ICANN Prague Meeting
ISPCP Meeting- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 26th June 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.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. Yes, welcome to the ISP and connectivity provider session. This ICANN meeting, there will be a sheet circulating around, if you could add your details for the record I would appreciate that.

We'll do a quick round robin of who's here and then we'll switch over to the bridge to see who's on the bridge as well.

The format this meeting is taking - it's a little bit different because we have some internal ISP discussions to add on at the end.

So the format is that from now until 4:00 it will be an open meeting and we'll work through this agenda.

From 4:00 to 4:30 it will be a closed member's only meeting for internal ISV business. So to get things rolling, I'm Tony Holmes so I currently chair the ISV constituency and I'm here representing BT.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm Mikey O'Connor also a member of the IS PCP and I'm here representing the Minnesota Internet Regional Exchange.

Osvaldo Novoa: I'm Osvaldo Novoa, I'm representing (unintelligible) and I'm also a member of the GNSO council.

(Hugo Teilanber):   My name is (Hugo Teilanber), I'm from the Dutch ISP auxiliary.

Man: My name is (unintelligible), I'm also from the Dutch ISP auxiliary.

Man: My name is (unintelligible) and with Firstcomm. I will be (unintelligible).

(Toshi Tateshi):   My name is (Toshi Tateshi) from Japan, (unintelligible).

(Rob):   Okay, and I'm (Rob) from (Jekinik) Japan that (unintelligible).

(Dan Alexander):   (Dan Alexander), Comcast Cable.

(Rod Baragio)   Hi, I'm (Rod Baragio) from CGI BR and also Brazil ISP Association.

Jaime Wagner: Jaime Wagner from internet soul Brazil.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Wolf Ulrich-Knoben, I'm on the current GNSO council as vice chair and I'm representing large telecom.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Mikey could we go to the cohort, who is on the bridge?

Mikey O'Connor: Is there anybody on the bridge that would like to announce themselves?

(Jen Taylor):   Hi, (Jen Taylor) with BT.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks a lot, anybody else?

Tony Holmes: Welcome (Jen). Okay, there are some other people on the bridge but obviously not going to announce themselves. Could I just mention for those of

you who aren't members of the constituency if you could leave your business cards there that would be quite helpful.

And then we can follow up with you after. So to the meeting, we've got quite a full agenda, certainly for a two hour session and having been through the introductions we should get straight into the first issue which is the ICANN budget and strategic plan.

So you will see there are links to the operational plan and budget and there's also a reference to ISPCP funding and if you open up the operational plan and budget you'll see that there are some items which are now going to provide in measures of support that we haven't benefited from in the past, in Annex 5 on Page 72.

So they cover outreach activities for the constituency, they also cover sponsored attendance to the ISP constituency and the rest of the ICANN meetings from members of the ISP community, particularly those from developing countries where they might struggle to get to the meeting.

And there's also a line that provides a certain amount of funding for the constituency itself. That is one of the issues that we will be following up after the open session in the closed session that I mentioned that will occur at the end of the meeting to pick things off to make sure that we do everything we promised to ICANN we're going to do in relation to that funding.

The other thing I should simply mention here is that we are working in conjunction with the other commercial stakeholder groups, the business constituency and the intellectual property constituency.

So pull together a combined response back on the budget and you heard some of those issues which we've identified mentioned earlier if you were attending the meeting between the commercial stakeholder group and the

ICANN board when Chris Chaplow presented the findings from that work at the end of the meeting.

So it's been an ongoing project we've had for a long time and the comments that Chris made at the end of that meeting I think are comments we'd all subscribe to, that with the new CFO taking over there have been some quite significant changes both in the process and in the output on the strategic plan and project, all of which we welcome.

It isn't the final approach that we were looking for but it's certainly gone a long way to moving things along. There's a lot more detail given now against each item of funding.

There are some areas where it's still quite difficult if you look in details to get beneath the skin and actually find what has been covered by that pocket of funding.

But we're certainly getting there. And at this stage if anybody else wants to get involved in the budget community representing this constituency I'd certainly be more than pleased to hear from you on that.

So with that introduction before I move on I just want to open up if anybody else has any particular items of concern or issues they want to raise now against this item on our agenda.

Okay so that's the update of where we are and as I said just now the further work on this in terms of utilizing the resource which we have been allocated now for financial year '13 we will be discussing in closed session at the end of the meeting.

So moving swiftly on, update on the register accreditation agreements, you see on the screen there there's links to the presentation that was given in the public session earlier in the week here.

And there was again some discussion on this within the session, we came away from just before lunch with the board as well as the commercial stakeholder group where we had further discussions around this.

And it's certainly an item that the board are looking for input on. There was a statement made on behalf of the intellectual property constituency in particular in the exchange with the board that made it quite clear that they were very supportive of the proposal set out by the staff, the summary of changes you can find (unintelligible).

And they emphasize the need to actually apply in particular the WHOIS verification aspects of those proposals. Now as a constituency we haven't gone back on this issue at all although we have certainly contributed to the dialogue that's gone on.

Having sat through the session with the board, what I want to riase here is whether you feel there's a need now to provide any further feedback than the feedback we gave during the session this morning to the board.

They are looking I think to take some decisions in this area and they're looking for feedback as to what the view of the constituencies is.

For us we have I think long supported the need to get this done and in some of the broader dialogue we had this morning about the challenges to ICANN internal and external, this was a key issue that came up there.

We do need to get some good news out. And that's been said a number of items this morning and this is one area which is a significant step forward if ICANN can actually conclude the discussions that have been taking place.

It's also a very hot issue between the GAC and board that these agreements haven't been thoroughly pushed through and signed off. So my question is, is

there a view that we should put some official input back to the board either by a short communicate here or by a more formal statement that we could actually send to them.

So open for comment, Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: I think - Jaime Wagner - I think we should support ICANN (unintelligible) common on the point that the - if the registrar wants to do business in the new gTLD arena he should sign to the new AA and that if we - I put the support on the idea of just being carrot approach and a stick approach also to it be mandatory.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I must have - when was that closed? I wasn't quite sure what was the carrot and what was the stick, it sounded like two sticks to me.

But what you're referring to Jaime is the proposal that if an existing registry wants to move in to the new gTLD space as part of that negotiation they should accept the new registry accreditation agreement both for the new gTLD and for their existing registry operations.

Jaime Wagner: Registrant, yes.

Tony Holmes: Any other views on that? Well let me ask is anyone opposed to the constituency following that line offering support for that proposal which originally came from the IPC but - sorry originally came from the BC but has since been endorsed by the ICP.

So hearing none let's go ahead and do that. What would be your preferred approach towards that Jaime, just send a communiqué to the board members that we've actually discussed this following the session we had with the board this morning?

And we also would offer support for that position.

