**ICANN Singapore Meeting
Commercial and Business Users Constituency (BC)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 21 June 2011 at 15:00 local**

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.

Marilyn Cade: I think I can do this part. Thank you. This is Marilyn Cade. I'm opening the Business Constituency meeting. We're going to move immediately to our first set of presenters.

And I'm going to then come back, after we finish this we'll go through catching up on the few other details. But I want to take advantage of the time we have with the compliance team.

And Maguy I'm going to turn it over to you to introduce the topic and your team. And to say, since this is your first official meeting with the business constituency, we very much welcome having you here. And thank you for making this time.

Maguy Serad: Can you guys hear me? All right. Do you have the presentation we shared with you? Can that be projected? All right, while we're waiting on the presentation, this is...

Marilyn Cade: Shared with who?

Maguy Serad: I sent it to you.

Marilyn Cade: That wouldn't actually work since I don't have a laptop with me.

Maguy Serad: Like two days ago. Okay, all right. Do you guys have the (laptop)? Okay. Can we plug up our own computer? All right. Do we have (sources events) on the phone that probably you can share with them later? All right, great.

So we have a very short period with the business constituents today. And I was very pleased Marilyn extended the invite to us. As Marilyn said, my name is Maguy Serad.

I have been with ICANN for two months now. And this is my first ICANN meeting. I feel like a kid in toy land. I don't know what room I want to run into and test and hear. There's so much liveliness going on. It's like, I feel like I'm missing out on something if I leave an area.

My background guys, I'm not a lawyer. I don't know if I will disappoint you in that aspect because I have the pleasure to tell you that the team that's accompanying me today, they're all lawyers.

I have a lot of lawyers on my team. So I bring more of the business side to it. With me in the room today I have Stacy Burnette. She's running around trying to get our presentation going.

We have Pam Little. I have Khalil Rasheed and Carlos Alvarez. So we have a very strong construction compliance presence this week in Singapore.

My background is automotive industry, not Internet, not legal. But my background that I bring to the team, the strengths I bring to the team here is really my contractual compliance background, my processes, my organizational skill set and the business aspect of it.

I've been in over 20 years of experience in the industry. And while working at the automotive company, I've had the really pleasure to take on different roles in the organizations. And evolve in the organization, of which the last

role was for several years I had to go through what we call internal certification to obtain the master black belt in Six Sigma.

What's all that about and how is that valuable to my new role and the role I played in contractual compliance is really about the processes, about efficiency and effectiveness.

My style is very, very simple. What you see is what is. You know, I communicate, fact-based, keep it simple. And really collaborate. I believe in that approach.

And then I'm not talking ahead of the slides that we're having a hard time projecting. But so this is just a brief intro about myself. And I do also speak three languages.

English of course. Sometimes I make mistakes in English also. But I also speak French and Arabic okay.

Moving on from, thank you. The question I get asked a lot being a newcomer, people always expect when you have new team lead arriving, they say what is your short plan, what is your plan?

The short plan, you know, for over two months now that I've been here has been very focused on the strengths that I'm bringing to the team. So the first thing is I needed to make sure I continue to support the current staff who has been so understaffed for a while.

By me joining the team we are officially now back to the number that existed a year ago guys. So hats off to the team that's been running contractual compliance over the past few months, short staffed, but still running the business.

It's about running the business, keeping the lights on. So by me supporting them, I also took on a role where I started to say okay, what is this organization about? And how can I assist?

You know, I started to assess our current state. And that was the focus I've been doing for the last two months. And the team and I will, in the next trimester, start looking at how can we start deploying some of the efficiency and effectiveness identified from our current state.

The biggest challenge for me, I think I've learned most of the acronyms. But I keep discovering there are new ones. So the biggest challenge here, not just the acronyms, is this ICANN model.

You know, in the previous life in the private sector when you're working with contractual compliance, even though you have multiple suppliers or multiple contracts, it was between two parties.

I'm learning with this ICANN model it's truly between two parties. But man, you have so many people involved, so many stakeholders, so many interests, you know, contracted, non-contracted. All of the different stakeholders and voices that really have a say in this contract and this how we're doing our operations and how it's all working.

So that's the complexity of the model that I'm trying to still put my arms around. And the reason I say I'm really trying is because it's really important to understand the stakeholders.

You know, you don't want to work in silo. You don't want to work just based on what you were tasked with. We have to have an understanding of the different perspective and where each area is coming from to help us understand and have a better appreciation for why a comment is made. Or why a request is being put forth at the table.

So understanding the ICANN model I think will be an ongoing challenge but an ongoing thing that I will be working. And the best way to do that is really being a meetings like this. Extending and being present in other opportunities.

The - so that's going to help us (concentrate) the relationship and also continue with that.

On the major initiatives that be of relevance since the arrival here, the first initiative that's really of importance and I heard that spoken too earlier. There were two bullets with the previous presenters about ICANN.

And I'd be glad to tell you that we're going to have a little bit of an update of what we're doing in that area too. But the first major initiative as we all know about, everybody keeps saying staffing, staffing, staffing.

