wednesday this week, it was ten years since the ICANN Board made a decision to create SSAC. So we survived.

Thank you.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you.

I'm quite moved as I focus attention on each of the chairs. We have a stellar cadre of seasoned, dedicated, energetic and quite effective

managers and chairs of each of our committees. And I think this is -- it is not a matter of comparing them to prior chairs exactly, but it is an element of the maturation of ICANN as a complex and distributed organization.

One of the things that I became aware of as I was chairing SSAC was the need to interact with the budget cycle and get involved. And that supposed the issue of how do you have coordinated management when you have a mixture of professional staff that is, in most ways, similar to a regular corporation and, in addition, this complicated set of volunteers that are operating sort of in a surrounding ring, and sometimes it looks like the staff is under attack from all of these organizations that are around.

A lot of challenges, but an extreme amount of talent, and an extraordinary amount of responsibility that each of the chairs and, of course, all of the other people who work in those groups actually take on, take on willingly, take on without compensation, and do so out of sense of dedication. And what I wanted to take particular note here, and the reason why I am interceding, is that in addition to the dedication that brings us all together, I wanted to note the extreme level of competence that they also bring to this.

So I think we are all very fortunate.

I would like to ask for a round of applause for the chairs of the SOs and ACs.

[Applause]

Now we have two more reports, and I don't mean to slight either of the people, but they operate in a smaller arena, in a sense.

The office of the ombudsman, Chris LaHatte.

Chris, just stand by. We are getting it loaded for you; okay?

Thank you.

CHRIS LaHATTE:

Thank you, chairman.

I'll start off in a traditional way by greeting you in the indigenous language of New Zealand, where I come from.

(Speaking in Maori)

Greetings from the ombudsman.

In New Zealand we celebrate cultural diversity, and, therefore, although I'm what you would call (saying term in Maori) and not of Maori descent, we regard it as important to embrace the different cultures, which I think is a model ICANN exemplifies.

To briefly introduce myself to those who haven't met me. My name is Chris LaHatte. I am the ombudsman. I have been with ICANN since July 2011. I am based in Wellington, New Zealand.

I am going to show you some quick statistics just to show you that the number of matters coming into my office is steadily increasing, and it's a pie chart, because I understand the other day was Pi Day. I thought I would share in that.

You can have a look at these statistics at your leisure, but you can see that there's been quite a steady increase since I was appointed.

And again, you can see the actual numbers. That's already increased, because at every ICANN meeting, there are some issues which arise.

So 13 has probably now become about 16.

And, again, looking at those statistics, I will move past those. They are a little bit boring.

There are some new initiatives I have undertaken. I have been steadily writing the blog. I don't know how many of you have actually seen that, but one of the features of it is that when I need to make a recommendation or write a report on a matter, I'm putting it on the blog rather than on the Web page itself. And that gives people an opportunity to comment on it.

I also have a Facebook page for the ICANN ombudsman, which is slowly increasing in numbers. And, of course, getting involved in community groups as well. And that's of particular interest because of the networking.

Some of the things that I'll be doing. We have to address the ATRT recommendations, and I recall that George Kirikos made a comment through the Web that he wanted some comment about that. And I just want to reach out and say that if George or others have any views on these matters, then I would welcome them. I am not one who has a closed door. I welcome information from any source.

So some of the features that I see ahead are the growth of complaints, the issues from the new gTLDs. I've got to continue outreach to make sure that everybody knows that I'm here and that I'm available, and perhaps work, in addition, on better communications.

Before I turn to the closing part, there's just something I wanted to add from a theme that I mentioned yesterday, and that is that there has been a tremendous amount of discussion about issues like conflict of interest and ethics. There's a lot of debate in the blogosphere about decisions made and unhappiness. But where are the complaints coming into my office?

I would suggest that if you're really serious about these issues, rather than just the gut reaction of putting in another comment in a string on a blog or publishing a Web site devoted to slugging an organization, if you think something is unfair, if you think there's a delay, if there's some issue that you want, then you should be coming to see me.