Jaime Wagner: I think a communiqué from chair and maybe in the public forum, could do that.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I see the opportunity to do this within the public forum, I haven't looked at the agenda for this particular item but assuming that there is quite happy to go ahead on both fronts and do that.

Jaime Wagner: Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay, let's move on. Making good progress. WHOIS is the next item on the agenda and again this has been discussed I think a couple of times already today, the actual situation with the response that's gone into this work from the ISP constituency.

                  The initial draft report that was set out from the WHOIS policy review team which was part of the AOC commitments this team was set up, we get to the comment and going into that work.

                  And at the time it supported the general direction and urged them to move ahead with their work, produce a final report along the lines of the draft.

                  They actually went further than that, they actually did a pretty incredible job and what they pulled together in the final version of the WHOIS review team report, was a set of recommendations that was somewhat stronger than originally appeared in the draft.

                  And I think to some of us that came as quite a surprise. Particularly I would suggest to Tony Harris here and a couple of others that were so heavily involved in the earlier work in the GNSO where we just couldn't move these issues forward for years.

Actually making the progress that's occurred there is really something that again we should all be appreciative of and almost look on in awe as to the actual work they've done.

So having seen this report we then submitted some further comments from that which have been posted the link to that is on the list.

And going this morning when we had the session with the board, we reiterated our support for that work we urged the board to actually move forward in terms of endorsing the recommendations.

And then look towards implementing them and I believe it will be on the agenda for the next board meeting so that input seemed to be more than welcome.

There is another piece of work that goes with this and this is the work that's taken place on WHOIS within the GNSO and if I go down to the next part of the presentation, the focus is on GNSO activities.

I'd like to hand over to one of our colleagues on council to actually give an update on where those discussions are within council.

So maybe Wolf you could do that for us.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, thank you, Wolf Ulrich-Knoben speaking. So on the council in the GNSO we have still as you are aware of we have still the ongoing item of WHOIS studies.

So there are several studies on WHOIS going on, some of them are already in place, it means they are in - there is work on those studies that means ICANN has engaged a company dealing with that.

We have on the other hand a survey, there's a working group who's working on a WHOIS survey and this survey was sent out right now to the public or to the GNSO at least asking for response, for comments on this kind of survey that this is appropriate or what could be - what amendments could be entered in to that survey.

So I would like to ask you all to have access to the ICANN and its public, you know if you are interested in and click on that and I invite you to comment on this survey.

So that draft survey which has worked out regarding all WHOIS staff and (unintelligible) to be collected and so on.

That is the one part regarding WHOIS studies and WHOIS survey, the other thing is we have for the council meeting tomorrow a motion provided with regard to WHOIS access and this motion refers to a work which has been done with in a working team of the council, Mikey you know that, two years ago or so.

So they provided their report, the so called registration (unintelligible) working team and they provided recommendations to the council, how to deal with that, for example in order to provide reliable data and in order to provide a how is it called, a kind of access where the data could really be provided for in the manner which - for the users of them.

So it is - that discussion is ongoing on the GNSO and this work has already been done or not, so we will ask your opinion if there is a lag skill in that work with regards to providing those WHOIS access.

And therefore we provided - we came up with that motion. Now to stick on that work and then not to make a decision on council that this work has been finished and there may be no more (unintelligible) with GNSO. That was right.

However have a separate discussion on Sunday this week about this motion, the contracted party of the house is not in favor of that motion, arguing that way that all the items which are dealt with in that motion are already being covered in different base, in the RAA draft, in the RAA negotiations, in other WHOIS studies.

And so far there is no consensus on that motion and couldn't be achieved, I would say it that way and the question for us is really I personally I could not really evaluate to what extent this type of work is already really covered in that part of the RAA for example.

Because okay it's out of our scope, we are not partners in our negotiations so I heard other - I got other signals from staff, we have seen that in the RAA negotiations they are not finished, they are contentious, they are controversially discussed.

So it's not clear whether this time it's going to be covered or not. So I did not find out before I go to more - to that motion to the council it's on the list of the actions for the council tomorrow.

But it's still could be discussed, what is it, all of you here on the ISP CP with regards to that, I would like also afterwards to communicate this to the other constituencies in our stakeholder group in order to get their feedback to put them in line with our views.

And then that's the end - let's go for that tomorrow. So this is just briefly what is it about WHOIS. If you like I could like also do - I could refer to that to motion and if you like to do that, or to hear what it's about.

Tony Holmes: Yes, please do.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: What it is, it refers to as I said to that work but the registration of these policies team did and (slightly it's) just two years from now so they included a lot of recommendations in this part. And a lot has been done already.

So it is step by step, it is done so - and with regards to that recommendation the motion is easy, it's just - if the council should recommend that the issue of WHOIS access which means that to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible and (unintelligible) reliable, enforceable and consistent fashion, is it included in the RAA policy development process as it commences.

So the reason is why because councilor, that item to that working group which is WHOIS survey, and this team came back, fired back to council, said no, it's not in our scope so if we don't deal with that.

And then the council came up and was asking okay how should we deal with it? And okay the idea came up okay, let's forget it. So that was - that's in there because that's the argument from the contrary party house, it's already covered in certain other areas as I explained.

In that situation we have - and we were a premium, no, it couldn't be done that way so let's find (unintelligible) and our proposal was to include that in a PDP around the RAA if that is commenced.

So which is still controversial but we couldn't find any other way. So and on the other hand okay our board is also our tool to full out present in September or end of this year and look out what would happen with the RAA negotiations is that the step going on and on.

So that's more ideas, not to get rid of that item, but to stick on that and I would like to get some arguments from your side and to know about whether this is feasible or from our point of view could we say following the discussions we had on Sunday, okay maybe this part is gone already, let's forget it.

That's where I am.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thank you Wolf. What I don't understand is if it's part of the RAA agreement already why should you be worried about including this and supporting it as a motion?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, well this is - sorry just to explain my understanding, so I was then following up with the RAA and looking what is done in the RAA really and also what is done with some proposals coming from the SSAC in this regard.

And thought it was more or less technically related so it was you know an update of the WHOIS protocol and all these things, this is done really but there may be some others opening.

Maybe might be good to assist in that.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor for the transcript and also the guy that caused all this trouble, sorry about that.

I was on the RAP working group and just to clarify what we were working on is the Port 43 access to WHOIS, there's really two ways to get WHOIS access, sort of the front door, you're at your terminal in excision or if you're coming in through a web page, that's sort of the front door.

But then there's a specific port, Port 43 that you can get WHOIS data from a registrar and what we found in the working group was that access to WHOIS data was pretty good coming in through the front door.

But some of the smaller registrars were pretty erratic in their Port 43 provisioning, most were great but quite a few weren't.

And so we wrote this recommendation into the report saying please beef up Port 43 and one of the things that's happened in the interim and I need to add to your list Wolf is that compliance now monitors Port 43 for all registrars.