You're right. Staffing is important. And I have my management's full support on that. We have now eight full-time employees. I personally hired on a person who is working in the contractor capacity for us. So now he's also full-time. So that made us up to eight full-time employees.

We are in the process of finalizing on job descriptions. We're going to hire on three more employees in the near future. And the first one is in the near future, and of course the two in 2012.

So staffing is always going to be a question we ask ourselves of. But as we all know, you know, you run your businesses. You always get requests, you know, I want more staffing. Give me funds for staff.

You can throw a lot of staff. But that's not always the solution. So that's why one of the other initiatives I've undertaken and will continue to do over the next trimester is what I refer too as operational effectiveness.

Simply put, I've been evaluating what I our organizational structure? Who are we? Where are the skill sets? How can we leverage our skill sets? Where are the gaps?

So looking at our organization and see how can we leverage the skill sets we have and build a team that's going to help us in the future. And also in the near future when new GTLDs roll out.

So establishing a strong foundation in that aspect will help us take on any challenges, not just new GTLDs.

The other area of operational effectiveness, as I said is processes. It's very important to have processes with clear roles and responsibilities and publishing them. So we're revisiting those and trying to see what is there any gaps and how can we improve those.

The third operational effectiveness is tools. So it's people, processes and tools. We have a lot of tools that compliance uses today. The tools have been existence. And as appropriate, enhancements are applied.

Again, we're looking into the future. You know, even though it's not just a short-term plan. It's a three-year plan and even a five-year plan. What is it going to take to get us there?

So we are in the process also of evaluating our systems and see what's best for us. And to support the ICANN model, but also to help us give answers and be able to do our job.

A major initiative underway is the who is compliance and the who is compliance area. And I heard you guys discussing that. We came a little early.

The first thing I'd like to tell you when I came on board, actually it was my first day here. And John says okay Maguy, I want you to put a lot of focus on who is.

I said okay, who is who is so I know who is I need to focus on. And so he says okay, I know you still, it's your first day. But who is from Day 1 my management expressed the importance of it.

So being here about two months now, the leadership team and I, we again part of the organizational structure. We looked at the skill sets of the person. And recently we have promoted Khalil Rasheed to the Senior Manager of who is.

He is fully accountable for the who is area. Why is that important? Not just accountability, oversight, direct point of contact, outreach with the communities and the tools.

So he's looking at the who is model as a whole instead of just when we have who is audits or who is monitoring or who is issues. So he's really going to look at that and not, you know, of course with continuing to run the business, but ultimately strategize what is best to be able to really deliver a contractual compliance (brought in it).

The other area of who is compliance that's been applied recently is an update to, you know, we do the Port 43 access monitoring. And in the past we've used it from an IP address that's an ICANN address.

So the idea was let's do an IP address that's not an ICANN address so we can get the user experience. And we monitor both to make sure that we're getting consistent valid information.

And that was implemented recently. So another tool we have is the WDPRS system, which is the who is data reporting system. It's critical for us to have

all the data. It's logged in there about who is compliant. But we also use that to help us manage all that information.

What's happening on the WDPRS tool is, as I said, some enhancements are underway. But also looking at the big picture, is this the right tool that's going to sustain us into the future? Or do we need to replace it?

So we have a lot of operational effectiveness in that area. Enhancing communication, you know guys, you run a business. The first thing that goes when you're short on staff or economic crisis is not good is communication.

You want to just keep the lights on. Who cares about newsletters. And in a way that's kind of happened to us too. The team had to run the business. And our communication letters, the really full scope of it is out of date.

Even though the team continued to update it on the breech notices and, you know, important information of that nature. But we really did not give it the full newsletter approach with reporting and update.

Man: What was that acronym, W-R-D-P-S?

Maguy Serad: W-D-P-R-S.

Man: W-D-P-R-S.

Maguy Serad: Data...

Man: So you're as bad as the rest of us.

Maguy Serad: I'm getting there. So that's a good certificate for me. I need a new button. I'm reciting the acronyms. They should give out buttons by acronyms.

So enhancing communication is not just about the newsletter guys. I know everybody's interested about the reporting, reporting that's valuable from different perspectives of the community.

So that's one of the things we're looking at. How can we report? How can we measure? And be transparent about all this stuff? We do it today. At the end of the deck we'll leave you with, we're not going to go through all of those slides. But you have that information in front of you.

We know there are opportunities to improve those. And we're looking into them. Collaborative efforts, we're reaching out and working not internal to ICANN only, but to the full community.

And that would be more than the face to face effort and just the different areas where we can connect and work together.

New GTLD readiness, I think if you've been listening to me after lunch, nobody's fallen asleep. You can tell everything I spoke to until now, it's about readiness.

New GTLD or whatever new initiative it is, we have to continue to do what's referred to as continuous improvement. So with new GTLD everybody's saying is contractual compliance ready?

Well we are. And we're going to be ready. New GTLDs are not going to happen tomorrow. So we are preparing ourselves with our operational effectiveness and all the efforts underway today, processes, people and tools.