And I say to you, those who have not done so but are very vocal, that if you don't make a complaint to the proper place where these matters can be investigated, you are going to just sound petulant and end up lacking credibility.

But I'll finish on a more positive note. And again, I speak in Maori.

(speaking in Maori).

You pursue excellence, and if you stumble, let it be to a lofty mountain.

Thank you, Steve.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

I think you are going to eventually succeed in getting us all to speak Maori, too.

Any questions? Any comments for our ombudsman?

BRUCE TONKIN: I just have a question, actually. At the risk of sounding like one of my Board colleagues, I am interested about the categories of complaints and how they might be changing.

Are the categories that you are getting, are they -- because the ombudsman can look at issues of the staff, Board, et cetera, or even between parts of the organization. Are they able to categorize or give us a sense of the balance between ones that might be related to issues within supporting organizations or issues between external parties and staff or external parties and the Board?

CHRIS LaHATTE: Most of the complaints, unfortunately, and that is where I need to refer people to places like compliance.

The rest of them come in a full range of issues from, perhaps, unfairly presenting policy issues, such as disharmony between different supporting organizations. There are expressions of unhappiness with the way elections have run. There are one or two others that I don't

particularly want to talk about just yet, because they're still percolating through.

So they tend to be issues where there is disharmony between people, and it's where my function doing mediation I think will come to the fore.

And those sorts of complaints, of course, won't result in the report, hopefully, if I can succeed in bringing the parties together.

Is that helpful?

STEVE CROCKER: You're asking Bruce, really; right?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Bruce asked the question so Bruce should answer whether the answer made him happy.

BRUCE TONKIN: Sorry. I just didn't use my mic. Yes. Thank you for the answer.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

Rob.

ROB HOGGARTH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. This is a question from George Kirikos. It's designed to go to the board, but it would be helpful to get Chris's

perspective as well, I think. And this is something that George asked earlier today.

He said, question: There should be a public comment period on the ombudsman review with outreach to past complainants and respondents by e-mail. Will the ICANN Board commit to that today?

And perhaps Chris might have a perspective on that as well.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, let me just speak to a part that asks for a commitment today. We don't do that. We take things under consideration and try to process it in an orderly way.

So that said, let me pass back to Chris for whatever you might want to offer on that.

CHRIS LaHATTE:

I think I might have, to some extent, already answered that by saying to George and any others that if you want to reach out to me with comments about things which have happened, I have my own way of doing things, but one thing that I'm very anxious to tell everybody is that I want to be very open to talk to everybody. I don't have any preconceptions. While I have read some of the material that has occurred in the past, I don't carry any baggage from that. And, indeed, I come from the other side of the world. And it's my job to be independent and impartial, in any event.

And any input into making me -- into assisting me into doing my job better, I welcome. You know where to find me. Please provide input.

BRUCE TONKIN: Steve, if I can just make a brief comment as well.

STEVE CROCKER: Bruce, please.

BRUCE TONKIN: Just with respect to George's question, there's two aspects of it, I guess. One is a question of do we have the right processes mechanisms, and that's what the accountability (garbled audio) that we're seeking. And so that's the advice we also asked the ombudsman to review. And I don't really see an issue in publishing a sort of view on that at the appropriate point.

It's a separate issue if you're then saying we want to evaluate the performance of a staff person in that role against those procedures, and that's a different thing.

So I just want to separate those two issues. If you're saying, yeah, I think we're not complaining about the process but I didn't get the outcome I wanted, that's a rather different situation compared to do we have the right processes in place.

CHRIS LaHATTE: Yes. Thank you, Bruce. I completely agree.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

Ah, yes, sir.

PAUL FOODY: Paul Foody.

I just want to know what sort of teeth do you have?

CHRIS LaHATTE: They are all my own.

PAUL FOODY: In terms of the action you can take. Say for example I complained to you and said this whole thing -- the whole new gTLD process has been brought into disrepute, do you have the teeth to throw the whole thing out and start again?