And I think on some ungodly schedule like once every two minutes and if they don't respond on this two minute test cycle compliance starts sending them warnings automatically and so it's my understanding in talking to some of my pals in the registry and registrar community that basically this problem has been addressed through compliance as monitoring.

I didn't know about the RAP business or the RAA side of this but I think part of the reason that you're getting so much resistance from the contracted parties is because they feel like problem really has been solved.

And that - because I think it's true that in order for compliance to be able to do what they did it's got to already be in the RAA. And so I think what we're - maybe completely confused here about this and my tendency would be to say that if we're sort of budgeting our political capital and wanting to save our - you know our bullets for really important issues.

As a member of that working group I think that I'd say that is probably isn't a real big deal and that we may want to just let this one go.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Well I don't have any problem with that, just from my understanding on the other hand an issue seems to me this regard an SLA related to all this stuff, so which is also negotiated.

And overall that this SLA regarding WHOIS data, so an SLA from my understanding would include the question of quality, yeah, question - operation of quality in accessibility and all these things.

So - and that seemed to me every time a controversial issue which is not yet solved, so that's my understanding, if I'm wrong please help me.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I think that the subtle distinction is between quality as in connectivity so I ask Port 43 and I get an answer as opposed to quality in terms of the content.

And think that the technical access quality is what compliance is monitoring and the content, in other words are the fields populated with data that's nonsensical is not being monitored and that's very controversial.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime and I would like to understand something, I don't know if my Portuguese translation to - from English but I guess what this is because from what Wolf said it was not only problem of access to Port 43.

It was more in the realm of reliability of the data including WHOIS data and that's what I - and my understanding is that the contracted party blocked any advance in here saying that it is not in the present RAA but the one that is being discussed.

And they block there too, so this is my total understanding of the situation, problem is by my mistrust in them and probably - I'm probably wrong, please correct.

Tony Holmes: There's a couple things here I don't understand as well because to start with I don't think it's the Port 43 access that we're focused on, it's the problem which is what you were saying Jaime in the past.

SO I'm not so sure that all of the issues are resolved through the RAA agreements. The other thing that I still can't actually get clear picture of is if it was that simple that everything is fine here through the registry, accreditation agreements, there isn't any damage being done by this motion.

Because it isn't asking for anything that would be in excess of that, so why is it such a stumbling block for them that they can't sign up to if they're already doing this? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think that the distinction is between - and so I don't want to be representing registries and registrars but as a member of the RAP working group we hammered on each other long and hard on this one.

And the working group was focused entirely on the technical aspect of reaching Port 43. Once you reached it and got data back, if the data was nonsense that was outside of our recommendation.

And so what the registries and registrars perceived this to be, what they feel like this is doing is dramatically expanding the scope of the recommendation that the RAP working group came up with to include data and they're quite opposed to that.

Jaime Wagner: What is with this motion right now pertains only to Port 43 or it puts things out through the reliability of the data?

Osvaldo Novoa: What I understood what I talked with Jeff Neuman is that they recommended us to wait to see what comes out of the RAA and see if it sends in the meeting, then we send the motion. Not that it's there but that it might be there.

Also regarding the access to Port 43 I was in the presentation they gave us some registrars were saying that there are three methods of access in the WHOIS data, web, Port 43 and some other one.

And that they may make available one of the three of them. Regarding that point in particular. Okay.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: May I? So Osvaldo you are right, there is slightly different than that so one thing was, one argument okay was from the country clearinghouse why are we doing this, this is duplication of work?

If it comes to that, so because it's already covered, so okay, we wouldn't like to have duplication of work, never. Sure, but we would be sure that it is covered, it's going to get covered.

So then the proposal was okay then let's get a little clearer this time and if it's - may not be covered then come back, that it used to be an item of constant agenda in (unintelligible) topics. So because it was on the constant agenda of the council, just to make a statement that all work has been done and the council is not more dealing with that in future. And that is what I would like to avoid.

So the motion says I also would like to provide (unintelligible) senseless motion up, you know, it doesn't make sense (definitely). But it says just okay, it should be included in the (IA) policy, development (unintelligible) and it commences. They don't like to have - that's what they would like to avoid because it would (unintelligible).

Also if a (unintelligible) process commences, they wouldn't like to have it in that process.

So I understand from that point what (Mikey) was saying, that in this respect I understand that we have several meetings with compliance as well, and they will provide us this information what they are doing.

So I understood also that that was a merger of those tool recommendations, wasn't it? And so, (again), there are several tool recommendations. It's one with regard to compliance and one with regards to whose access in the (unintelligible). And both of them - or the (unintelligible) it has been merged (through) compliance, so I understood.

So (unintelligible) so the question of whether it's just on the (unintelligible) related. (If that's) the case that they would like to get rid of Port 43 anyway?

(Tony): (Unintelligible). Sorry, from the presentation they made, both of the (unintelligible) one of the discussion point that it's being discussed between ICANN and the registers.

(Jamie): Anyway, (Jamie) again. I would be satisfied that only there is a procedure now by compliance department that (unintelligible). I would be much more confident if this was in the RAA written form. Because a procedure can be (upheld) and a request for compliance cannot.

Man: Did you want to come back, (Mikey)?

(Mikey): This is (Mikey). I have to admit that I'm not the closest follower of the RAA. But usually Compliance doesn't monitor anything that's not in the contract. And so I (unintelligible) Port 43 access quality and SLA for Port 43 is already in the RAA.

Now it may be that the registrars would like to get rid of that, and especially if in the case of thick Whois they may be saying, "Look, go to the registry for this." And so there's no need to have Port 43 through us.

And so I guess my thought would be maybe we could scurry around somewhere between now and the meeting tomorrow and visit with (Jeff) a little bit and clarify some of this because I'm not sure, I just don't know. And I...

Man: Well in regard to that decision, isn't there another issue here, which is that we've been trying to push the RAA to be concluded for quite a time now?

And even at this (moment) we're still doing exactly the same thing. And there's no assurance whatsoever that those negotiations are going to be finished.

(Jamie): Same problem. Same problem.

Man: Yes. So I don't see anything other than a risk if we don't support the motion, because it's just left totally open-ended regardless of whether it's Port 43 or not, because this isn't just about Port 43 and access. (Mikey)?

(Mikey): I don't see the risk. It seems to me that if events proceeded and some of these other Whois issues didn't turn out the way we wanted them to, couldn't we just bring up another motion at that time?

Man: Yes, we could. But there was a discussion this morning that impacts back on this. And that is that there seems to be a habit in Whois. The first time you have a motion on Whois the motion is about shall we have a motion, (unintelligible) about shall we do anything. And that's the problem I have. It just slows everything down yet again.

That was the response we got (with the Board) this morning when they were talking about the Policy Review Team implementations. We don't want anything that's got to go to GNSO to be about whether we should have a motion. The Board would (either) send it there with a request and we consider the motion to do something or otherwise we don't debate it.