And, you know, in six months they open an application. And then after that contract signing. So really contractual compliance is going to be at the tail end if you think of it from compliance perspective.

But we're going to take an active role up front and, you know, collaborate and cooperate with the communication aspect of it from the training and education.

We have a couple of slides in the deck. We don't need to go to them. But we have what we're looking at new initiatives here. And we're still designing them as a registrar self-assessment tool.

But again, efficiency and effectiveness, to physically and manually do that requires a lot of efforts and a lot of time to try to be more proactive and create more of a tool that up front will allow us to send that. And let the registrars do it.

We evaluate, we validate and we, if there is a need to do a manual audit, we take in on. There is an initiative on the registry data escrow audit. We know that they do escrow the data.

But today we really don't have a specific audit plan for it. So we're putting a plan for stage approach. How can we get there? And the law enforcement initiative that's mentioned here is the last one.

It's really an interesting and a challenging one. If you step off just being an ICANN community member, we all have commitments to our communities, no matter what the community is.

And in this case with the law enforcement initiative when I joined, during my interview process actually Rod asked me. He says we want to make sure we form a license process.

In the past there were requests that would come our way. And we'd usually work with our internal legal team saying okay, we got this request. Can we provide this information? Is this not invading anybody's privileged information or something before we work on it?

So instead of just kind of taking it that way every time, we want to formalize the process. But most importantly, understand what is the information that's being requested or that we're going to be sharing with them.

So this initiative is still in the design phase. And we will be sharing more information about it as we solidify it. We've been working with the registrars, with law enforcement and, you know, the different as we build that design.

So the last comment I want to say before I open it up for Q and A is I want to assure everybody, I know I'm the lead of contractual compliance. And I will be fully accountable and responsible for that area.

So if you have any specific concerns or information you'd like to share with me, Marilyn has my contact information. I'd be very happy to hear. Do not send me complaints guys, please. I don't like winers.

Send me a concern, you know, fact-based. Send me a scenario. Send me an issue. But if it something going on that's really bugging you, I'm sure you have a solution in mind. So let me know what that is.

Don't just say hey, I don't like you. You stink. You're not doing a good job. At what, where do I stink? Why did I stink? Which area caused you to formulate this opinion about it?

So I'm willing and able. I'm very open. Let me know if there are areas where you need to collaborate with us on. Or we can provide information on okay. So Marilyn, I'm ready to take on the questions.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible) and I'll ask people to just raise their hand. And do you want to, Maguy do you want to just recognize them yourself?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, since I know them, I'll do that.

Maguy Serad: I do not know the names.

Marilyn Cade: Oh come on, you know the acronyms already. If Ron let's, okay let me, I'm
                  going to do a queue. So I see Ron, Mikey, yes. I can see you in the back of
                  my head Mikey. Didn't I have somebody else down at the other end here?
                  Where did you go, Ron.

Ron Andruff: So Maguy, Ron Andruff. Nice to make your acquaintance and to let you know
                  I'm also a new TLD applicant. So I'll be on that side of the equation at some
                  point.

                  First of all, I cannot tell you how happy all of us are to know that the
                  compliance team is finally up to the full manpower. I'm sure you've heard it
                  from many, but the fact is that the weakest chain in the link of ICANN, by far,
                  has been compliance.

                  And compliance has never had any chiefs. And so what's happened is
                  unfortunately, nefarious actors have just gotten out of hand. So finally we
                  need that to be reined in.

                  And it's critical that all of you are doing that. It's not going to be an easy task,
                  certainly not in the beginning. And it's going to get worse as time goes by.
                  Because with the large number of TLDs coming forward, what's going to
                  happen is you're going to be running from pillar to post trying to just keep
                  pace with their standard activities, let alone catch up with all the other things
                  that are going on.

                  I'm just saying that to kind of set the stage to make sure that everyone's clear
                  that you're going to need a much larger staff than you have now. And you
                  said that you have eight. And you're going to have 11.

You know, in my view you probably need a team of 50. And I'll tell you why. If I just divide 11 into 500 TLDs, that means everybody gets 45 to manage, just on a TLD side.

And we have 900 registrars today. So we can do the math there and you can see how much each one of you would have to manage. And you mentioned the audit. And now it's a manual audit.

So it's impossible to do a manual audit. So what happens is all of the activity, nefarious activities go on. And if you've got part of that who is, J. Scott Evans sat over in that chair and he says you know how much happens just between registrars, the trading of names, the money that they're making?

So it's a really, it's the blackest of eyes we could possibly have for ICANN. And for all of us who are here to try to build a strong ICANN, a strong institution. This is the place where it has to be done.

So you really have a challenge ahead of you. And I have a couple of pointed questions in terms of ramp up plans. I'm happy to hear the compliance tools are there. You know, Pam talked to us earlier, about a year or so ago and said that there were some hope to get some assessment tools and so forth in place.

And I'm really happy about that. We had the board meeting an hour or two ago. And we brought them to task on where do we stand with those tools? It's all well and good what the future looks like.

