EDITS SUBMITTED BY THE RySG

ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
June 26, 2012

Registries Stakeholder Group
Morning Session

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.

Jeff Neuman: The application evaluations that were from 185,000 be treated the same as the excess received from an auction. And I think our point that at least some of us have discussed was that they should not be treated the same.

The applicants went into the application process understanding that auction proceeds would go, and the community could decide what to do with those. But applicants understood that the 185,000 was for a cost recovery program. And by definition, if you've recovered your costs, the rest should be refunded to the applicants.

And I just want to make sure that we do not set the expectation now with the community that they will have $50 million, $100 million or whatever to decide what to do with. I think it's really for the applicants to determine if they want the money back or whether it should be distributed.

I mean they could always give the money back to ICANN as some people have - I believe I saw (Frank Schilling) that sent around an email saying he's

happy to have ICANN have the money, and that's great and he can do that. I think the other applicants should get the money back.

Frank Schilling: You know, I was just trying to make a point, which is everybody's chasing nickels around the table. ICANN's chronically underfunded, I think, you know. And I think the grand scheme, having a little extra cash on hand isn't a terrible thing. ICANN's culture is not going to change overnight because they came into a bunch of money. And that's just for the record.

David Maher~~Man~~: Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Thank you. I just number one want to echo Jeff's comments. Number two, in response to (Frank), in worst case scenario, (Frank), they're looking at $200 million. So it's just a little more than a little bit of extra cash.

I think it's going to boil down to - surplus is going to boil down to a situation where ICANN's going to look at this thing and say, "Okay, fine. We've recovered a cost. We have to be able to fund contingent liability, contingent legal costs."

What I propose, and the comment I made on the proposal on the operating budget, was basically this needs to be done in a way that's independently verified. Those of you who are lawyers and accountants know full well that as we move further from the introduction of these TLDs, the legal exposure actually would decrease.

We're going to get a significant potential for exposure in the first year. But three years after these things are released, that exposure's significantly lower. So I could understand a situation where they may want an escrow or have available a larger fund in the early years.

But I also see a situation where it could very easily be justified that these funds be returned to the applicants over a period of time, because number one I don't think it's incumbent on us to fund future application efforts. If they can realize economies of scale for future applicants as a result of the processes here, then those applicants can benefit in the cost recovery program for the next round.

But and I'm in complete understanding there are many of us in the room -- including Chuck and myself, and many members of the Board like (Bruce) -- who from day one acknowledged that this was supposed to be a process designed to recover the ICANN cost.

I've also had comments from directors who indicated in a very polite way that (Rob) was way off base and (unintelligible) when he said that the community would decide what to do with all the surplus and everything. It's always been our understanding that, as Jeff indicated, the auction funds had a completely different nature than the application fees. Thank you.

David Maher~~Man~~: Okay, (Jonathan)?

Jonathan Robinson~~(Jonathan)~~: Thanks. My (unintelligible) a follow-on from Ken's. And I think my understanding is that we could ask the question about the principle now, and then maybe an answer on the principle, because there's two issues.

Ultimately there's a calculation of the amount that's quite sophisticated, as Ken said, that may involve future audit. It might mean putting something aside which then trickles back at a later date.

But the critical point for now is to establish the principle. So I'm not sure if you're in a position to answer that, but it would be helpful to understand if that principle of the refund of excess application fees is - you can clarify that.

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Yeah, so to me it's a new idea that - I remember the past discussion, too, and I remember the past discussion being that excess fees would go to reducing future fees. And so if, you know, I see this is on your agenda for the Board, and I urge you to bring it up with them, sort of a proposal for them.

Man: Thank you.

~~Man~~Kurt Pritz: And I really, really want to talk about the - you know, we don't have much time, and I really...

Man: Yeah.

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Want to talk about staffing, because we have a...

Man: Yeah.

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Why don't we move to that? We have a number of nine or so people we're going to add to registry liaison this year, and plans for future growth. And we have, you know, some idea of how to go about that and want to have people dispersed around the world to a certain extent. But I want to hear from you how you'd like to see that go.

And since we're talking about staffing, I want to introduce (Gustavo Losano), who's the newest member of the registry liaison team. Everybody clap for (Gustavo). I'm clapping because I'm very pleased that he's here. He's from (Dot MX), and so reported to be cut from the same mold as (Francisco). And

if he is, that's going to be a terrific resource for registries and us. Who should we hire next? What sort of skills and how should we be organized?

Man: I'm not raising my hand to be hired. I just have a question. Anyway, so the first question - let me just go over the registry/registrar summit in LA. We had kind of discussed a model of kind of changing the nature of the role of liaison to more of a specialist or more of an account owner.

And I think liaison in the past has really meant, you know, we send a message to the liaison. The liaison then sends it back and, you know, there's weeks of time that go by, whereas I don't think we can afford to continue in that manner.

We really need account owners that have the answers and have the ability and the authority -- let me say that. It's more important. Because I think our current liaisons do have the answers and do have the knowledge and expertise, but I don't feel like what they have is the authority to answer all of the questions. And I think that's going to be key. Give them the authority to handle accounts on a day-to-day nature.

And the question I have now is so now we have a bunch of registry liaisons. Is there a head registry liaison? Who is the first point of contact for all of us? And then obviously you could divide out the work. But who's the first point of contact?

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Well so I just want to flesh it out a little bit. So I remember you discussing the concept of account managers. So you would call your account manager. How would you have them - how would you organize it?

Would you organize it geographically? Or by type of TLD? Or just a certain - you'd see a certain span of control that would be effective -- you know, one account manager for so many TLDs? What - and it's something we don't have to sort out here, but when we organize it, we want to organize in a way that's...

Man: Isn't the question, given for the at least next year or so, who is our principle point of contact?

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Let me just change it a little bit. I think there's a specific point of contact for the stakeholder group.

Man: Right.

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: As a stakeholder group. And then I think there may be, like you said, if they're account owners or whatever, there may be separate points of contact for the applicants or the specific registries.

And as far as how to organize them, I mean by geography makes some sense simply because, you know, they have about the same hours as those that they would support. As far as how many accounts per rep, I mean that's a whole - you know, we do this in our individual companies, right?

Man: Right.

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: We take the amount of - we estimate the number of hours it is to support them. We estimate, you know, for commercial companies, the amount of revenue brought in. And we do all sorts of complicated models to do that.

Unfortunately I don't have the data to do that for you all. But if you want to give me the data, I can help with it. But I think that's, you know - so I would

say first by geography so they could support and have the same hours as their customers, and then how many is to be determined.

Man: Yeah. Endemic in all of this discussion is one basic problem that I've seen, and I've had a lot of discussions with other people in other constituencies. Right now the communication process between constituents and ICANN is somewhat driven by legal exposure.

So what happens basically is, in many cases, we'll send a request or communication up to somebody at ICANN. And they may prepare a response to that almost immediately, but it gets log-jammed in legal, because literally what's happening is a significant amount of this stuff has to be vetted with legal before it can come back.

So it won't do any good to hire nine people if the responses that they are making to you get clogged in the legal department at ICANN.

So I'm hoping that, as you move forward your expansion process, you can develop guidelines and make it easier for these kind of communications to be stratified in a way that our expectations - because what happens is the messenger, the person you sent the communication to, ends up being the ass.

You don't realize that they answered the next day, and that it's getting held up someplace else, and you don't get it for two weeks. So I hope you understand my concerns, (Kurt). Thanks. And you are the man. I mean between you and (Akram), you set the tone for this. So...

David Maher(Kurt): Probably less of a demand than you think. But your point's well taken. Okay, we're running short of time and we want to get to the confusingly

similar issue. Chuck, I think you're the best man to be the spokesperson for this.

Chuck Gomes: (Kurt)Kurt and I spent, I think, enough time on this in LA. I think you (Kurt) did have a part in commonpoint at the end of that discussion -- I don't know if you remember that or not -- where we neverdidn't really followed through on that. If that's something else that you wanted to suggestdiscuss on that, I don't know.

Let me just keep it simple rather than rehashing the whole issue, because we've been through it many times. I would just - I mean do you have anything to add on that? Or have we already visited it enough?

Kurt Pritz(Kurt): Well there's a review, so if two strings are found confusingly similar by the panel, there'll be an independent recheck of that. So our confusingly similar panel is (unintelligible). What? Okay.

So anyway, we have a - and then in instances where strings are found to be so similar that they would be put into a contention, that will be reviewed by (Inner Aisle)Interisle. So we have two firms working on it, so there's sort of an automatic appeal for each issue of finding similarity.

Chuck GomesMan: Thanks. That's helpful information. The question is, in that appeal, will they look further than just the strings? That's been the concern all along, because as with the ccTLDs, there was an exception made in a similar case that because two strings can be visually similar, but offered in a way that does not create confusion.

And that's the critical thing. If the appeal doesn't look a little bit further than just the strings, then we can have false positives that will occur on that. And you know the point. We've hashed it over a lot.

Kurt Prtiz~~Man~~: Can we write that up somehow? Like what factors should that panel take into account? So say the first panel just looks at similarity, and then the second panel would look at factors and mitigation of the - you know, it's going to look and see if it finds it visually similar, too. But if it takes into account perhaps other factors that would mitigate that...

Chuck Gomes~~Man~~: Good question. I think it comes down to one question that goes beyond just the visual similarity. And that is, is the string offered in a way that would mitigate confusion?