CHRIS LaHATTE: I can be very, very annoying.

PAUL FOODY: So can I. It doesn't get me anywhere.

CHRIS LaHATTE: If I am asked to investigate a matter and I find an issue that needs me to be critical, please be reassured that I will have no hesitation in being critical and making that widely known.

But you will have read the bylaws, and you know that the ombudsman does not have the power to force anybody to do anything.

What I would hope to do is to, by writing a report which illustrates those issues, persuade the community to get behind any changes that are necessary.

PAUL FOODY: Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

We move on to the Nominating Committee, Vanda Scartezini.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Good morning.

Buenos dias.

I am seeing NomCom is in many conversation this week in Costa Rica, so I am very happy with that because it's part of the outreach process. Thank you.

So let's start. This is our committee. The committee come from all the organized groups in the community. So we have 20 persons working with us, and we have 13 men and seven women, just for the record.

And they are people from all the regions of this planet, so it's a very good committee.

So our task here is listen to the community. So Accountability and Transparency Review Team demands that we listen to the community. In order to get some desired skills from the board members, we need to look for in our candidate pool.

So to follow this recommendation, we start last year in Dakar talking with each one of ACs and SOs and its constituencies in order to get the desired skills, especially for the Board, the board members, but also asking them about the other positions.

Then we make a summary those thoughts, and here in Costa Rica we went back to each one of these groups and with this summary to ask them if that summary really reflected their suggestions or if we need to add or withdraw any other items related to those skills to have a guidance for us.

So that's what we did since Dakar.

And after that, we also start to talk about our methodology, and we agree also with the methodology and the timeline. That's our timeline.

We have now -- we are now in the process of outreach. So please help us to do that. And this window will close on the April 2nd, so it's a tight schedule, to allow us to finish all selection just after the Prague meeting.

So what do we have now? It's really a tight schedule for that. So all those informations will be posted just after this meeting. What I mean,

all the information is the presentation we made in the public forum, in the public workshop, the methodology we are following, and the timeline, and also we're going to post the results of our survey that we did regarding 2011 also following instruction in the demands recommendation, whatever the name is, from the ATRT.

So, next, what is open now? It's for leadership position. We have the task to select three board members, and one must be from this region, because there is bylaws -- ICANN's bylaws demands that no region can have less than one representative in this board. So we need to make sure that we have the best pool of candidates of this region to select one among them.

So we also have one member -- to select one member for GNSO, another for ccNSO, and two member for the ALAC. This year is -- there is a (indiscernible), so last year was the other regions. This year is North America and Europe.

So talk about the people, connect with your network, and help us to do that.

So our deadline is April 2nd, 2012. So it's short time period. Please help us to do that.

So I'd like to end my presentation with two things. First, thank to my committee and the special for all the groups that we met here and in Dakar, and all the consultations we make and talk with the people during this period. I know it's not an easy period. There's vacation time and holidays and carnival, and it's hard to get outreach time in this

period, but we have a lot of support from the community and I thank that.

Especially I would like to thank Olof Nordling and Joette Youkhanna. The name is a little difficult. But they are wonderful and friendly support they have given to our committee.

And if you allowed me, Mr. Chair.

I would like to thank everybody, especially the group that worked all this time for agrees great facilities and organization.

Thank you all.

Now I will talk in Portuguese.

Again, I would like to thank the ICANN Board for making it viable, the translation into Portuguese and the name of the Portuguese community. I would like to thank you deeply for this opportunity to have this community or to give the community the possibility of providing information easily in our own language; that we can understand in our language.

Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much.

Comments?

Get your statements of interest in. April 2nd; right? Yes?

All right. That brings this session to a close. We are quite a bit behind schedule; however, the next and final piece of this morning's activities, a formal board meeting, will be much briefer.

I do want to take a quick break here.

Let me ask that we reassemble at 10:10 sharp. We'll start with you or without you.

Somewhere it's 10:10.

11:10. Excuse me.

Thank you very much.