But where are the compliance tools now so that your staff can get to work on the current activities, let alone what we're about to face. So that's very, very helpful.

But on the ramp up plans, one of the questions I have for you in terms of your forward thinking. We are very clear within the BC that IDNs is the future of where ICANN will be going.

IDNs are critical, in fact the most important part in terms of this new GTLD process for in the eyes of many. So how would you expect to meet that challenge in terms of a multi lingual Internet?

You know, you're going to see IDNs in so many languages across the board. You know, there's 240, 250 languages and then all of the sub-sets of those languages. So how will you meet that? How do you expect to address that kind of a challenge? And have you given thought to it? Thank you.

Maguy Serad: I wake up every night hour upon hour. I understand the challenges ahead. Thank you for the way shed it up front. So IDN specifically, what we're looking at when I speak of staff augmentation and job descriptions.

It is not necessarily all US-based. We're looking at international staffing of the model. As I said, I speak and write fluently three languages, which I walked in the office one day. It was like my third week and the gentleman who handles our calls, I heard him say I'm sorry sir, I don't speak French. Can you say it to me in English?

I said I can speak it. I can speak it. So I got on the call immediately. And I said all I'm going to do here guys is translate. So I asked the gentleman in French what was his question.

I translated it in English and presented back in French. So we realize that that is critical to understanding, not just from a language perspective, but also from the culture, from the diversity, from the finest nuances that differ.

So that is what we're looking at from a staffing perspective. How, you know, that will help us be better prepared for that.

Ron Andruff: I agree. But many of us speak multiple languages here. So the point I'm getting at is that you're going to need people to speak hundred. No, I'm not joking. I mean it's quite clear.

You think just in India alone how many languages there are there. So I don't expect that we're going to get that far that fast. But I am saying that is a critical issue.

And so your biggest fight will be to get funding. We are very happy and ready, willing and able to support you in that. Be careful how you tell us because the last person went out the door when they told us they needed some help.

But I'm serious about that. That we really are - we are serious about it. We need to have these people in place. We need to have that long-term view that we as a group, as a family.

And so it's up to you to give us that guidance in terms of what does that look like. I hope that we will have a meeting with you and another two meetings or three meetings on maybe a year from now.

And you'll say oh, by the way, this is what we're going to do because it will be hundreds of languages, and not just a few. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: You're welcome. And I'm going to turn it off to Mikey. But I'm just going to say, it's Marilyn speaking. I think you may find this, and I think you may need to take it, use that.

You may find us a bit skeptical about the history that ICANN has of investing early enough in resources so that they can be thrown into the deep end of the ocean and allowed to swim around a little while before they have to climb the mountain.

So we're going to be really pushing the idea that people don't start, have a two-week training period and they're in charge. From our view, understanding the model and working in the organization to us is going to be viewed as a critical part of the skill set.

And I'm going to tell you, there is no history. There's no demonstrated history in ICANN today that shows that there's a recognition of that. So expect to continue to hear us pushing that point. But let me go to Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: What an act to follow. My name is Mikey O'Connor. A couple of points, there's an unlikely alliance that's emerging from the working group level, which is where I spend most of my time.

And the alliance, interestingly enough, is between those of us on the BC that are on the working groups and the large registrars who are as concerned about marginal registrars as we are.

And so a lot of the impetus that showed up in things like that memo that we wrote that caused all that excitement a year or so ago was really a joint effort between big registrars, go daddy network solutions, and us.

And that's an alliance that's very strong. And so feel free to call on that alliance when you need it because we're ready to step up and do that again.

One of the things that drove us crazy was the intensely manual effort that was required when we asked the compliance department to conduct an analysis of the complaints.

And none of us realized that what we had triggered was a three-month effort, basically a manual effort, going through the data to produce one report.

And that's where this idea came from that you guys need better systems. And then we wrote the memo. And then all hell broke loose. So to the extent that

the big kids at ICANN and the budgetary Gods and the management Gods don't get it. Let us join you in the conversation with them.

The other thing that I want to highlight is that we would love it if you participated in the policy making process with us, rather than reacting to what we write.

And to the extent that you can get in the game earlier, it doesn't take that much time, sometimes only an hour a week. But it's sort of designing in quality instead of inspecting in quality kind of approach to the thing.

So to the extent that you can get your staff engaged with us in the policy making process, I think that would be great too.

Maguy Serad: Marilyn, you know, we have an engagement. We're already late. But I would like to address two points, one you made and one the gentleman made, Mikey about the staffing and readiness and training.

That's, I really consider myself lucky. I have an amazing leadership team I work with. And my management is fully supported. So I know you're going to say well what do we care about that? You know, what's in it for us?

It's in it - it's a win/win for all of us. It's a win/win for me. It's going to help me do a better job. But it's also a win/win for you because I'm going to be able to support what I'm hearing you talk too.

So from a training perspective, we are proactively going to try to start staffing early so we can do the training, the onboarding in advance. They can shadow. They can work with the team.