For example, okay? And we've used this example before. For (Dot KOM) -- this would apply to any of our IDN applications -- our plan is to offer it in such a way that the only person who could register a name would be the one who is associated with the second-level name in ASCII dot com, so that you don't have different registrants with different versions of that, so it maintains the ubiquity of dot com and protects the brand there.

So it wouldn't create any confusion. In fact, we've talked to the intellectual property people about this. They love it, because it does avoid those. And because we're the same operator offering that, it's very easy to manage.

So the key question to consider is, is it being offered in a way that eliminates or almost totally eliminates any confusion that would exist in other circumstances? Now if you want more than that, let me know. We can...

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Yeah, I think so, okay, because you kind of merged the variant discussion, right? What are the set of rules under which you delegate variants in a way that ensures a good user experience and avoids (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes~~Man~~: Right. And they key again in the GNSO recommendation - and this was recommended by the GNSO Council in an approved motion that we look further than - there be some appeal process. So I like that there's an appeal process, but they have to look further than just the visual similarity...

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes~~Man~~: To determine whether or not those factors (unintelligible).

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: (Unintelligible)/

~~Man~~Kurt Pritz: Oh, sorry.

David Maher~~Man~~: Do we have a moment to talk about the IDN bundling? Okay, just one minute. Okay, Ching or (Terry), did either one of you want to - go ahead.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: That concludes it then. All right, well thank you. See you guys...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh, sorry. I was going to - on the appeal, I think I wasn't sure, the appeal process, whether the applicants would actually have an opportunity to...

Man: Yes or no.

Man: Present something. I don't know that that's fully formed.

Man: Right.

Man: But I would hope that...

Man: Yeah.

Man: You did have an opportunity...

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~:   Yes.

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~:   To, yeah. And as to the point you asked Chuck, you know, is there something
                we can give you, I would love to be able to, you know, help provide
                guidelines for that. So how do we give input into that process, since it's going
                to get underway probably fairly quickly?

Chuck Gomes~~Man~~:   Right. So I don't want - so let's not characterize it as an appeal
                (unintelligible). But it's an automatic re-review of any strings that are found to
                be similar. And so what Chuck was suggesting was providing that there
                should be criteria in that review other than just the same criteria as the first
                panel used. So that's all we wanted to talk about forming.

Man: Oh, yeah. And then on that second review, would there be an opportunity for
                the affected parties to have input into that?

Man: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz~~Man~~: Yeah, so right now it's no, because they're just looking at exactly the same thing. It's just another set of eyes that assure we're taking this, you know, kind of big step to say this TLD shouldn't be in the (unintelligible). And so if we're going to try to modify that with an extended review or some sort of different review, that's what we have to talk about -- how to do that.

Chuck Gomes: And what the GNSO suggested was -- and this follows on what (Brett) was saying; this is Chuck again -- that you could even use the extended evaluation process if the second appeal used that, so that there could be some interaction between the two to deal with exactly what your concern is.

David Maher~~Man~~: Well anyway, thank you very much. (Kurt), we appreciate the time you've spent with us. Thank you very much everyone.

Moving along on our agenda, we have three items under the agenda reviews. The first one, stakeholder group meeting, I'll treat as just a very brief update. We had a joint meeting, breakfast meeting, on Monday, (X-com)s of the registries and the registrars.

We talked a little bit about the RAA, and we also talked about the positions of the two groups, and at least I think the general agreement in principle that voting will be separate for the two groups. In other words, a registry or a registrar that - put it this way. A registrar that is operating a registry will not be allowed to vote in both stakeholder groups.

Anyone want to add to that? If not, I will move right to the agenda for our meeting with the Board at 1 o'clock this afternoon. We now have two agendas -- one that we developed and another that was furnished to us by the Board just yesterday.

And there's not really an overlap. Our topics that we suggested for the Board -
- the impact of new gTLDs on ICANN staff, which we just discussed; impact
of new gTLDs on the group, which has to do with our organization; and then
refunds of the surplus.

The Board, however, has asked for our input on three separate issues. First,
the RAA. Second, the issue of the Whois -- what duties should be performed
by the GNSO? What duties should be performed by staff? And then third, the
planning cycle for budget and operations.

I thought about this. I think when we meet with the Board, we're really
obligated to ask them which agenda they want to do first. Anyone have any
other thoughts on that? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. I think it's actually the opposite. They have suggested topics,
but they really come in to listen to us. So if we feel like we have agenda items
that we want to cover, it's up to us to - really this is our time. It's not their
time.

I know how weird that sounds, but they come to us - or we're actually going to
their room. But essentially they're coming to us. They want to hear from us
our chief concerns. It's a time for input, and frankly I don't want to spend
much time talking about the Whois review team when there's so much bigger
issues that we have.

So I think if you take the subjects that we had proposed - plus they do want to
hear from us on batching. I'm not sure if that was on your list. But I do know
from - they've at least been going around saying that they promised the GAC,

or the GAC had submitted a letter with advice strongly recommending - or advice saying that the Board needs to get input from the groups.

So we need to add batching to the list, because that's a requirement. And as far as everything else, it's our topics. And then if we have time, we got to theirs.

David Maher~~Man~~: Okay, I can accept that. Any other thoughts? Okay, then that brings us to the agenda for the meeting this afternoon about 4 o'clock with the registrars.

The topics that I have -- changes to the respective bylaws to avoid conflicts and crossover in membership, assuming that vertical integration takes place. And I mentioned that before, and again I think based on a conversation with the two (X-com)s, there's at least agreement in principle on that.

The second item is standardizing the on-boarding format. Third is RAA negotiations, which will be an update. There may be some developments there. General issues regarding the council, GNSO council, and the contracted party house. And finally new gTLD issues. So at its - yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so I know we have on there RAA negotiation updates. I think one thing that we want to probably discuss as a group is I think the registrars really need us on a couple key items.

And I think we should provide support on these items, more particularly on the recent addition by ICANN staff on the change to the definition of consensus policies. And the second one is on the addition in to the registrar agreements of a revocation clause.

So the first one on consensus policies is that basically ICANN has added a provision on their own without consulting the registrars that says that the

entire RAA is now subject to the picket fence, which basically means that, you know, there is no picket fence.

So I think that's a very significant clause. I actually raised it at the RAA meeting yesterday, and a bunch of registrars came up to me and said, "We didn't even know that that was in there."

And then the second one is on the revocation clause. What ICANN says is in the event that ICANN reasonably determines unilaterally that the model is no longer working, that they can revoke their agreements with all the registrars and adopt a new business model. And then it says but don't worry, registrars are free to apply for that subsequent entity if that were to exist.

So I think it's ludicrous. I think, you know, ICANN (unintelligible) added it on their own. No one had asked for it. And frankly now I think it's a huge danger, and it's not the kind of precedent we want to set, because I don't want to see in my next agreement that they can revoke our agreement if they determine that the registry model doesn't work.

And so I jokingly but not so jokingly had suggested a mutual clause if they were going to do revocation, which is that the registrars can determine unilaterally to revoke their agreement in the event that they determine that ICANN is not the appropriate entity to be managing registrar accreditation, but that and the registrars are free to adopt a new mechanism. And, of course, ICANN would be eligible to apply to be that new entity.

Half of it's a joke, but the seriousness really needs to be pointed out.

David Maher~~Man~~: Okay. Anyone? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Well first of all, let me compliment Jeff on the job he did yesterday. It may have been a joke, but it was very effective. It got the point across really well. And those two points really are key on that issue.

So, you know, this kind of thing, this kind of approach, is one that we'd have to be careful of, because it'll be used on us next. So they really did try the one clause, a similar clause, on our agreement as well.

Now the - I want to refer to one other person's comment. He actually got up twice. Bill Smith from PayPal was trying to make the case yesterday that there shouldn't even be negotiations between ICANN and the registrars -- that ICANN should basically just dictate the terms because registrars are they're a service providers.

I only bring that up not for us to discuss here, but - and I hope something like that wouldn't get any traction. But let's beware. Let's watch and so forth. So...

Keith Drazek: This is Keith Drazek. What's the best path for supporting the registrars in this beyond, for example, making public comments? Is there something we should consider -- drafting a letter or a formal comment from the stakeholder group?

David MaherMan: Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, a couple of things. First of all, the registrars should be using actions like this to argue with the GAC that the impatience that's being shown in their not being able to complete the contract with ICANN is, in some cases, the result of actions like this.

Also I think we need to bring up to the Board - I'm not saying we do it today. But in opportunities to discuss and support, I'd actually go further than saying

this is not a public commenting. This is - if we comment, we need to start doing it more often in that forum by sending direct correspondence to the Board, because I'm going to guess that most members of the Board don't even know some of the shenanigans that are being pulled.

And frankly it's unconscionable that things like this get stuck in it. This is supposed to be a collaborative effort between constituencies and ICANN. It's not supposed to be an authoritarian regime.

David Maher~~Man~~: Thanks, Ken. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. I can't help but call your attention to one of the other comments that was made in that session by (Judith Vasquez). It was very good. Now if you know (Judith), she's one of our Board members and she's very brief, so you don't have to read very much or listen very long.

But in response to a law enforcement comment, she basically said, "I'm a registrant, and you give me a call on the phone," which is what they were talking about. "I don't know you. I'm not going to trust you."