We don't want any motions on motions and it seems to be circular.

(Jamie): The way the council will...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jamie): I turns everything to (unintelligible), every division.

(Tony): Well let me add just to that. So I think it could be (unintelligible) let me say. But we already track, we track what's going to happen (unintelligible). So we may have time (unintelligible) cast on the council on the weekend that we may have time and come back again in case we are of the opinion that it is not covered.

So what I would like to avoid is that if we would agree right now to refrain from that motion, yes, then it's automatically done by the constant agenda.

So I would open the speaker and tell, "Okay, now." But it's not an item for the constant agenda. So for us it could be (unintelligible) open point. But in future so you (retract) on this and maybe end of this year we will come back.

Is that the way to go or?

Man: But I think you went further than I was thinking you were going there. I thought what you were suggesting was that we ask for this motion to be deferred whilst this is clarified. Now you're mentioning come back at the end of the year, so it's a long way out.

(Tony): If deferral is a specific proceed process. So that means you defer only once.

Man: Yes.

(Tony): And that means that because there was no time to discuss that. So in this case we could defer back to the next (unintelligible) meeting. Then after three weeks or four weeks it comes up again and what is going to happen then. So a deferral is not the right term in this context.

Man: It's the right term in terms of what I was proposing. Maybe that's exactly what I was proposing, that if we need time to clarify this, why don't we defer it and put it on the agenda for next meeting?

But before you answer that, (unintelligible).

Man: (Tony) just to clarify it because I was checking my notes. And no, the Port 43 is not under discussion. This other (unintelligible) (session) for the (low-end) (unintelligible) Port 43 is just fixed. They have to give. But they do have a lot of firewalls in Port 43 though, that's the content not the access. Sorry.

Man: Thank you, that was helpful.

Man: And this is a little bit too trick I would say. Because, you know, I came up with that motion. Then it was already deferred on (recourse) of the registries. And then I myself come back - we have motion telling us, "Oh we need more time for these (unintelligible) because (unintelligible)."

Man: Okay. I didn't understand the background, but certainly you're right. Against that background we don't have that as an option.

So what we need to do is to make a decision here on whether we are going to go forward and support the motion tomorrow or not.

Man: (Jamie)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jamie): (Unintelligible) at first a proposal that came from you, so why not? We will be support for (unintelligible).

Man: It's pretty hard when you propose something to suddenly say, "We're not supporting it (unintelligible)."

(Jamie): Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) (professionally) then. You know, it's (unintelligible) (version done). That means if you go (unintelligible) and it's going to be defeated, then it's over.

Man: Well let me ask another question then. Certainly my understanding is that the other constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group do support this. Where do the Non-Commercials sit with this?

Man: The Non-Commercials had a slightly amendment which I took it (strangely). And there was just - with regards to - it was from their point of view with regards to the kind of data. But it's friendly. So they would like to accept - I saw only (Wendy) (unintelligible) against.

(Jamie):   (Unintelligible). Maybe if we are defeated, I mean, in the basis that this is already in the RAA, you're not being defeated at all, our recommendation is (unintelligible).

                        But I would require them to make a vote saying that. You're (defining) why (unintelligible) to say that they are voting against because this is in the RAA already. Okay, it's okay for me. Then I accept the defeated.

Man: I think that's a good proposal as well because I don't understand what they have to lose if it's in the RAA anyway. But I should come back to (Mikey). (Mikey), you expressed the view earlier that maybe this is one we could let go. Haven't heard this discussion, particularly the clarification on the Port 43 access. How do you feel about that now?

(Mikey):   I'm fine with any of the things that are proposed. I think that the key point that I wanted to make was that the working group recommendation was a very technical, very narrow recommendation. And the perception of this motion by the contracted parties is that this is dramatically expanding the recommendation of the working group and that's why they're opposed to it.

Because we - the working group doesn't have consensus on what we are implying. And in fact it's difficult to predict two years ago what we would've done. But my guess would be we never would've come to consensus on anything to do with data quality at all.

Man: (Unintelligible) true. Because (unintelligible) you get there. So if you...

(Jamie): Excuse me, (unintelligible). I will ask a (vote) for clarification. But my understanding, the present motion behind the council is not dealing just with the (unintelligible). It is being - it has been expanded. Am I right? Okay.

Man: Okay. So I'm going to make the call on this. So (unintelligible) I think - and also it's (unintelligible), it's the council (members) for the ISPs.

I think you're both suggesting that we should go ahead and pursue this. We should raise the motion, vote in favor of the motion. If the motion is defeated, then I think (Jamie)'s proposal comes in that we should seek clarity why they voted against. And ask the direct question, "Was it because this is already covered by the RAA?" And if nothing else, that should then be included in the council (minutes).

Man: Okay. As usual, the (unintelligible) follows, the motion comes up to the council agenda. I'm going to read the motion and then there will be a discussion and (if it's) (possible), put their arguments to the table which are recorded and (unintelligible) it. And then give a revote.

Man: But if that discussion doesn't cover that point, if that point isn't made, the reason they're not in favor of the motion is that it's already covered in the RAA, I think that's a good time to ask that question.

Man: (You have) the ability, okay it's partly covered in the RAA and it's - to other extent it's covered by the different Whois activities - what else, you know? In the RAA I'm not aware if the Whois protocol (on the policy) RAA, the

(unintelligible) Whois protocol was say part of the SSAC recommendations. Well...

Man: It is part of the RAA, that's for sure. So what degree it goes down to with this particular issue I am unclear about, but it is part of the RAA.

So is everyone in agreement with that if we take that approach? Okay, thank you and good luck.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. Next item is the update from the gTLD issues. We had the reveal date, the list of gTLDs is now published. What's on this particular slide is what are the issues for ISP?

And this is something that we skirted around for awhile. We are all aware that probably the hot issue here at this meeting is the issue of batching. And as a constituency which stayed out of that discussion, others have expressed views. It was quite clear when this was discussed in the cross-constituency -- the Commercial Stakeholder Group today -- they (unintelligible) in those other constituencies. There are very mixed views.

We were asked some specific questions to go back to the board with this morning about batching. And all we could give them was some fairly generic answers that we all signed up to. Certainly they should proceed with care and whatever approach they actually put forward, it needs to be a little bit better than what's been offered so far. There needs to be proof of concept that it's going to work and some faith in the actual approach.

And they asked the - for the public (work) was the other point that was made during that session.

So on that particular topic (unintelligible) have some discussion open up the comment. In doing so I think we need to take some care as a constituency here because it's a very tricky issue and there's been a lot of emotion expressed around this at this meeting. But let's see where we (with) (Tony).

Man: Well this is an issue I have a particular interest in of course as an applicant. But I think (Tony)'s quite right, this is a (unintelligible). If we take any positions I think it would be extremely risky. It's something that ICANN has to sort out.