Regarding collaboration with the policy, I would like to tell you, you know, again there's not enough time here. Maybe in the future we'll allocate a little more time.

Day 1 I reached out to stakeholders from the internal ICANN for the registrar, registry, policy development, you know, all the different groups. Because being at the tail end of a process, I don't want to inherit, you know, it's garbage in and garbage out guys.

I want to be up front, not only because of garbage in but because of lessons learned. But we also can provide an input. And we are already doing that. We have collaboration meetings with the policy department, with the registrar liaison, with the legal team. We have started all of this.

Marilyn Cade: I actually, I'm really worried about this because they have an appointment next door. And I think maybe we could do follow-up questions to them because...

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going do one. It's just one sentence long. And that is when you collaborate, don't forget to collaborate with the working groups. All those collaborations you talked about are staff. That's fine.

The people who actually make the policy that you have to deal with are the working groups. So don't forget us.

Marilyn Cade: Let us thank you and particularly, you know, it just pays to be friendly to the people you run into on planes, because that's where we met. Thank you so much and thanks again to the great team.

We're moving - if you don't have a copy of an agenda there's a few lying around. Remember we are being streamed. We have a conference bridge and we are - also we will have a transcript of the meeting.

The next segment of our session today is to hear from two of our members that are playing a leadership role in two very important areas. The BC has increasingly - sorry guys.

The BC has increasingly been turning its attention to a critical area for business, and that is SSR. Looking at security, stability and resiliency across the entire Internet area that ICANN influences is very important to business users.

And we're fortunate that the CSG representative to the SSR Review Team, Jeff Brueggeman, who is from AT&T is here with us and Scott McCormick, who is the designated BC representative from - and also from the CSG to the DSSA team is - Committee is here with us.

And we're also joined I'm pleased to say by Patrick Jones of the ICANN Staff and by Jeff Moss, our newest Vice President at ICANN. So we're going to hear from Jeff first and then from Scott and then we'll hear a few words from Jeff and Patrick, and then we'll open it up for quick questions.

Thanks Jeff very much. I know you've got a full schedule with the SSR Review Team while you're here too.

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, it's going to be a busy week. So just to provide a quick update I've done this a few times so I won't start from scratch. But first I wanted to thank the BC for filing comments in response to the - what were quite broad questions put out by the Review Team.

And I think it was very helpful on highlighting some general themes as well as some specific areas of concern, so that was really good input and we did not receive a lot of comments generally.

But I'm hoping that if we can refine our questions and our work that that will help to elicit more comments, although interestingly having been immersed in the Review Team I think one of the things we've talked about is there hasn't been a lot of public comment on any of the security issues, whether it's the

SSR plan, you know, other than the DNS server which kind of became a bigger issue.

I think that's one of the challenges and I think the Working Group might be an opportunity to help improve the awareness and comfort level or whatever the issue is of people participating.

So where we are right now is we have been - since the San Francisco meeting we broke into Working Groups to try and divide up the work or trying to really review a lot of the underlying documentation and really do the analysis.

And now we're coming together to try and actually think about how the report should be structured, and figure out where we want to go in terms of actually producing the report.

And we're using this meeting to do a lot of in-person meetings with various Stakeholder Groups. We met with the ASAC and the RSAC today. We're meeting with the GAC tomorrow and then on Thursday we have a public session I believe at 10 o'clock in the morning, maybe 9 o'clock.

Yes, and then we're meeting all day basically as a team to work on these issues. And so the - so where we are right now is we've got things structured under a set kind of three big categories of issues.

The first is what is ICANN's role on enhancing security, stability and resiliency given its limited technical mission, which is clearly one of the questions posed in the - in our section of the Affirmation of Commitments?

And we're approaching each of these sets of issues from a variety of ways, so on that issue we're looking at the underlying key documentation of ICANN's responsibilities.

We're getting input from what the community thinks about that issue, and we're also looking at how ICANN itself has defined its responsibilities particularly in the SSR plan.

And as you've noted the SSR plan for fiscal year '12 actually is broken down kind of into the responsibilities and then work effort. So I think that's very helpful to try and crystallize this issue.

You know, I would say and my own kind of personal comment is I think they're - one of the benefits that can come out of this Review Team and that maybe there should be a more focused community discussion on is a better consensus and understanding of everyone about what ICANN's roles are in this area.

I think that's emerged as kind of a recurring question. We've been talking internally to the Group that, you know, we kind of think about it in concentric circles.

There's a very small set of things that ICANN operationally has control for. Obviously you have the ICANN organization itself, whether it's the security staff, those things where there's direct control of the budget and then you have the outer layer of areas where ICANN has heavy influence capability with contracts, enforcement and those areas.

And then there's another, you know, engagement kind of area where I think that ICANN is recognized its relationship with law enforcement, governments and other things on the security and stability issues is very important.

So we're hoping that by virtue of being careful in how we outline the issues, we might be able to help in this area to make clear that it's not a homogeneous set of issues basically.