So let's not assume when we're talking with the Board that Board members don't have some other perspectives. And (Judith) is one that knows the issues with regard to registrations pretty well. So if you have a chance, you might want to listen to that one or read the transcript.

Ken Stubbs: So you're advocating we shouldn't talk to the Board members or lobby with Board members about stuff like this?

Chuck Gomes: Not at all, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: It was just - it was a surprising comment, though, coming from a Board
                 member that she sees both sides.

Ken Stubbs: Well, you know, we have representatives from the GNSO. And I don't really
                 think that people like (unintelligible) conflicted out in a situation like this of
                 making themselves heard up there, even though he's affiliated with the
                 registrar. Sometimes it's part of the educational process.

David Maher~~Man~~: (Unintelligible). Anything further on the agenda with the registrars? If not, we
                 can move along to the - oh, go ahead.

David Maher~~Man~~: Sure, yeah. Keith just whispered but he should have said it. What is the action
                 item? I think if we're in support on these two issues - and maybe Chuck can
                 weigh in, too. But if we're in support of this, you know, why not go to the mic
                 at the public forum and tell the Board that we're in support of the registrars on
                 this issue?

David Maher~~Man~~: Roy Dykes has raised his hand.

Roy Dykes: Hello? I'm here.

David Maher~~Man~~: Roy, can you hear us?

Roy Dykes: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?

David Maher~~Man~~: Yeah. Go ahead.

Roy Dykes: The only thing I was going to suggest on the joint meeting was that we strike Number 2, the on-boarding. We're going to have a separate session with ICANN staff and the registrars and registries as a follow-up to the discussion that we had last month in Los Angeles, and this effort has been ongoing for quite some months now.

We're going to have a follow-up session on that next month. It deserves its own time. And so that's not something that we need to discuss today. And that also serves as my update to Section 9, Number 1, as well.

David Maher~~Man~~: All right. Thank you. That adds. That's very helpful for getting through our agenda today. I appreciate that.

Roy Dykes: Sure.

David Maher~~(David)~~: Okay, turning then to the list of issues for public comment, as I understand it, we currently have two drafts that are being circulated -- one involving the conflict of interest issue in (Epix); and the other involving the registrar transfer policy. Are there any other draft comments that are out? I think not.

I'm watching the schedule on those two, and if you have not - the members have not already voted on either one of those issues, please do so so that we can get the Board and the Council the full level of our member support.

Running down this list one by one, the first one is the proposal for a revised process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership. 28 June, which is two days, I don't believe we have time to consider comments on that.

The second is Whois policy review team, 11 July. There's more time, and a - okay.

Chuck Gomes: (David)David Maher, this is Chuck. Note that on both of those we did submit comments in the regular comment period. It's just a reply period we're talking about.

David Maher(David): Okay, thank you. Then third, the ICANN's role (unintelligible) security and stability and resiliency. I believe we've also - nothing there. The Whois proxy privacy reveal and relay feasibility survey, initial comments were actually due yesterday. That takes care of that.

Then preliminary GNSO issue report, protection of the international organization names -- this is the Olympic/Red Cross issue. Again, comments were due yesterday. And that brings us to draft ICANN language on services policy and procedures. Go ahead.

Jeff NeumanMan: No on that, sorry, but it's kind of on the whole - I mean you're joking - I mean you're not joking. You're reading these times and they're all, you know, comments due yesterday all during the ICANN meeting.

And so I just wanted to fill you in on a discussion that some of us had. Before every meeting there's a SOAC dinner with the CEO. It's usually just the GNSO council chair. So it's usually Stephane who meets with the CEO and the chairs of the other organizations for dinner on the Friday.

And Stephane couldn't go, so I was able to attend. And one of the key items that we discussed was the fact that we have all these comment periods or reply periods that occur during the week of ICANN, or even the week before or even the week after ICANN. And ICANN, the CEO basically - and the new CEO was there as well as - so (Akram) was there, who's the interim CEO after Friday.

And they all agreed that in the future they will try not to have any kind of comment periods that end during the week of ICANN, the week before or the week after -- that they're going to try to basically institute an informal new process of asking the stakeholder groups and constituencies whether they intend to submit a comment, so they know that if it's going to be a day or two late, their constituency stakeholder groups should be able to send that message to ICANN staff so that they know there's a comment in.

Or even if there's a request to extend the period by any stakeholder group or - I think that one might come up through that, so before the comment period. So all of these things that you're reading, it's not that - and we told this to the CEO.

It's not that we're not interested in these subjects. It's not that we don't have any comments. We just don't have any capacity or time to respond to them.

David Maher(David): Good point. Thanks. I think we got down to the services policy and procedures. Then there's another due date -- security, stability and resiliency framework. Then the registrar transfer policy where -- thanks to (Carolyn) and others -- we already have comments pending. Again, please vote if you have not already voted. And then...

Man: (Unintelligible).

David Maher(David): I believe so.

Man: (Barbara) wanted to comment.

(Barbara):   (David)David Maher, this is (Barbara).

(David)David Maher: Oh, please. Go ahead.

Barbara Knight:(Barbara): I don't believe that that has actually gone out for a formal vote yet. I was receiving comments from everybody. And thank you, (Carolyn), for providing the latest group of comments, which have been incorporated into the latest draft.

If there are no further comments, I would like to propose that we do formally put it out for a vote, since it's due to be submitted. I believe the closing period for those comments are July 4.

(David)David Maher: Thanks, (Barbara). We'll do that.

Barbara Knight(Barbara): Thank you.

(David)David Maher: Then the next item is the community input on formulation of the 2013-2016 strategic plan. Do we have proposal for comments on that? Okay, then the conflict of interest review. Those comments are out for vote and, as I said before, please vote.

And then finally Number 11, more on security, stability and resiliency. If there are no other discussion of the pending votes or pending issues, we can move to the next agenda topic.

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan): Just a quick comment before we move off those. I mean I'm just thinking about the request for - on the strategic plan. I mean we had a joint GNSO/(CCNSO) Council lunch yesterday, which is part of the regular schedule.

And I mean I think I'd probably just go so far at this stage to encourage people to be aware of the work that the (CCNSO) does. They're pretty comprehensive. They've got teams dedicated to working on - groups dedicated to working on strategic plan and financial plan, and the kind of work that they do is at least worth being informed of and reading, and being aware of the comments that are being submitted through that, through them.

(David)David Maher: Thank you, (Jonathan). Anyone else? Okay, moving to GNSO and ICANN updates, Chuck, you mentioned on-boarding. Does that appropriately come under this topic or...

Chuck Gomes: It wasn't on-boarding. It was outreach.

(David)David Maher: I'm sorry, outreach.

Chuck Gomes: Outreach. We can cover it now if you'd like. I'd like to...

(David)David Maher: Yeah, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Just bring everybody up to date, and the councilors may be able to help on this somewhat. One minute historical recap here. One of the five working teams that were established to develop an implementation plan for GNSO improvements, going back several years, was the one on GNSO outreach.

So the Board approved GNSO improvement recommendations that the GNSO should develop an outreach program. That team came back with some recommendations, and I did participate some in that, part when I was chair and after I was chair a little bit.

But we as a group were okay with the recommendations. The recommendations were approved by the Council, and they formed a drafting team to develop a charter for what is called an outreach task force.

A motion was put forward on the Council to approve that charter - and forgive me, and you guys may have to correct me on this a little bit. But either it failed or didn't get a second or something. And I think there was an assumption that the business constituency was going to come back with some more information there.

Regardless - and I'll let you correct me in a second. Let me just finish the history. This thing has been dangling. Another motion was put forward later for some sort of change, and I don't recall right off what that was. That didn't go anywhere. Meantime, the Council has never done anything with this.

We had a meeting this week of a little group that was formed in Costa Rica to try and reach some sort of a resolution. Basically what happened in that meeting was they kind of decided well let's just kind of let this thing go by the wayside, put it on the consent agenda and let it go by the wayside.

Personally, I'm really uncomfortable with that. A working team worked for a couple of years on developing this thing, and it was refined a lot. They were really reaching out and asking for a lot more when it started.

I reviewed the charter yesterday. You know, it's not that bad. It's an outreach task force that will come back with some recommendations for outreach and so forth. My own personal opinion -- this is my personal opinion, okay -- is that it would be good if that motion to approve the charter was put forward again.

And I think that Bill Drake, for example, would probably put it forward as a councilor, because Olga put the motion forward, and of course she's not on the Council anymore -- the original motion -- and that one of our councilors second it if we're supportive of going forward with that.

Now it may fail. I don't know. But we should at least make a concrete decision on the Council in terms of what to do with those recommendations, rather than just kind of letting it fall by the wayside. That's my opinion. Please, Jeff, bring me up to date if there's anything I was incorrect on.

Jeff Neuman: I think you were correct. I think the only issue with this, and the reason why we've not been so - I mean I agree with you on the fact that outreach is basically harmless. For whatever reason - and I don't fully understand it. Maybe (Jonathan).

For whatever reason, the business constituency vehemently opposes this, because I think in - well let's put it this way. In their leader's, the BC's chair's, mind, she believes that that work should be done by the stakeholder group chairs and by the individual constituencies, as opposed to the Council.