And they had this planned to do the digital (archery) sort of lottery type of arrangements. And apparently there was concerns now that that can be hacked, which is why they have suspended it.

Basically I don't (believe) your problem because when they originally contracted the review panels, which are of course extremely well-known international organizations such as (KPMG), and I think (unintelligible) economics was mentioned also. They were thinking of 500 applications, which is why of course now they keep referring to the first batch of being 500 applications.

As it turns out they'll have 1500. But that also means that instead of having $185,000 multiplied by 500, they have that amount of dollars multiplied by 1500. So basically they have a lot more money which they can offer to these evaluators and say, "Well look, you're going to be paid by the number of evaluations. You have three times much more money to make, but we need to make this process quicker." I would transfer that problem to the evaluators, you know, not to the community - not to the ICANN community.

And the second problem they have is once you award those who get through the gate once you say, "These people have ties to these domains they're asking for, how do you sequence, you know, who gets them first? Who gets into the root before the other guys?" Which that is another problem which involves - well (unintelligible) who gets their first. They can't get them all into

the root in the same day or the same week. So that's another thing that has to be sorted out.

So it's not an easy problem. And taking a constituency position, as (Tony) has just said, I think has more risks than rewards in the offering.

Man: (Mikey)?

(Mikey):   This is (Mikey) for the transcript. You know, I was fascinated by the conversation this morning. Because what's going on is the business constituency in the IPC is suddenly turning into the registry constituency.

And so the conflicted (use) were astounding to me. I think that's part of the reason that this is so tricky. And I think that this bears a bit on sort of a reorganization question that (Steve Crocker) asked about what's the best configuration of ICANN going forward.

And I think we're in a middle point where roles are suddenly changing. And one of the things that we might want to do is encourage people -- when they speak about this issue -- to indicate whether or not they're an applicant. Because if you're an applicant sitting in the business constituency and not (unintelligible) that, essentially it's almost a conflict.

We get pretty unusual policy conversations, so I'm fine not taking a position. But I think that we could raise the sort of broader issue, which is the roles here suddenly getting very confused.

Man: I think you made a very good point, (Mikey), because we saw some companies turn up -- such as Google today -- in the business constituency, I've never seen them before and Google is an applicant. Of course it's a very good point you made.

Man:	Well the whole situation with the impact to gTLDs is something that's also caught on our agenda as well. But certainly the landscape is changing and there's going to be some significant impacts on ICANN through this journey (unintelligible).

(Jamie):	I would like to add if we are not supportive of the three positions that we already subscribed, there's a consensus this morning is to take your time. If there are no flaws, support the one disclosure of the evaluation (phase), one single disclosure at the same time. And we have the time to figure out one kind of a sequence that should prioritize global public interest.

But this means that for us, at least from my point of view, should take into account geographical and community considerations.

Man:	My understanding on those three points is that we don't need to do anymore (Jamie) because the session we had with the Board. If you remember (Steve Crocker), he went through each of those items meticulously and made a note of each one and said to us, "What I'm hearing is this," and he read out exactly virtually what you said.

So I think that message is out there quite clearly.

Man:	(Unintelligible).

Man:	Well that's an open debate for us to have here.

(Jamie):	And for the (third) point? For the second?

Man:	Well it's open-ended (right the way) across, (Jamie). But we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that there's going to be other opportunities. So I think for people to put their own positions - whatever they are -- into this debate. (Mikey)?

(Mikey): This is (Mikey). I've got a question from the chat room. This is Mr. - the distinguished Mr. Mark McFadden.

Man: I don't know him.

(Mikey): You don't know him? Oh dear. Well maybe not the distinguished Mr. Mark McFadden.

He says, "The Chair of the Board Improvement Committee -- which is responsible for the next GNSO review -- wants to concentrate on business process and not on structure. But isn't this change in the registry/registrar business landscape a reason to look at the structure of the GNSO in the future and not just the process of the GNSO?" You know, I kind of keep sort of feeding into this seem theme that we (unintelligible).

Man: Good. Can I respond to that? The answer is -- I think from this constituency -- yes, you're absolutely right. And we already had some debates about this within the membership.

It's something we're going to come to on the agenda as well. But the point (I) picked up is one that's got a lot of support from this constituency. I would suggest at the moment it's probably got more support from the ISPs than any other constituency from some of the (unintelligible) dialogue I've heard here.

That isn't to say that there aren't (unintelligible) other constituencies who think similarly to us. But on a collective view I don't think they've reached that (point). So yes, we need to pick up on this point as we work through our agenda.

But I will open the floor up to see whether anybody else has got any other issues to raise here. Not just on the issue of batching, but on the whole issue of the gTLD applications and whether there was anything that -- as a constituency -- need to raise, this is your opportunity. (Mikey)?

(Mikey): This is (Mikey) again. You know, I think one of the themes that we -- as a constituency -- might want to hit sort of over and over again is that what drives us is security, stability and resiliency, and just pound away on that. Every time a question comes up say, "Well, the ISPs are generally on the sharp pointy bit when things aren't right, because the customers -- when things break -- tend to call us."

And so just as a sort of underlying theme in our comments about the new gTLDs and basically anything else, keep pounding away on the (SSR) theme.

Man: Yes, good point. And there may be an opportunity here. When these discussions are going on to be in a public forum at that point may need to be made.

Yes, please, welcome.

(Eduardo Paraj): Hi, this is (Eduardo Paraj). I agree completely with you, (Mike). Because one of the sessions that I already participate, one of the question is how will (be) the process to start the new gTLDs on the roots, how is the speed that you can do that? Because it has a problem with that, we are having a biggest problem (choice) about it here.

So in this session, it's not official that what's conducted by (Thomas), I believe, this is one of the questions that he will ask to verify. And this is real important because if you (unintelligible) the process, maybe you'll have a big issue on the (unintelligible).

So you have - I believe we make - maybe make a comment on that action. The (unintelligible) of the system, and also verify how fast we can go. Because I heard the Chair said that is 1000 a year, that's the maximum. So you need to verify the technical issues of our site.

Man: Okay. Thank you (Eduardo). (Mikey)?

(Mikey):   The esteemed Mr. McFadden is commenting again in the chat and I just want
                   to inject his comment.

                   The first comment is back just a bit. He wanted to follow up by saying that in
                   terms of the reorganization conversation, we -- the ISPs -- may want to
                   interact directly with the Board Committee on that question because our - and
                   I'm now going to elaborate a little bit on what he's saying.

                   It's interesting now our interests are starting to diverge from the ISPs -
                   essentially from the brands who now are suddenly acting a lot more like
                   registries than they used to. And so we may want to, you know, I agree with
                   Mark, we may want to go straight to the Board Committee and talk to them
                   directly.