Marilyn Cade: I might just - I would think of this as four layers maybe, a four-layered cake. Would you let me ask a question about that? So there is the operational aspect including the fact that the organization itself must be secure and stable, both from a technical aspect but also a geopolitical, so not to talk about the geopolitical, just the technical aspect.

There's the L root server which is not directly about the operation of the organization, and the reason I mention it is that once you get beyond the operational aspect of the organization there's a Contracted Party.

But then there are the RARs and the RSACs, the parts of the root server operators and the CCs. And I would have probably put them in a different circle than the Contracted Parties because there's a relationship to them, and only in certain instances is there an actual agreement. And then the larger engagement with other groups...

Jeff Brueggeman: That's a good point. So even within the - I guess in - where we're using influence generally but there's kind of influence with a contract and there's influence that's more of a relationship another way.

Yes, so that's one big area of issue. The second is - and again the Affirmation of Commitments is very specific that, you know, ICANN has this security plan and we're to evaluate the effectiveness of that plan to deal with existing and emerging threats.

So that's really a focus on ICANN's existing SSR plan and - which is now in the third iteration for fiscal year '12 and is out for public comment right now. And, you know, Patrick has been...

Patrick Jones: Actually just to clarify they completed the public comment period on June 7 and the Board will be acknowledging receipt of that document on Friday.

Jeff Brueggeman: Thanks. So I think what we're focused on there is, you know, the initiatives that ICANN has identified as a key component of that plan. So how is the plan being executed itself, both directly and then indirectly as it feeds into the budget and into the strategic plan and into the other work efforts that ICANN is conducting?

And then we're also - I guess the broader issue is we had a very productive discussion with the SSAC this morning to look at how is - how did they fit into the function of ensuring SSR issues within ICANN?

You know, I've been looking at the policy development process and how SSR issues are addressed there. We're - so we're trying to get a different, you know, a number of different perspectives on that issue but really looking at this - kind of the implementation and execution on the security plan.

Marilyn Cade: However have not yet met with the ccNSO.

Patrick Jones: We have not.

Jeff Brueggeman: We have some representatives from that group, yes. The third big area is I think one of the most difficult areas that we're looking at, which is the existing and emerging threats.

And so that is an area that could become a very open-ended, broad discussion. And so I think we keep trying to look at that issue within the context of yes, there are many different types of threats to the DNS, existing and emerging, and we're trying to frankly get a way of - to manage that process where we can look at those issues without having it become a - either an endless work stream for us or create the - almost the impression that because there are a number of threats that somehow that ICANN should be held accountable to solving them.

And I think we have to be very careful about how we approach that issue. I think one of the things that helps is we're also going to link it into contingency planning, which is another component that was specifically mentioned in the Affirmation of Commitments.

So I - we're trying to do more of a process review rather than an underlying security audit. So to me the question is does ICANN have the right processes in place to do the types of risk assessments and identify the threats and to look at the contingency planning that's being done to address that?

But there is some element of I think some on the team who have security expertise - wanted to kind of think about the threats as part of that process. So those are kind of the three big areas that we're looking at.

I would say so far we've been in my view a little bit - taking a long time to frame the work effort into a structure and not have us just going off looking at an endless number of documents and things like that.

So I feel good that we're now settling on that structure and now can have the interviews and the review process feed into something, and in my view we are at the stage where we need to start outlining the report and get moving on this.

But it has been a challenge because I would say this is a particularly - of the three Review Teams it was maybe the most potentially broad and has taken a lot of work to try and figure out how we wanted to approach the work.

I'm not seeing any major disagreements on some of the issues. I think so far we've been on line and that we have to be careful about framing things within the terms of ICANN's roles and responsibilities, that we're not doing our independent audit of ICANN on security, that we're here to document what's happening including things that are working well and, you know, potentially make some constructive recommendations.

So, so far I think the Group is working well. I think the broad representation is both a plus and a challenge for us. We have representation from all the different groups of ICANN.

We have some people who are engaged and some people who are less engaged and - but we're making progress. So Mikey, you know, one of the things we've talked about is I know you've talked to Alejandro who's our Chair about the potential synergy with the new Working Group.

And I think we feel like, you know, to me that's something that should be identified in the report as a step that ICANN has taken, help encourage broader community participation on these issues which is a positive.

But we also think that there might be some synergies in just the work efforts that we're undertaking in the near term, so I know that's something that we're in communication with about which I think is good. That's it.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to turn to Scott and then we'll take questions shortly. And I have Scott to report because he is our designated representative, but I want to acknowledge that we're actually very fortunate that we have in the room the GNSO Co-Chair or the - I'll let him explain what his title is in a minute so Mikey may have additional comments. But Scott, can I ask you to give us an update on DSSA?

Scott McCormick: So the DSSA has kicked off a few weeks ago. We've had a couple of conference calls. Realistically we've just been looking at the charter, making sure that we understand the charter properly.

A few individuals from the charter Working Group is actually part of the DSSA, so that's out. The last call that we had was just kind of trying to refine the process and procedures of the Working Group, as well as refine and come up with a mechanism for confidentiality because there may be times

that we need to have that shared between members or within the groups or within subworking groups.