And this is a very big - it still is a very big issue with her. And the constituency has gotten behind it for, you know, right or wrong. And, you know, and I am actually starting to get a little bit tired of that position, because I think basically what overall what the BC is trying to do is strip the Council of all of its power, simply because the chair's not - has different views.

And so again I think at the time it was something that we did not want to go against because, you know, it wasn't that - it wasn't our highest priority. And

we didn't think it was worth the battle. And I still think, you know, we need to decide.

While I totally agree with you it seems harmless, it's outreach and it's, you know, motherhood and apple pie -- as we say in the United States -- the real question is, is this an issue that's worth going toe-to-toe with the business constituency? And so that's what we all need to discuss.

Chuck GomesMan: And just one correction. It's not the Council doing it. This task force would have two representatives from each stakeholder group and/or constituency. It does not have to be councilors. It would come back to the Council, so in that part it's right -- any recommendations for outreach that they would make. And of course it's dependent on funding, too.

Jeff Neuman: Well, yeah, and thank you for that. And we raised that in response, and the principle that the BC (unintelligible) is yeah, but it's a working group that's controlled by the Council, meaning they report to the Council. And that in and of itself was offensive in her words.

So again, I personally don't - I think outreach is a good thing. I think it sent the wrong message to the community when we voted it down. But is this an issue that we, the registry stakeholder group, want to go fight tooth and nail with the business constituency? So that's really the decision in my mind.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck again. You know, I don't see it as a fight. I see it as a vote. If the motion's made again, if it passes, fine. If it doesn't, I don't see an ongoing fight. But I think that's a cleaner approach than what we talked about in the little work crafting team session the other day.

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan):   So, Chuck, you know, in a sense you suggest

(unintelligible) putting it back on the agenda, and then putting it to bed one

way or another without putting a whole lot of emotion or effort into it. It's

simply, in one sense, housekeeping.

Chuck Gomes: Correct. But if we're not willing to support the motion, I don't think we want

to have one of our councilors second it, okay? So I think we need to have a

feel that we would support it, because that's going to make us look kind of

foolish otherwise.

(David)David Maher: Any other discussion on that? If not, we can move to the...

Man: Sorry, (David)David. I think Chuck's point was he wanted to get a feeling.

And I'm asking the same question. How does everybody else feel? Do they

support it? Do they not support it? We shouldn't just move on to the next

subject without kind of getting a feeling from the rest of the group.

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan):   It's (Jonathan). I'll just make one other remark. I suspect

this is quite difficult to get a feel for, because one of the thoughts that strikes

me is - although, Chuck, I took your point. The GNSO is commissioning an

outreach task force rather than doing it.

Is one of the BC arguments that this is somehow outside of the scope of the

GNSO? Because I mean I would imagine that the point might be -- and I don't

know this for sure -- that the GNSO should be making policy and

concentrating on its core business, and this is overstepping the mark, if you

like.

Chuck Gomes: So, Chuck again. Sorry. One of (Marilyn)'s key points - and Jeff hit it right on

the head in terms of where this is coming from, okay? One of the points is that

outreach should be done by stakeholder groups and constituencies. That's fine. This task force can come back with that as the approach. No problem.

(David)David Maher: Well in order to move this along, can you put this in a yes/no, black and white question that we ask the group to vote on?

Chuck Gomes: Well I won't do that now, because what I should do - I'll do it in the email, okay? So it won't take a lot of time today. And I'll send it out, because we can resolve this over the - it can't happen at the Council meeting anyway this week. So I'll send the charter along as well, and the original motion, okay?

(David)David Maher: Okay, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Now by the way, the charter will have to be updated because the dates in it are - now in terms of implementation dates would have to be updated.

Man: And so, Chuck, so are you saying just to make it - make it clear. So are you saying that some of us should bring this up in the (AOB) session during the Council meeting just to give everyone a heads up? Or...

Chuck Gomes: No. Well that's up to you. I wasn't necessarily suggesting that. I'm just suggesting that if we're supportive - and that's the first decision we as a stakeholder group need to decide.

If we're supporting it, if there's no opposition to that, we can ask - I can ask Bill Drake to resubmit the motion -- and I'm noting that the dates have to be updated in the charter -- to approve the charter. And that if, again, we're supportive, one of our councilors would second it. And then according to Council procedures, it would be voted on again.

(David)David Maher: Thanks, Chuck. Okay, then, Jeff, Ching, got up in the motions for the GNSO Council meeting. Ready to talk about those?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. So there are two motions that are currently on the Council agenda. The first one -- which was actually deferred from the June 7 meeting, so it does need to get voted on -- is the motion to address Whois access as recommended by the registration abuse policies work group - or, sorry, working group.

And essentially that motion is one that we had - if it wasn't deferred, we had decided previously to vote against. And the registrars were also against this motion.

But to just go a little bit into it, one of the result clauses is essentially that we recommend that the issue of Whois access and, parentheses -- and this is important so I'm reading it -- to ensure that Whois data is accessible in an appropriately, reliable, enforceable and consistent fashion, which does not violate freedom of expression, privacy and related rights, is included in the RAA policy development process when it commences.

We had - there's some more in it, but that's essentially the main part of it. We had gotten some wording changed so that it doesn't say - or actually we didn't get the wording changed at the end, which is the RAA development process, because I think we were going to vote against it.

But essentially this comes out of a 2009 report that the RAP put out, which is four - three years old now. And it's completely taken out of context. In the actual report, it was talking about -- when it talked about Whois access -- it was talking about access to (Port 43). And it was talking about SLAs for registrars in displaying Whois information.

And this is by the way, the danger of having executive summaries and people only reading executive summaries, because the business constituency and others took this to mean not the service being reliable and enforceable, but the data itself being reliable and enforceable and consistent.

And I think those are two incredibly different things. And, in fact, Mikey O'Connor did us a favor. Mikey's with the business constituency, but also he was on the...

Chuck Gomes~~Man~~: Just a correction. He's no longer with the BC. He's with the ISP. And it was the ISPs that put the motion forward.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, that's right. Thank you. Sorry. So Mikey got up there - I thought you were going to say he's no longer Mikey, but he's Mike.

So he got up there and he clarified to his own constituency rep, (Wolf), who made the motion that this was not intended to be about the data, but to be about the service -- took sort of the wind out of (Wolf)'s sails, I think. I'm not even sure that this won't be withdrawn. I think that's our goal, is to get this withdrawn.

But, you know, in the end we're going to vote against it like we had planned to at the last meeting. And I believe the registrars will as well. And we can - I think there's always time to discuss that with them.

But I think it's very serious, and it's something I'd like to make a point about, of people not just reading the executive summaries and taking it out of context.

Man: So that's the first motion.

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan):   So it's (Jonathan). I think just one minor postscript to that. I think we need to articulate that. It just strikes me just hearing you, Jeff, that we've got to be careful not to be seen to be voting against something which is to do with the reliability or accessibility of Whois. And so we need to explain our position, assuming it doesn't get withdrawn. I believe that the vote against is correct, but I think we just need to make sure we explain it adequately.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, (Jonathan). I think to add to that, you know, the reason we were voting against -- even if it was narrowly construed to just (Port 43) and SLAs -- is that we believe it's been overtaken with recent events.

                    So (Port 43) is pretty much resolved now, and they're talking about it in the negotiations. So it's going to be resolved very shortly, as well as the SLAs are being negotiated by the registrars as well. And we believe that's going to be made - that issue will go away.

                    And that's what Mikey had said, is that these are no longer really issues and, you know, you shouldn't even move forward with the motion.

                    Okay, the second motion is to approve the international (unintelligible) registration data working group final report. And actually I'm going to turn this over to Ching to talk about it.

Ching Chiao: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: You've got much more experience...

Ching Chiao: Well thank you, Jeff. And this is Ching. And actually we have also - I mean circulated this motion and had some discussion in our mailing list. And during

the GNSO Council work session on Saturday, we also had some discussion about first of all how this motion - actually this report has been staying, you know, staying quiet for some time.

It was actually brought up by the Board, and then, you know, just a while back. And then the Council did discuss this in our last Council meeting, and with the revised final report from the (ASAC).

And basically this is about - just to recap, this report is about the internalization of the registration data, which this report is aiming to, I mean, just develop some recommendation including setting up some models and also some access - I mean the protocol - I mean even contractually whether there should be issue report or potentially a PDP for registry and registrar contracts.

So it seems to me personally this is a less controversial subject, and I know that we had some discussion on the procedural question, is whether the GNSO should have a position at this point before we submit the report to the Board. I guess we had discussion with (unintelligible) who put together, and actually (Julie), who put together or helped put together this motion.

So the motion was made by Stephane, and during the meeting was seconded by Zahid, if I remember correctly. And, yeah, I mean this is open for discussion. I know, Chuck, you have some thoughts on this. But we have discussed that on Saturday, I mean the work session.

So there is some contractual elements or potentially, I mean, elements in this motion. But it seems that - I mean in the motion it does provide some place for the (unintelligible) saying that if there's any policy - I mean implication, this - I mean this goes back to GNSO for further discussion.

So the purpose of this motion is simply to have the report for - I mean to submit the report for the Board. Thank you.

(David)David Maher: Thank you, Ching. Any discussion? All right. (Barbara), if you'll give us a report, transfer policy?

Barbara Knight(Barbara): Thank you, (David)David Maher. This is (Barbara). Basically the only update that I really have is that tomorrow there will be a meeting and an update of the IRTP working group. That will be happening in the (Carlin) Room from 9:00 to 11:00 in the morning.