                   And then in terms of your comments, he said, "I would say that history shows
                   that if there are problems that customers have with the new gTLDs they tend
                   to blame the ISPs for those problems. This happened with the introduction of
                   .travel and .museum (unintelligible)." So he keeps chiming in right behind
                   you.

Man: Yes, the trouble is the esteemed Mr. McFadden is always in front. And he's in
                   front on this one because his first point about interacting with the Board
                   Committee is exactly right and it was something that, again, that we were
                   going to come onto.

                   And the second point is very pertinent to this constituency. The issue that
                   Mark raised particularly with the introduction of those earlier longer domain
                   names, when they didn't work we were actually accused of filtering them out
                   as ISPs. And the problem wasn't at that layer at all. I know you were involved
                   in this as well, (Tony).

It was more the fact that the software couldn't (clout) with the longer names. And it's those sort of issues, any issue that come up through this expansion of the namespace is likely to bounce back on us yet again.

So (Eduardo) and (Mikey) are both absolutely right. The emphasis for us should always be on the (SSR) aspects of this. (Tony)?

(Tony):   You not only have the possible technical problems, which is what happened in the first two rounds. But also with so many new domains coming out, you'll find more ISPs -- particularly in small cities in Latin America for example -- who will call their ISP and say, "Something's not working," and customers call the ISP.

And the ISP will say, "Well, that domain doesn't exist, I never heard of it." And this could very well happen with the telephone cooperative or a small wireless ISP working somewhere in the (unintelligible) in Northern Argentina.

So I think we have our work cut out for us to see how we can get to these people, at least they should be aware of what's coming.

Man: (Eduardo).

(Eduardo Paraj): Thank you. Yes, you're asking (unintelligible) (correct). We need to also have a huge announcement about the (unintelligible)-based (unintelligible). Because this will happen, be certain about that.

If (we) could have some huge announcement about when we started to introduce the new gTLDs, you'll be very (helpful) to everybody has (that knowledge) that this has happened.

Man: I have another question beyond that (unintelligible) stability and security (unintelligible). That is so we either just mentioning that the VC and the IPC

are faced with newcomers which may have to feed one VC, the other one (unintelligible) what is about us.

Will there be a movement which (around) so some of us going to get involved in the registry business, whatever, could expect new ISP? Well I doubt a little bit but would that be the case?

Wolf-Ulrich-Knoben: There will be a movement going around so some of us going to get involved in the legislativeness, whatever. You could expect new ISP all right. I doubt a little bit but if that would be the case, how are we affected by them?

So the question is whether that is something which affects us here in our structure, (unintelligible) the list which has been published for often new publications. I did not object, not yet. So I really, I don't know so for example I have seen only (unintelligible) privately which some of the telecom providers in (unintelligible) or wherever, they've applied for twenty of these. Others did not, so.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I mean the quick answer on that is - well, we certainly can't know but there is the potential for some increase. There are a few ISPs that have applied, certainly there are a few big connectivity providers listed for new (unintelligible). So potential there is.

But they are faced with the same problem that a lot of these are which is where do they fit. But even though existing membership - for instance France Telecom. You can sit in on a number of places within the GNSO.

And these new applicants, they are in exactly the same situation. We've heard that the registration constituency have all ready looked at changing their actual charter so they can afford people (unintelligible), that's one thing that's happening which seems from the discussions we've been involved in the Commercial Stakeholder Group, there was almost a fight starting at one

stage between whether these new applicants should go in the IPC or whether they should go in the BC. But they've got other options as well.

So it certainly is going to change that what the impact back on us is. So I wouldn't like to guess at this stage what we'll - I do think it's probably less than some of the other constituencies.

But that is still a real issue for us because the GNSO isn't just about numbers. It's about getting the balance right so that the policy that comes out of the (unintelligible) is actually policy that is reflective and in public interest to go back to that point as well.

Did you want to add something?

Man: I just want to add to that that beats my experience in Argentina. I think all our members ISP - because we have like 150 of them now all of the country, our resale is of domain names. So basically they are in the registrar business. So - but I mean we're sitting here representing them in the ISBPT.

Jaime Wagner: I would say the same for Brazil. I would bring the same contribution. We have all ready (unintelligible) the past in this constituency. And I think that there is no - the problem is getting bigger because it's the same of the same.

Tony Holmes: Okay. So what I've really heard there that what came out of that initial debate on (unintelligible) is that we're not going to get into the realms of trying to thrash out any proposal and that's probably fairly wise. What we are going to do is keep emphasizing the need to be very cognoscente of the SSR issues and we will keep making that point whenever it seems appropriate.

And there is some back the issues that Mark referred to and I think (Wolf) has picked up on, the issuance of giving back to the program, back on our (unintelligible); something that we'll pick up on the agenda.

But let's move on now to the next thing. And this is Mikey's show on the IRTP. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Tony. Those of you on the Adobe Room can see the next slide going into a scramble on the PC for a minute for those of us in the room. So if you want to Tony - he's very clever, he just unplugged his PC from the screen so we can't watch him jump around.

The IRTP Working Group, IRTP stands for Inter-registrar Transfer Policy. It's a long standing policy and this is probably the longest running PDP in the history of ICANN. We started I think in 2005 on this one.

It's a five part PDP, we're on part 3. And we are down to about three of us who write it all because everybody else is exhausted. It's awfully hard to bring any new people up to speed. So it's pretty inside baseball.

But there are three issues that we are talking about this time and we are running a session tomorrow and I just wanted to introduce this to you today very briefly and then we can carry on.

The three issues that we are talking about in this round are change of control versus transfer - I'll circle back to that in a minute. Another one that's much more narrowly focused is should the form of authorization FOA to do these transfers being limited in time - and I'll explain that in a minute too. And then the final one which is extremely inside baseball is whether the registry should be required to INIDs for registrars rather than their own proprietary ID.

And so let me circle back to the first one. If you transfer a domain from one registrar to another and at the same time change the administrative contact - in other words change potentially you can't say owner because they aren't really property.

But if you change the control, if you change the entity that controls the domain, there's a pretty substantial risk - this is one of our SSR type topics. This is a very good way to steal domain names.

You hack the credentials of the entity that controls the domain, usually hack their easily hacked email, you use that to gain control of the account at the registrar, you transfer the name to a new, much friendlier registrar, often transferring it through several of those, and that multiple transfer process makes it very hard for anybody to retrieve the domain back to the correct owner.

And so this is primarily security ability - you know, it's an SSR kind of thing. And I'm one of the folks that's pushing pretty hard to get this enacted.

Now what we want to do, at least in our current proposal, is so say you can transfer a domain but the entity that controls the domain needs to be the same on both sides of the transfer between registering. And then if you want to also change who controls the domain, that's fine. Do that after it's moved to the new registrar. Because then what we're proposing is that once this change of control has taken place, the domain cannot be transferred to a new registrar for 60 days.