So that's where we're at right now. Not much has moved forward from there.

Marilyn Cade: I do want to be sure that we have a chance to hear from Jeff, so can I - Mikey is there anything you need to add on the DSSA? And - or then - can we then go to also hearing from Jeff Moss?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think Scott's got it pretty much nailed. What we did between the last meeting and this one was really all process all the time, and we're basically done with the launch.

And on Thursday we finally dig into the work so we're at that transition point.

Marilyn Cade: Let me ask and turn to Jeff. I'd like to just introduce him and it's one of those fortuitous things that we are really fortunate that because we know Patrick Jones we managed to coop Jeff's calendar.

So we hopefully will have longer time with you when we meet in Senegal. Jeff joined ICANN I think about five or six weeks ago and has quite an interesting background.

For those of you who know of him he's the founder of DEF CON and he will - is the Vice President and Chief Security Officer of ICANN. So let me just - I thought he might want to just say a few words and then we'll just go to questions about the SSR topic, and he may have questions for us.

Jeff Moss: Great. Thank you for the introduction. So as I understand it this is the business community, so I'm not sure who everybody is here. But my experience with business has been, you know, starting them and watching them fail and starting them and having them succeed and selling them, and

then moving from, you know, running your own business to working in a big kind of matrix organization where we don't believe in synergies.

We believe in adjacencies, right, so it was a different way of looking at the world. And then since then I've been donating more of my time, and part of what I do is I donate time to the Department of Homeland Security.

I'm on their - the Homeland Security Advisory Council and what we do there is we report directly to the Secretary on whatever it is she's interested in, and those have historically been things like border protection or right now, you know, building resilient communities.

And then from there I got involved and was recruited to come to ICANN, and I find ICANN very fascinating because there's only one organization like this in the world and I like how it tries to be very neutral.

It's nonprofit and it matches a lot of my own values, and the businesses I had sold were all very international in nature and so I like having a global scope. And so I like being involved in groups such as yourself that represent a global view and realize that there's many competing interests and there's generally no, you know, perfect solution.

It's - a law professor once told me that politics is the art of what's possible, not what's perfect. And so - and what's possible changes all the time. So - and then my philosophy on security is - I view kind of what I want to do with the security organization is I want to be a business enabler.

I want to make security available to you to help if you have questions - if you want to understand how we perceive the risks. So when you do make decisions you're rendering it with sort of the full knowledge of how security sees a particular space.

So whether it's the right decision or the wrong decision at least you've made an informed, you know, decision. So I don't want to be blocking anything. I want to be enabling activities and so with that said I have a very open door policy.

I'm happy to talk with anybody about anything that, you know, within constraints that I'm allowed to talk about. And so with that said I'd like to thank everyone.

I've had a fantastically warm welcome. It's kind of an interesting welcome how they say, "Congratulations. Boy, you're in a hot seat." Yes, so it'll be an interesting ride and I look forward to working with all of you, so thank you very much.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to open it up for questions actually to Jeff, Scott and also if you don't mind to Jeff and Patrick as well. So who wants to kick off?

Ron Andruff: I'm in.

Marilyn Cade: Ron Andruff is in, Mikey is in and (Jonathan). Ron?

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon Jeff, Ron Andruff, and for your information a new TLD applicant. We're all pretty excited about the changes and developments in the - in ICANN and this new regime, new TLDs and all the rest of it.

And then we find that a man of your stature in terms of security comes to join the company, and we're trying to understand a little bit about what's your role?

What's your day-to-day activities? What will you be doing? And in that there's also - Whit Diffie has joined the company some time ago, so is there, you know, he's a cryptographer.

You know, you're the guy that breaks cryptography if I could put it in those terms. How do you - what's the two roles and what will you be doing in terms of serving the organization so that we can better understand how we can interact with you in terms of bringing the interest of business?

And earlier in your comments, just a observation, you had said - I'm not sure who you were talking to. Many of us are small businesses and many of us represent large organizations.

I am a small businessman but others represent Facebook or represent other large corporations, so it's a real broad mix and there's about 25 or 30 of us that travel around to all of the ICANN meetings so you'll see our faces pretty regularly.

Jeff Moss: Okay.

Ron Andruff: So thank you for joining us. If you could give - shed some light on that question I'd be grateful.

Jeff Moss: Yes thank you for the questions. So the way I initially perceive the role is probably 30 or so percent internally focused with normal IT controls and policies and dealing with the business of ICANN the company, not ICANN the community.

And then I see the rest of my time being consumed, you know, externally facing with issues of ICANN the community. And one of the things I'm - as an outsider kind of coming in I've noticed that ICANN's profile has been rising quite rapidly, pretty much in lock step with world governments' recognition of the Internet as an economic force and, you know, a business enabler.

And just in Washington DC where I'm relocating to the ICANN office there, a year ago there were no bills in front of Congress relating to cybersecurity, and last time there were 72.