Other than that, we're on hiatus until the next regularly scheduled meeting, which is scheduled for the 10th of July. Again, the comments are out there for any additional comments that you all may have. And if nobody has any, then if we can have (Sherry)Cherie go ahead and kick off the formal voting on that, that would be great. That's all I have.

(David)David Maher: Okay, thank you. And we also will get to work on the draft comments. That brings us to the Whois updates. Michael Young's not here. I think he stepped out. But well, Jeff, do you want to talk about the thick Whois?

Jeff Neuman: No, I think this item should actually be dropped off our agendas until later this year, because I think the resolution that was passed talks about it in November, when it will come back up again.

I'd also like to just say, just a kind of point of order on the agenda, if we could spend some time talking about the Board meeting -- assigning owners for each subject; maybe going through a couple minutes of what we're actually going to say to them, that would, you know, that would be great.

(David)David Maher: That's a good idea. There's one other item, but it is actually for this afternoon. (Akram) and/or (Xavier) will be here to talk about the budget and operational plan.

So at this point I think it would be a good idea to take a break, and then when we come back we'll talk about the Board meeting, if that's agreeable. So I think we have - we're expecting Patrick Falstrom and Jim Galvin at about 11:30. That's - well we can have a 20-minute break.

Man: No.

(David)David Maher: No? No? Okay. Yeah, all right. You're right. Fifteen-minute break, and that will be enforced. I will be here at 11:00 and we will resume, or else.

Cherie Stubbs(Cherie): And (David)David Maher, this is (Cherie).

Coffee is available on the lower level. That's the only place they are providing any coffee down by the exhibit booths.

(David)David Maher: Okay.

(Cherie)Cherie Stubbs: Nothing on...

(David)David Maher: Thank you. Okay. It's after 11 o'clock. The man who insisted that we start at 11:00 is back. So if he will take his seat, we can get moving. And if the rest of you can take your seats, thank you.

Okay. We'll get started. And the break is now officially over. Karla has reminded me that there is a Strategic Planning session on Friday morning at 9

o'clock. Any of the registry representatives who are still on Friday are warmly invited to participate in that session.

Karla Valente: And Wednesday from 9:00 to 11:00.

(David)David Maher: And also Wednesday from 9:00 to 11:00.

(Carolyn), go.

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn): (David)David, I had noticed that there was a Registry Compliance...

(David)David Maher: (Unintelligible).

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn): ...consultation courtesy.

(David)David Maher: John Nevitt, could you take your seat please?

Thanks.

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn): And so I was wondering since we were talking about that, if Karla knew what the agenda for that meeting on Thursday was supposed to -- I believe it's Thursday afternoon.

Karla Valente: I can take a look.

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn): I just...

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible) giving an update. I don't think there is new status.

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn):   I'm sorry -- say again.

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible) new data for (unintelligible).

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn):   Okay. I was - I was just - I...

Karla Valente: I'm sorry.

Carolyn Hoover(Carolyn):   ...unclear of what the agenda was.

Karla Valente: So the (unintelligible) is giving an update and giving an opportunity to the constituencies of the Stakeholders to, you know, exchange ideas and talk to them.

But I do not believe there is really new data there from what was presented before, but it's a great opportunity to interact with the - with the Compliance team and ask questions.

(David)David Maher: Thanks, Karla. Okay. If - while we're anticipating Jim Galvin and Patrick Falstrom to arrive, we ought to talk about the agenda for the board meeting and get some ideas on how people - how members will participate.

I'm not quite clear as to the setup of the room where we meet with the board. As I understand it there is no U-shaped table. There is no platform. There will be a head table of some kind, which will include Steve Crocker and myself and possibly one or two others. And everyone else will be seated out in an audience.

So if I learn more about that I'll let you know. Any - at any rate, that meeting is at 1 o'clock and I believe it's in Congress 1. (Cherie), is that correct? Yes. Congress 1. That...

Cherie Stubbs(Cherie): (Unintelligible).

(David)David Maher: Congress 2 at 1:00 pm. And we're awaiting the luncheon tickets. Please remember that those who have Observer status and members are each entitled to a luncheon ticket. If you don't have a luncheon ticket, sorry -- you're out of lunch.

((Crosstalk))

(David)David Maher: I'm - go...

Man: They can pay for lunch.

(David)David Maher: Pardon?

Man: I believe that they do allow people to pay for lunch (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(David)David Maher: Yes. Lots of luck. And the lunch is at the Atrium. Is that correct?

Cherie Stubbs(Cherie): Correct.

(David)David Maher: Okay. Jeff, you've brought up the subject of assignments for the board meeting. Do you want to give some ideas on that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. If - I - it'd be great if we could post the list's topics, but I know we don't have that up there.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(David)David Maher: Well, we have the agenda. Well we don't have the agenda that the board wants, but we have our own...

Jeff Neuman: Oh, right. Okay. So yes, I mean I think what we should do is assign owners to each of these subjects so that they could speak on it, because I think in the past, (David)David, you've pretty much introduced everything. But it would be good for them to hear from different members of the (unintelligible).

(David)David Maher: Oh yes, I agree. I'd - what - I'd still like to introduce people, just to have an orderly system.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

(David)David Maher: But my own thought on this -- looking at the three topics that we suggested -- I'm going to forcefully insist that we start with our agenda before getting to the board agenda.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

(David)David Maher: On the other hand, if Steve Crocker forcefully insists that we go with the board agenda first, I think we'll probably have to follow his insistence.

                 My proposal would be that I would take on the second item -- the impact of new gTLDs on the group. I can talk to the amendments to our charter and

Observer status and so on that the new Observer Interest group who have volunteers to talk about the impact of new gTLDs on ICANN staff.

Ken?

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan): I'm (unintelligible).

(David)David Maher: Okay. Any other discussion on that?

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan): It's (Jonathan).

I could - I can talk to Ken. And I mean, I can help with that topic as well, because, I mean, I think for me -- I would - I would frame it in - as in many ways a question rather than - I mean, I think we need to have as much detailed reassurance as the board is in a position to provide us of the measures they're taking to upgrade and enhance and develop their management and operational capacity to handle all of this, because -- so I think we can - we can - we can cover it in as much as a question to them as any statements that might come from our self of our only -- and maybe that's the way to do it, is to provide a question, plus then back that up with statements of examples or experience -- some of which we all know all too well.

Man: I think you're all aware of the fact that I've expressed it in a couple of venues already.

I have a passion about this dealing with the surplus. I'm more than happy to give up the impact to deal with talking about dealing with the surplus. And if you're comfortable with that, you know, I...

(David)David Maher: Well, at any -- let's turn it at the -- this is the refund issue and surplus issue.

Any other - Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we have to keep in mind that this topic is kind of the impact -- this one that's an ongoing discussion with us on the board that was started earlier.

So I think there should be some follow up. I don't know that we need...

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...to spend a lot of time on it, but we should -- like, I think you're going to - you're going to start off by noting what we've done already and that we're in pretty good shape for Observers and new members and stuff like that, right?

Man: Yes.

(David)David Maher: Oh, that's the second topic -- the second on the list. I think we're...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I see. Those are - those two are different.

(David)David Maher: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(David)David Maher: We're now talking about number one and number three.

Chuck Gomes: All right. I was blending the two. Okay.

(David)David Maher: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes, (unintelligible) this is Jeff. And I'm going to make the same point that (Brett)'s going to make, because I think his hand's raised.

I think on the refund issue it should be relatively short. I mean, I don't think we should give any kind of, you know, and I know you said you're very passionate about it, as I am on a lot of other things.

And I think really the basic issue is look, we want to put a stake in the ground.

Chuck Gomes: That's (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: This is how we feel.

No need to talk about cost now or anything else. Let's push it off until later. But this is our point -- please don't set the expectation of the community otherwise. That's it - pretty much it.

Chuck Gomes: That's exactly the point I was going to make -- putting a marker down...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...that this is our mission.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

(David)David Maher: And I think (Brett) had his hand up first, and then John Nevitt.

(Brett): I - that was the point I was going to make. I'm done.

(David)David Maher: Okay. John, go ahead.

Man: (Unintelligible).

JonJohn Nevitt: Yes, I would -- if you could supplement it in this way, I think that the new
                    TLD budget that they put out in May is totally, absolutely padded.

                    It's huge. It's -- and we don't want them -- not only do we want, in my opinion,
                    you know, the excess fee issue -- we want to raise that, but we don't want
                    them - I don't want them spending to that budget because that budget is just, I
                    think, out of control.

Man: Well, I had a - I had a brief conversation with the (unintelligible) and made a
                    recommendation to him, and that was that ICANN - the board consider the
                    possibility of requiring a complete audit of that process, because you're
                    talking about deal with a quarter of a - at least a quarter of a billion dollars.

                    And it - I don't think it should be buried in the ICANN annual report. I think
                    there needs to be a full accountability and that audit would go - get very
                    granular, which is going to make certain people on the staff very
                    uncomfortable, which is I think to a great extent what we want them to do.

                    He - I think it was very favorably taken for that, because what he - what I told
                    him was, "Listen, this gives you more credibility with the community. You
                    talk about transparency. Here is an ideal situation. We - the public needs to
                    know you were given a quarter of a billion dollars to make sausage, you
                    know. Just exactly how did you do it, you know?"