So what this does is it puts the domain essentially in the box. So if somebody steals it you have 60 days where the registrar can fix this without this huge cumbersome process that exists at the registry level right now.

You would think that this would be not terribly controversial, but of course there is another side to the discussion. What's going on is that over the last ten years of so, the domain aftermarket has emerged. Domainers lift their domains for sale, in the option and like (unintelligible) for example.

And their goal as a business is to make the transfer to the new owner very fast. It's a convenience. And so while the large registrars like Go Daddy and

Network Solutions and so on are on favor of this approach, there's a community -- essentially the domainer community and the aftermarket registrars that support them -- that are very uncomfortable with this proposal because it slows down their business prospects.

And so we have been negotiating like crazy. And I don't think I want to bore you with all that today. But if anybody's interested in this kind of thing - I've been living with this since 2005 - I'm happy to, you know, I will explain this in exchange for beer. How about that.

And so I just wanted to let you know that this is coming and if you happen to think that it would be a good idea to allow rapid transfer of registrar and control, we should talk about that today. But I'm presuming that I'm bobbing along in the direction that you all support on that.

Maybe I'll just stop at that point and talk about that and then we'll go to the next item. Jaime, you want to go ahead?

Jaime Wagner: Won't this go the council (unintelligible)?

Mikey O'Connor: We published our interim report. We're doing a workshop tomorrow. We'll go out to public comment starting sometime after this meeting and we'll come back to the Toronto meeting with a final report. And it's sort of in that time frame, I would expect sometime after Toronto, that we will actually get something to the Council.

And during the public comment cycle I plan to sort of chat with you on the list and we'll write a comment that sort of summarizes our position. So it's not like our seeing something go out the door that you have to react to really fast right now. I just want to give you a heads up that that's what's going on.

Anything else on this particular one?

Tony Holmes: What I would say on this is, this is something you should flag because I think it needs (unintelligible) out to the members of the ISPCP who have an interest in this business. And there are some people here who do that. So the advance informing is welcome, particularly if we're getting into the realms of the (unintelligible) as well.

So thanks for that. Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, I have one question. Since we have on council and for several years I would like to see the we have talked about the IRTP different parts (unintelligible) or whatever else, you know. So it's a huge thing and then it's split up in different parts so. And I remember that to some extent for example it was more of interest of the IPC something, so - and then more contractual issues it would seem to me. So how is that fit in this part here, so from their understanding? So what do we have to expect here?

Mikey O'Connor   I think this one is less contentious. We're very close to true consensus in the working group. The one group that as I said is having a little trouble with this is the aftermarket folks. And what we're doing right now is turning this language in such a way that we can accommodate their needs as well.

Essentially what we're coming up with is the idea that the default position for a domain is SSR. And then if a registrar is a person who controls a domain chooses to waive those - to remove those protections, we're providing a mechanism for them to do that. So we're saying that in general, the typical registrar is a business where this domain is very important to their business.

Coordinator: Stand by one moment, I'm letting them know we lost the audio.

Stand by while we get the main line reconnected. Thank you.

Standing by for the speaker location to rejoin the conference. Still standing by, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor   Like chat. And...

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor   And we're all good.

Tony Holmes: I'm not sure where we lost the string, so I apologize to those who are back on. You're back on (Jen), and (Mark's) back on. I don't know how much you missed.

So I was explaining some of the proposes that have been made that we're going to work on in terms of separating out some of the broader issues that ICANN dealing with them in a different forum from everything going through council in GNSO that others to contribute to on the same levels. So it involves the other support organizations as well. Hopefully you got all of that.

Jaime Wagner: I would like to - for the benefit of those who are new comers, I would like to add their consideration. In the present structure of the GNSO Council voting agreement, the contracted parties have power of blocking anything that they are against.

And they fuel the old with their day-to-day business, they are (unintelligible) they tend to block. And sometimes their fears are overrated and this is a problem with the present structure. So the other side, I mean the other side of the non-contracted part which would fit in, not always. I think this is where the concerns are now if there is a good balance on this side of the fence.

But I would say that mixed half always happens. And Tony here gave an example that I subscribed too. So what I do think is that the structure with the power to create obstacles to proceed in any discussion and also there is a tendency to everything is understood as a process and to reduce it to a process quality and everything has a process side.

And so I feel it extremely difficult to say - to find an issue that has no process side, you know. And so there is a big problem in finding issues that the Council would not claim that it in fact their (unintelligible) of the Council contracted parties.

Tony Holmes: Let me give you a quick example of that, Jaime. WHOIS is an example where clearly WHOIS policy to the GNSO actually does impact Council; there is absolutely no doubt about that. But if you look at the WHOIS report that came out of the IOC activity, that affects far more than the GNSO.

So there is absolutely no reason why that can't be dealt with at two levels, if that's the case.

But I don't want to get into the details of that because I know that is a lengthy detailed discussion that we'll actually have to face in the future rather than now. I think you had a comment online Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor Yes, (Mark) had a comment that runs right down the track that I think that's your docket Jaime. And this was just before everything went off line.

He said, "I believe if you subscribe to the idea that balance in policymaking is important, then the opportunity to address the issue of balance is during the next GNSO review. But unfortunately the current chair of the SIT," S-I-T - and I don't know what the SIT is.

Structure Improvement Committee.

There we go; S-I-C. "Has no interest in structural issues, only process issues."

I think that that's potentially a huge problem for ISP. What ISP needs to do is engage the SIC Committee that identifies the issues related to balance and

proposes alternative approaches to making balance work. So it sounds like we're all coming at the same thing. And he's typing like mad, so let's see what's he's got.

Oh, I guess he's just saying, "Thanks Mikey." So I guess I got it right. There's (Mark's) comment.

Tony Holmes: For your information Mark and everybody else's, we actually had the door open to have that discussion because it was the representatives of the SIC. Sorry, SIC, S-I-C, that came up to us following the session we had with the board this morning asking for that sort of input. So I think it does fit in with that.

I also believe that it would be wrong to personally have another GNSO review before we've don't this work because it cuts across everything we need to consider. And if they just look at the GNSO as it is now, and have another review of that, it isn't going to change on the mental, it isn't going to change enough.

So it's better to look at the big picture viewer I think, and try and get some ideas in.

So what we agreed to do is to produce a white paper from this, and to certainly get back now to the structural improvements committee as fast as we can. We've also said to them that we would be ready to engage in some form of discussion on these issues, but it's a (unintelligible) meeting.

And they said, "We'd also like some ideas about how we could organize this for (unintelligible)." So the doors open for that as well. They are looking to do something; they don't quite know what needs to be done or the best way to do it. So that's something we can work on between now and then.

The other bullet on this particular side talks about the (unintelligible) in with the commercial straight (unintelligible) group and other constituencies. As far as that debate goes we have spoken about this approach with the other Commercial Stakeholders, not formally but informally with some members of the Commercial Stakeholder Executive. And they are sort of warm to the idea that there's a willingness to talk about these things.