And so that was the only other thing that I was - but even that doesn't need to be brought up as much today. We have serious concerns. In Toronto that becomes a more relevant deal, because they're going to say, "Listen, you're already asking us to do all sorts of stuff that we need to be looking at 8 months or 12 months down the road, you know. Let's focus on making this work."

I agree.

Chuck Gomes: It -- Chuck Gomes. It seems to me that there are a couple of key points that would be very helpful to make with regard to refunds. Number one -- very simple point -- the GNSO recommended cost recovery, okay?

Number two -- there are some known costs and some unknown costs, some fixed costs, okay? So we need to -- and I think this is help for the board to distinguish between.

The easiest example of fixed costs is the $25 thousand for TLD for historical costs. That was based -- it's a fixed amount. It was multiplied times 500 or divided by 500 -- whichever, I guess, is the correct way to say it. It's now divided by 1900, less any withdrawals or anything.

Those are fixed costs. Those could be dealt with right away. There are some costs that are unknown. Certainly, their litigation costs are unknown, but 500 times $60 thousand per applicant is a lot different than 1900 times $60 thousand per applicant -- again, less withdrawals and refunds and stuff like that.

So there are certain things I think they could deal with early on, some -- we need to respect the fact that there are some unknowns and we need to show some flexibility there.

(David)David Maher: Thanks, Chuck.

Man: Yes, one thing. I was very disappointed that they put Xavier out to discuss this kind of initiative, because this guy does not belong talking this kind of stuff. This was not an accounting issue. This was a policy issue.

And I think from a practical standpoint we need to make it clear that the board needs to give direction as to how to deal with the community on this issue. (Rod) spoke literally right off the cuff and board members told me that he had no right to say that.

And I think the board essentially is accountable for how that is dealt with in the long run. If the board instructs the staff -- so on that, you know, that's how I would - I'm approaching it.

I'm not addressing it to the CEO because he's not going to make a decision. The board's going to make the decision. And there's already a strong awareness amongst board members about dealing with this.

So...

(David)David Maher: Go ahead, Ray.

RaymundoRaimundo Beca Segura: You (unintelligible) - in the comment I made - I made to the - to the budget - the - to the - to the budget public comment, the - I

mentioned the fact that the calculations that was made in the - in the past was made under the basis of $25 million - $25 million of surrogate cost.

But those surrogate costs are until September 2010. And so I - we don't know which is the number - the number of the surrogate costs year from September 2010 to June 2012.

And I'm not - I guess - I guess it's a lot of monies. And so we - let's see, but yes -- the answer they gave me - they gave me to my comment was, "Well, we are - we are - we calculate regularly the surrogate costs, so it will be included in the - in the - it will be included in the - in the final budget approved by the board."

Well, the board approved the budget on Sunday, but we don't know still which is the number of that. Like, yes. I wouldn't be surprised if it - if the number is about $40 or something like that. I wouldn't be surprised.

Yes, because we have all the - all the outreach - all the outreach which was board members make. And it's not including (unintelligible) $25.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ~~Raymundo~~Raimundo .

Man: Well, I think so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, mine is.

Man: He's getting the hand mic.

Man: Pardon the glitch.

Man: Okay.

Cherie Stubbs~~Woman~~:   Testing.

Jonathan Robinson~~(Jonathan)~~:   Thanks. So in response to Raimundo~~Raymundo~~''s point,
                        the item that we learned at the ccNSO yesterday was that the ccNSO has been
                        working with the ICANN Finance staff through their Finance subcommittee
                        for some time to try and - I mean, their objective is all about negotiating
                        ccNSO contributions to ICANN.

                        So in order to do that, they need to - their objective is to understand cost
                        allocation at ICANN. And they've been working on this project for two years,
                        and I think they've just learned - now, they said that the software that ICANN
                        is using overlaid on top of their finance software to manage cost allocation is
                        no longer trusted by the ICANN Finance staff.

                        And so that's left -- they're hidden. They had quite a significant barrier in this
                        whole process. And to that extent it's relative to this issue of cost allocation to
                        the new gTLD program or normal operations.

                        So there's clearly an issue there, but we'll need to - we, you know, not
                        withstanding your good point about what's gone on since September 2010.
                        That's going to need some work on it.

So that's just to - in response to that point. If we're going to discuss this more, I will - I'll hold off on the other two points then, if this is...

Jonhn Nevitt: Just to follow up on the - on the cost recovery aspect.

And RaymundoRaimundo will appreciate this, because we both served on the Finance committee together on the board. And I don't know if Karla or the ICANN staff could explain, but they don't do - at least they've never done time sheets, so it's kind of hard to do cost recovery and allocation of where the money's going when you don't do time sheets.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jonhn Nevitt: And it's kind of amazing that a service-based organization doesn't do time sheets.

Have they implemented time sheets?

Woman: (Unintelligible) work (unintelligible).

Man: No.

Man: (Unintelligible).

RaymundoRaimundo Beca Segura: Thank you. I'm not aware if we do that. And I guess it would be a question for the CFO. Thanks.

Jonhn Nevitt: So it - I think this goes to if you want a firm recommendation -- and it's a recommendation that I raised each of three years -- and at the time, John

Curran and (unintelligible), "Oh, we have limited resources. To do time sheets would take too much - too much time and effort of our limited resources."

Well now they have a - it really would help in tracking where the money's going.

(David)David Maher: Thanks. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. And it's not that I don't agree with all these points. I just think we're getting down a rat hole that was - I was trying not to get to. So (unintelligible) with the board, really, do we make the one policy point that we were talking about?

I even think telling the board that the costs are too high is going to go down a rat hole as well. It's not that I don't - it's not that I don't agree with you, John, or don't agree that the cost's too high.

We really should get in with our one point, which is on the refunds -- put the stake in the ground. As far as the costs being too high, (unintelligible) is not really necessarily a Registry Stakeholder group issue -- it may be.

But again, that's more discussions with the Finance team. And if we're not getting the responses we like from the Finance team, maybe it's an escalation point.

But it's even taking up too much time in here right now, because you have a couple of other topics to talk about with the board. But that's just my opinion.

John Nevitt: If I could respond. I think it's an important point to make, Jeff, because - I think it's an important point to make, Jeff, because if they're spending money

in the next three months or whatever it is in their - in evaluations and everything else has a clearinghouse -- everything else that they're doing -- they should know that folks in the community think that they've, on paper, allocated too much money to a lot of different functions and that we should - we want them to be in a - we want them to get it done, we want them to get it done quickly and want them to get it done right, but we don't - we don't want them to waste money.

And the - and the - in that budget, I think there's a lot of waste.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. Yes.

(David)David Maher: Okay. To recap then for the first topic, which is the impact of new gTLDs on ICANN staff, (Jonathan), you're going to take the lead on that? Is that correct?

Man: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson(Jonathan): Yes, (David)David. I was - I was going to come to that. I apologize for sending us off a little bit. I just wanted that point of information on the - on the allocation of costs. So I didn't want to - I in no way intended to suggest we bring that up with the board at this stage. It was simply a point of information connected to all of that.

However, in terms of the staff issue, I've (unintelligible) just a couple of minutes getting some real practical examples of issues people have so that I can frame it and potentially provide examples.

So that's what I was going to come to. I'd - if I'm going to deal with that topic, I'd love any input that's available here.

(David)David Maher: Okay. And before we hit that, Ken, you'll take the lead then on the refunds.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. And the microphones are working again.

(David)David Maher: Oh, okay. Great. Thanks.

Man: Okay.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. And on their topics, I would be happy to take - I think we should put the RAA negotiations as one of our higher ones. And I would be happy to take that one. And I think the next one we should do is batching, because that's - they're required to ask all of us that and someone should volunteer for that.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck.

And we could maybe just give a summary of what came out of our meeting this morning with (Kurt) on that.

Man: On batching.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Man: Okay. And...

(David)David Maher: You'll do batching then.

Chuck Gomes: Yes(Unintelligible).

(David)David Maher: Okay. Then back to (Jonathan)'s question of concrete examples on the staffing issue.

Man: Sorry. I was acknowledging Jim.

(David)David Maher: Who would like to volunteer some concrete examples for (Jonathan) to mention? Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Well I mean you could bring up the point we had discussed with (Kurt) about having account managers as opposed to liaisons.

                 I think the real key of that is we need people on ICANN staff that are empowered to make decisions and that are empowered to actually take action, because right it's a complete bottleneck perceived in the Legal department but not known.

                 But, you know, you could talk to those issues that this doesn't scale and they have to have an organization that's scaled.

(David)David Maher: Anyone else?

Chuck Gomes: (David)David...

(David)David Maher: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...it's Chuck again.

Now, they have Whois report -- and I know that that's not a big one for us, but I wonder if we should make - because they ask us the question, "What should - in the Review team report, which one of their recommendations should be done by staff and by - which ones by - in Policy work?"

Well, isn't there a simple answer to that? And tell me if I'm missing something, but we know what things are within the policy development process -- the picket fence and so forth -- those kind of things should be done by Policy.

Isn't that the simple answer there? Or am I oversimplifying?

(David)David Maher: I agree with you. It - that was - that was my approach also. I'd - I'll try to answer that briefly and then that just leaves the budget to operations plan cycle. Anyone have any thoughts on that?

Man: Could somebody define what they mean by the budget operations plan cycle?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Let - this is Chuck. Let me take a crack at that.

We've got -- they deal with strategic plan July through December, they deal with operating plan and budget the next six months leading up to the final approval, and within that, now they - with the strategic plan, they've added one new step where they have - apparently are going to add a SOAC little Strategic Plan working group that'll provide input into that process.

The one point that the CC's have made is that things kind of get crunched with - towards the end - leading up to final approval that - and whether we want to make one, that's up to us, but, you know, (unintelligible) I think the overall planning cycle is pretty good.

And now sometimes a lot of groups don't participate very well, but it's pretty good although we still need more detail in the - in the breakout of the budget. And probably part of that is the problem that (Jonathan) referred to in terms of cost allocation, because like for this year in the budget they didn't provide a cost breakdown or revenue breakdown by the different groups so that you could see how much they spend on the CC's, for example, and how much they - and how much they get from - that - we do know how much they get from those CC's.

So that kind of - we still need more detail, but that's probably part of their system's problems.

Ken Stubbs: Is that...

(David)David Maher: Thanks, Chuck. Ken -- briefly, because the Security team is here.

Ken Stubbs: Okay, just real briefly.

You know, given my Accounting background, that's an issue that should be addressed to the CEO and tell him we need to get more granular. We need more specific information and on a departmentalization basis.

These various departments are dealing with constituencies. If they're in the process of revising their accounting systems, which they may very well be, this is a matter of doing some planning to make sure that they get that kind of information, as any entity -- VeriSign or anyone else would have -- it should be easy to do in the planning, per revising the accounting system.

(David)David Maher: Thanks, Ken. Jim -- welcome. I take it this is the revised team that you've brought with you. The floor is yours.

Jim Galvin: Thank you.

I understand they have some slides here. She's coming up with them? Okay. So let me just take a moment to say thank you for this opportunity to come and talk to you.

We do have a particular piece of work that we want to put in front of you and make you aware of. And it does actually have, you know, a request for continued study and continued activity, and so I wanted to put that question out there for you also to consider in your - in your deliberations going forward.

And I have with me here also Rod Rasmussen and Don Blumenthal, both from the SSAC, just here to help me as we move along.

So it is just the data model slides, right? Yes? Okay. I was going to say I can...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Oh, okay. All right. I'll quickly go through the first few slides. If you have them, you can look at them -- just sort of the update on SSAC's activities. And so I'll just skip to the next slide here.

And under topics, just a quick look at some of the documents and work that we have done here. Moving forward again to the next slide -- Recent Publications -- we have already published the SAC 54 document about a data model.

You need to go back up just a little bit. And I'll be talking more about that. I want to focus opportunity on that one and continue back up.

We have done a report on .list domains and that was, of course, a particular request from the board to actually comment specifically on that activity and what that means.

And of course we did an advisory on the delegation of single-character domain names, and that was also a specific request from the ICANN community. And those were all relatively quick pieces of work that we put together.

And of course we have commented recently on the fiscal '13 budget, the impact on SSAC and what that means okay? Skipping ahead to the next slide, The Workplan.

So these are the activities that are in progress now. We of course have our membership committee, which is the only standing committee that we have, always reviewing incoming members and perspective members and also because we do an annual review of the SSAC membership.

The internationalized registration data working group, which you're well aware of, because that was a joint group with all of us, we have a final report that has - that is in progress. We're waiting for final approval from the GNSO with respect to that.

We also participate actively in the DSSA working group. We participate with the DNS risk management framework working group. Patrick Falstrom, as chair of the SSAC, participants in that group directly.

We are working on a document talking about the impact of DNS blocking, so a little bit fuller treatment about that activity. And we have a root key rollover work party that's in progress too, for those who've been tracking DNSSEC, you know of course that the root was signed, you know, two years ago and, you know, now the question comes up as to whether or not it is appropriate and under what circumstances and the rules by which that root key would be (ruled). And so we're putting together and advisory on that work.

We continue with our public meetings as we have, and we have some work which we are exploring at the moment for additional work parties. Security and instability issues relate to gTLDs, deployment of IPv6 and also a public interest no-fee domain holding pen.

And just to explain a little bit about that is that's actually a look at a - the discussion of what happens when domains are taken down and what that really means, and what the process is for dealing with that and the post-takedown issues to the names. And also - as well as pre-issues.

Registrars and registries are, you know, often looking for, you know, fees set aside when you're taking down names, especially consider (unintelligible) when you take them down in advance.

So we're currently exploring issues around that to see if there's a way for us to comment about that whole problem space and, you know, perhaps offer some best practices or other advice about some policies that would be useful. That's a very formative work at that moment, so can't really say too much about what that'll be.

Continuing forward. Okay so the bulk of what I really wanted to get to here --
next slide please -- is a report on the domain name registration model. What
SSAC has done is we have put together a straw man idea for community
discussion and consideration.

And in fact we're explicitly reaching out to groups such as this, the registry
stakeholder group. We'll be talking to the registrar stakeholder group and also
reaching out to the ccNSO, in particular, for continued work in this space. So
we're offering this up as a baseline from which discussions can start.

And we created this data model based on existing material. So, you know, a
look at existing registry agreements, escrow agreements, and of course the
work that came out of the internationalized registration data working group
and what we do know about some ccTLD data requirements.

Most important thing to say is that we are not making any policy assertions.
This is strictly intended as a technical piece of work, and that's, you know,
we're looking to work with this group and others to talk about the policies that
one might develop around this.

So why is this work important? As hopefully you are aware, there is no inform
data model that exists for domain name registration data, and it is our
assertion that this unduly complicates data submission in handling, you know,
Exchange and Access.

The community at large would benefit significantly from a standards-based
kind of model that would help address a lot of this variability in representation
that you see in domain name data and of course improve the user experiences.

This has been talked about several times in the past. SSAC has reported on this in several prior documents that it has published. Of course the Whois review team has had its say about this issue, and of course the IRD report has also made a specific recommendation about a data model and the need for. Next slide. Next slide. Oh okay.

So what we did to develop this work was we took on this task and figured it would be very helpful if we could, you know, kickstart this effort by, you know, proposing a baseline, something from which discussions could continue. And our process was to think about what a typical lifecycle of a domain name might be. I'm phrasing that very carefully.

This is just a typical lifecycle. It's not intended to represent anything specific. And what we did to do this was, you can imagine, if you skip to the next slide, there's a little picture there that talks about how the domain comes into existence, it's available for registration, then it exists during registration. It expires, you have some grace period, and then suddenly it's released again, and it's now available.

And what we did was kind of take a step back and consider what events take place during the lifecycle of a domain name. No continue forward please. And then what we did was numerate data elements that fit into this model of what takes place in the lifecycle.

This is a slightly deeper look into the lifecycle of a domain name. Registrant, you know, explores whether or not a name exists. If a registrar is present, it's there. For those models that don't have one, they would be asking - talking directly to the registry. They would then register it if they wanted it, and that would then pass up into the registry.

And you can see here an indication on the bottom there of the three information stores, if you will, that will exist as part of a registration of a domain name. You're going to have Whois services, so directory services of some sort, there's going to be entries in the DNS as a result of this, then of course there's going to be a record of the entire registration in a registry database of some sort, which might exist in a registrar in the case of a thin registry. So moving forward.

So what is the data model? Again it's an inhumation of data elements. And this is intended to be descriptive, not prescriptive. Again we sort of laid out an idea for a typical lifecycle, recognizing that many TLDs and registries do have slightly different lifecycles.

In particular, some gTLDs have specific requirements. There's also the case that ccTLDs have a variety of different requirements. And we decided not to try and take on the job of harmonizing those. That's not really what we are after.

What we are proposing here is a framework in which the data model can be applied to all of those various registry models for this - for the lifecycle of a domain name. So the framework here is picking events in a typical lifecycle and establishing what elements are needed to support that event.

So if you look at this document you'll see that the elements we list are formed into collections, and they are collections associated with an event. And then if that event happens to be present in your particular lifecycle for your registry, then these are the elements that would be important that you would have to keep.

So in a sense, everything that's in the document as a collection is optional, and it's only relevant if you happen to have that event. And so you separately have to have a discussion and have policies about what events are required, what events are necessary, and then you might have a rule that says, you know, "If you have this event, then these are the elements that you would have. And this is what you would do to create a profile."

And then inside this profile, for each of those elements, you get to establish the attributes and various other parameters that are important. So in particular you can talk about (codings) that would go with it, you know, scripts and languages there that are in use, any kind of protocol issues that might be present, you know, and then the obvious technical issues about length, you know, cardinality, that kind of thing.

But that would all be part of the definition of the element, and you would create a profile based on some policy about the registry about incorporating these elements and their use into your particular registry.

So the relationship here is one data model in which you specify all of the potential elements that might be used, and then you create appropriate profiles for use of those elements.

So the particular recommendations, first of all, is we're inviting all of the SOs and ACs and we're making an explicit step to come to certain groups -- and this is one of them -- to reach out to ask you to look at this data model and comment on its completeness and, of course, its utility, again thinking of it in terms of being a framework and whether this is something that you could build on and then, within this group, you could establish your policies about its use and how it'll work. Then obviously we'd have to have some discussion about appropriate events and the elements that go inside those events.