We haven't spoken to the other stakeholder groups; that's something we need to do and it's something we need to do between now and Toronto. So there's a big piece of work here -- a very important piece of work as well. And it's something that I'm sure will be (unintelligible) when we have our future cause across the period between now and Toronto.

So with that and the fact that we do have this closed session, I'm going to move on. I think this is the last item under (unintelligible).

I don't hear participation in working groups. And I just wanted for the record to record currently where that participation is. Because there is some groups we need to run participation.

So I would just like to ask people who are currently acting in working groups to just update everybody, not with the discussions in their working group, but just what groups they're involved in.

Mikey, I know you're involved in some of these, so do you want to start?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm in IRTP, I'm in the Fake Renewal Notices Group, I'm chairing the DSSA. Essentially my posture is anything that has to do with policy with registry or registrars; essentially the core mission of the GNSO. I'm on those working groups. Anything to do with process, I'm not; that's the easy way to think about that.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks. (Unintelligible)?

Man: Yes, I'm in the IOCOC Red Cross tracking team.

Tony Holmes: Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm chairing the SCI Turning Committee on improvement orientation and I'm in Outreach.

Tony Holmes: SCI is your job for life of course, it seems to go on forever.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: It came to my mind, this is very tricky. You know, the charter of CSCI is talking about the chair elections. But it doesn't have a term for that. The (unintelligible) they talk about that, so it's on the agenda.

Tony Holmes: Okay, so (unintelligible), what groups are you involved in? For the (unintelligible) please.

Man: (Unintelligible). Nominating committee.

Tony Holmes: Yes, but you are also in some working groups aren't you?

Man: Yes, in the ccNSO Study Group on the impacts of CODs and geographical (unintelligible), whatever it is. It's very long.

Tony Holmes: Okay. And for my part is currently involved in the budget committee.

So essentially what we need to do on the next call that we have is look at some of the other things we need to engage in and how we're going to do that. So if anyone has any ideas in advance of that please let me know.

As the dates of conference calls, what I would propose is that we don't determine that until we have this closed discussion that's going to take place

next. And once we've had that I will send a proposal for dates of the next conference call to the list.

So this is where I ask if there is any other business?

Man: Wolf, (unintelligible) the last point of because of what's going on in council meeting tomorrow is also we have a one point to raise, it's regard to the uniformity of reporting in the realm of (unintelligible) so it's also an outcome off this (unintelligible) policy work, one of that and it also about the question about how to get rid of that.

So - but we may have an interest to keep that alive and find a way how to deal with that. The matter is too severe, it's not just GNSO related, maybe in part. And so the question is then, do we - the council and most of you on council now to read that item. But if you could find a way how to view that so it will be happy and it might keep, especially if you were talking about that.

So that's the question. How do we deal with that tomorrow? So I could introduce a point, yes, and then maybe I will be back on your side and then we'll see what is going to happen.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, sounds like a plan.

Man: It's just from my understanding my (unintelligible) could do it in a type talk.

Tony Holmes: Okay, we'll leave that to you guys.

(Oliver): Thank you. My name is (Oliver), I'm representing the German Internet Industry as a profession as the European ISP (unintelligible). And I came a little bit late so I might have missed something that I want to raise when you were discussing the (unintelligible) issues.

And you simply led us into something about the naming list regarding the reconsideration request from the IPC (unintelligible) Group in the connection with the dotCAT exemption for probably WHOIS and system. And has left being discussed or is the discussion going on by the mailing list or?

Tony Holmes: No. Just to bring everyone up to date, that was a situation where dotCAT were asking basically for an exemption from the WHOIS. And what was decided was that we would support the IPCU on that, that actually proposed that.

The rationale for that was there's much that in an era where we're trying to get some much accurate who is that we are basically that we're trying to make sure WHOIS becomes really useful tool rather than what it's turned into over the years.

Also against the report that came out from the policy committee which strengthened WHOIS quite a lot, if those recommendations are taken up by the board. It seemed counter to that to suddenly move away from WHOIS in a way that's being proposed for dotCAT. And that was the basis that we went forward on that issue.

(Oliver): If I - if we still have the time I just would like to (unintelligible) one or two sentences which is custom.

Tony Holmes: We are pushing the time, but I don't want to close this down too much. The situation though for clarity is that what we did, we submitted a statement to the - I think it was to the Board of Reconsideration Committee. Because what we were asking for was for the board to reconsider that. So we have gone as far as now putting in a statement that basically just says that - it didn't say anymore than we just shared the concerns that were shared by the IPC about this and suggest the board should have another careful look at that.

So on the back of that, what would you proposing?

(Oliver):   If we supported them now and then discussions closed of course, I just wanted to raise a point concerning a debtor retention - a debtor protection, excuse me. Basically I think it's an ISP (unintelligible). I'm convinced that our protection and our complying with the protections laws is a very important point for our business. And so I'm basically always in favor with any company regardless of which part of the industry that aims to comply with better protection laws.

And so in this case there obviously has been some kind of statement of Spanish protection authority saying that the current system is in line with Spanish better protection. And, however there's also the European legal framework for better protection and those of you who are from Europe may be aware of this framework is revised right now, the legal process of (unintelligible) has started.

So - well I think that is something that is very important for us basically. And on the other hand, the idea behind the reconsideration request from the IPC is quite clear. There interest is to enforce copy write laws and copy write infringement. And if any company feels that they have to comply with their national law or review European protection law, basically I would have supported that.

I had the chance to do it the other mailing list, I missed it. So it was close.

Tony Holmes: But the point is I think we took that action is in line with what you actually want to achieve. So we may not have managed to embrace your words but we embrace the spirit of that I think within our now recommendation.

Thank you for that, it is an important issue. And we will watch very carefully to see what happens with that and make sure everyone is aware of the outcome.

So with that I'm going to draw this meeting to a close. I would ask those who aren't members of the ISP constituency now, leave us to debate some of our own internal issues at this stage. Thank you very much for coming. I hope everybody signed the list of (unintelligible). If you haven't, please do.

Man: You haven't signed.

Tony Holmes: I haven't signed yet. And for those who are members, if you'd like to leave a business card so I can follow up I would be very pleased to do that. And to those who joined us on the link, thank you very much. We really appreciate your participation, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, for those of you that are in the Adobe Room, I'm going to boot you out unless you tell me that you're members. (Mark's) all ready gone. He's out of here.

So we're going to shut down the Adobe connect session for those who are still with us. Thanks for joining us and we'll see you on the calls, those of you who are members. Those of you who aren't members, now you can join and participate in this ventilating conversation.

Good, good, talk to this guy.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think we can hang up the call and kill the - no Web stream, no nothing. I think we're done with Adobe too, I think we're going to shut down.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, all right, terrific. Cool, all right. See you gang.

END