One of the particular things to call out here that's interesting in our opinion and why this is very helpful, is you can clearly separate the data model as the elements that are important to managing the lifecycle of a domain name, and then you can separately have a discussion about directory services.

And now you can step back and instead of, you know, the Whois situation we have today, where it just sort of automatically assumes that pretty much everything you collect is suddenly out there and part of that, you can have separate discussions about creating a profile for what out of the data elements you would pick and choose to put out there in the directory service. And that allows you to separately address concerns of different groups.

You can imagine having different profiles for, you know, intellectual property concerns for public use, for law enforcement concerns. And so we're especially interested in that discussion and being able to separate those discussions, creating different profiles, and then you can also have different requirements on them, different access control, you know, and the issues that go with that too - different privacy concerns. Next slide please.

Obviously a potential issue which we found very quickly in the beginning of this work, I mean is - from within the SSAC we have several people who are both ccTLD and gTLD experiences. It's very clear that, you know, data models will probably be different across these two groups.

So we hope that this framework that we've established, you know, with sort of a concrete demonstration of a typical lifecycle, allows each body to have its own lifecycle. Potentially any given registry could have lifecycles, and you create profiles to manage that.

So what you really need to agree on is just what the elements look like, and then you can separate the discussions about the profiles of those things, and that allows you to - you don't have to have a single uniform policy for registration data. You can do what's most appropriate for individual registries.

And obviously this would be the group on the gTLD side that would talk about how you want to do registry profiles, you know, whether you do want one, more than one, you know, or groups of one, collections of them, that kind of thing. And it allows the ccTLDs and gTLDs to work independently and do what they need to.

So the next step of course is just a recognition that need for a data model has been, you know, stated several times, both by SSAC, Whois review team, IRD working group, so it's a known quantity.

What we've done here is try to take this next step to establish a framework for how this could work and how a data model could be helpful, and to establish a starting point for discussions about a data model.

And we're now reaching out explicitly for this community to consider how to move forward, and we're making ourselves available to work with you in any way that seems to be appropriate and helpful to you in order to continue and move this work forward. So that's the presentation.

(David)David Maher: Thanks Jim. Are you looking for volunteers for the working group right now? Or what is the next step?

Jim Galvin: I'll actually turn that question back to you. I mean obviously we're willing and ready to start this work whenever it's appropriate. I understand that you have

your own processes for creating working group, and you need to consider how you want to go about adopting this and how it fits into your agenda.

Man: Okay. (James) - Jim, sorry. Yes it's kind of an interesting time for this, because a lot of us spent months working on, you know, in some cases, hundreds of applications, some of which are very different for new TLDs, each of which - or some of which may have had different data models.

And so a number of us have actually written a lot of materials on the lifecycle of a domain name for example. That was like Question 20 - 30 something, I don't know.

So it's good that you all kind of did this, but I'm almost - and some of us were involved obviously in the SSAC. I don't know to what extent NeuStar was involved in that, but I think some work should be done to kind of look at those that were presented and already written up, rather than - it's almost like you started from scratch or, you know, and just wrote it up, which - so it's interesting timing that this all come out.

I think there are - even the simple diagrams that you showed, I think there are going to be very significant changes to the lifecycle of a domain, especially with some of the brand TLDs and others that may never use a grace period or may never release names into the public.

And so I'm not sure how to comment on that other than it's almost too soon to do this and maybe, you know, hate saying this, put it off a year 'til we know what's out there and 'til we know the different data models. Otherwise you're putting this out, and then a few months later updating it, which might be okay too. So I'm not sure what else to say on that.

(David)David Maher: (Unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Yes. I mean the response that I would offer is that the timing in - you're right, the timing is interesting, and it was part of the reason why we took this on and wanted to get it started. The new gTLD program, you know, clearly is going to have data model issues.

But I think a piece of this work to keep in mind is, if you have a data model, there's - I believe it's the baseline from which other work really should be discussed and moved forward. Think that this is a first step before you really focus on directory services activities. It's a first step before you can talk about escrow.

And it would help actually, in some ways, in the escrow case, because if you have a data model, and you can establish profiles, then you automatically know what to escrow. And that's sort of a vague question right now, even in the new gTLD agreements right? You do have to escrow data, and there's some statement about what you have to do, but, you know, this offers a uniform and standard way to deal with that issue.

I think that we would welcome the input. Actually I think the timing is exactly right to pick up this work and get started, rather than waiting a year. We would welcome the opportunity to bring other data model work together with this and to work to bring that together and harmonize those. I think there's a - an excellent opportunity for that.

We didn't really want to wait for the TLD program to come out and get started. It has its own life. But now that all that information is public, we now have all of that input, and now we have something to compare it to, and we should work to pull that together.

Man: Yes I think on that, it's almost too late in one respect, to - I mean I know you said now that the new TLD program, but everyone's already written their answers, and everyone's already prepared their models, and everybody's already prepared their cost, based on those models.

And what ICANN staff sometimes does a lot -- and I know "sometimes" and "a lot" is - kind of kind of contradicts -- but what they do is they take SSAC recommendations and they immediately say, "Okay how can I make them legally enforceable?" And that's a problem for me, because essentially you're talking about - and your data model's very general. I think a lot of things can fit in there, so it may not be that big of a problem. But our guys haven't evaluated it yet completely.

But I'm worried that they take that and say, "Okay SSAC said this. These are recommendations. Now all new gTLDs, you now need to follow this when they spend a lot of money proposing that." And to change it actually may cause significant issues. May not. I don't know; we haven't fully scoped that out.

And the reason, you know, I'm kind of worried is because I saw what they did with SSAC 51. And if you look at their roadmap, I mean I think the document you guys put out - that SSAC put out, 51, it makes sense with some terminology issues that we need to work through, but the - what the legal team did or - sorry, what ICANN staff did, is that they put out a document said, "Okay we have recommendations from SSAC, (and) we need a Whois protocol."

So even before we develop this protocol at the IETF, we got to make the registry, sign on the dotted line saying that no matter what the IETF comes up

with, you're legally bound by it right? It's a completely backwards way to do it, but that's what ICANN staff is now in the process - or is in the habit of doing.

And so my fear is not so - your work; my fear is how that work will be taken. I think the roadmap for SSAC 51 is horrible, and I'm going to make some comments on that during the session. But that wasn't your work; that was what ICANN staff did with it. That's why I'm so concerned.

Jim Galvin: The comment that I would offer to you is we have been working through the development of this with ICANN staff. Now I certainly don't want to speak for them in what might come of it, but I share and SSAC shares the same concern that you have about this just being picked up and determined that it's the thing that we want.

I can tell you that SSAC does not want that to happen, and we tried to be very careful about how we worded our recommendations. And in fact when we make a formal recommendation to the board with this document, we are going to be extra careful about how this is presented to the board and what we're asking for, because we don't want to see happen what you're suggesting.

This really is intended to be a starting point for discussions with the appropriate group of people who had the most direct experience in what these data models should be. And so we share that concern and the goal.

(David)David Maher: Okay Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. I think it's really important that we look at the overall context of this, and I really don't - whereas I equally have concerns about how staff may implement things, I don't think this is a staff issue.

Bottom line is the GNSO delayed and delayed and delayed for years consideration of these kinds of issues. We weren't specifically thinking about a data model per se, but certainly new protocol and the problems with the existing Whois protocol.

We're years behind where we should be, and we should not delay any further in getting this together because we don't have anything ready for handling IDNs, and we should've years ago. So any sort of delay is I think out of the question, in my opinion.

We're finally seeing lots of work on this, and what we need to do is to get our people, including our technical people, involved in these processes so that they can be refined as best as possible, based on what each of our organizations knows and what we've done and what we've proposed and everything else, and fully (unintelligible)support all of the efforts that are going on in this regard so that they - so that we minimize impacts later on and so that it comes out in a way that we can hopefully all live with, because I think we're going to have to, and it'll eventually come to some policy work in the GNSO in terms of implementation of these things.

(David)David Maher: Thanks Chuck. Okay ahead.

Man: Yes one last comment. So from a, you know, technical or technology point of view, speaking to the issue of harmonization, my - speaking personally, not as an issue that was necessarily discussed in SSAC and as part of this document, what I would hope is that this data model is not prescriptive in the sense that it directly affects implementations.

I think the goal here, from my point of view, would be to look at this and recognize that you should already be doing everything that's in here. This is just about organizing it and structuring it and putting the right labels on it, and that's really all it's about. It doesn't necessarily have to represent exactly how you implement something. It just represent what stuff looks like from the outside.

And I would suspect that most of you are already doing some of these elements that are in there. I mean, especially if you're doing IDNs, you've already found a solution for the things. All we're doing here is saying, from a uniform and standards point of view, you know, "This is what it should look like, and this is how we should talk about it." But what you do on the inside, I would not expect this work to prescribe any particular changes internally in what you do, for the most part.

((Crosstalk))

(David)David Maher: Thanks very much Jim. We're at - it's almost 12 noon, and time for us to go to lunch so that we can get ready to meet with the board. But it's - at one o'clock we meet in (Congress) 2. Please be prompt so that we can get the board meeting going...

Man: Which level is (Congress) on, (David)David Maher?

(David)David Maher: Well...

Cherie StubbsWoman: If I may, I've got the tickets to the luncheon down in the atrium restaurant for any delegate or observer participant. Please see me if I didn't catch you already. Thanks.

END