Now they'll be distilled down to a couple and some of the best parts will be, but that - to me that tells me that legislation is coming and governments are getting involved.

And so we have to as a community be very proactive to understand their concerns and address them ourselves, because if we can't address them they're going to do it for us.

And I think it's much better that we self-regulate than, you know, have it. So part of my attention will be spent in addressing their concerns, trying to educate anybody that has questions about why it's better for us to self-regulate versus, you know, be regulated.

And on Whit Diffie's part he's not full-time but he definitely contributes time to ICANN, and part of the idea there is the thought leadership and depth of knowledge.

And so what we find is people - we find issues that pop up and we want some deep thinking and we want sort of an outside place that's respected that can talk or think about, you know, sort of long-term issues.

For example one of the issues - I don't know if I should - one of the issues I'd like to have him look at is as we move to a DNSEC world, will things go into DNSEC, you know, will our risks models change?

So for example right now you query DNSEC and you get a number back and you trust that number. But what happens when people start querying it and get a recipe back or a photograph back or a digital certificate back?

How does that change how our risk models are built around DNSEC? I don't know. I don't know if anybody's really fully thought that through, but that day is coming and it should not catch us by surprise.

So let's - I'll have - I'll ask Whit those questions and he can think about it for a while and come back and we can start conversations. And if what he comes back with is something that has nothing to do with ICANN, at least we can put to the community, "Hey, this is what we've thought about."

Now maybe it's a issue the community should think about. Or maybe it also happens to have five new business opportunities and someone can go into that new technology and make a lot of money, but I definitely don't want us to be reactionary in some of these areas.

I want to be leaning forward and taking a thought leadership role, and that's sort of I think what I'll be using Whit for.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just going to make a comment Jeff and follow up to something that you just said. I think that's extremely exciting and interesting to all of us before I go to Mikey.

But there was a previous CEO at - and President at ICANN who speculated about the idea for money making, revenue making opportunities to come out of research or other activities that ICANN engaged in.

It was extremely poorly received by the community and by the governments, so I just might suggest that...

Jeff Moss: I want to clarify. I'm not suggesting you come up with a business model. What I'm suggesting is people are going to be doing this regardless of what we say, and because someone somewhere will think that there's a business angle.

And so we should be interpreting the incentives and be able to talk intelligently about, you know, the outcome of that. What if all of a sudden people think it's the greatest thing in the world to put pictures in there?

What does that do to TCP traffic load? What does that do for server reliability? I just - I'm just using this as an example of one area where I could possibly use Whit to think deeply.

And I don't think that's an area that ICANN has really been active in. The security group has not really been active in that area, and so that's probably what I will - I'll pursue in that area.

And another thing I'm thinking about is we want to grow our training program where what we do is right now to a lot of the ccTLDs, there's a program, there's a schedule and we offer some DNSEC capability enhancement to them, because a lot of these smaller operators don't have the resources or the experience.

So with - that was - who is it?

Man: That's with John Crane and the capacity building program over the years with not just ICANN, but it's with partners with ISOC and with the regional TLD organizations.

Jeff Moss: So that's a program I want to continue and maybe accelerate and grow, and the concept there is maybe we train the trainers so it's not just us providing the training.

We pass on the material and we're not - I don't - we're not interested in making any money on it. We're not going to copyright it. We want to spread the knowledge.

So - and then what we're finding is there's other constituencies that say, "Well that's really great. I'm not a TLD operator but half of this material is interesting to me. Can you write another chapter in this other area?"

So we'll have to look at how many requests we get but we might grow that training a little bit more broadly, because I think a lot of problems can be solved with training and awareness.

So - and maybe we can kind of make the life a little easier for security by, you know, spreading some of the training.

Mikey O'Connor: This is a question for Jeff too. Mikey O'Connor, Interim GNSO Co-Chair for the DNS Security and Stability Advisory Working Group. How about that? I got it all.

And one of the things that we are working on is a very operationally focused look at the current state, the current level and stability in the DNS. We're not interested in TCP but we're pretty much within the boundaries of the ICANN mission.

And one of the things that we spend talking about mostly to the Co-Chairs because we have - we're just at launch right now - is this idea that one of the big values of this effort will be to enrich the community of security practitioners that is convened by ICANN.

You know, we come together here because we share the mission of ICANN, but we're a handy bunch because, you know, we're right at the heart of the DNS.

Do you have any aspirations along those lines, and if so would you be interested in joining our gang? Go ahead.

Jeff Moss: Right. Right. Well I already have my handy left hand man here doing some of that. Do you want to talk about your efforts?

Mikey O'Connor: Well - and as you know I've been sort of shadowing the group and providing some guidance - yes, Patrick Jones from Staff.

Patrick Jones: So I'm still bringing Jeff up to speed on the variety of things that each of the team members is involved in and that's one of the areas where I was part of the - following along with the charter drafting group, and this has continued with - as the DSSA has been getting up to speed. So I'm certain you'll have opportunities to dive in and be part of that.

Jeff Moss: Yes, so I don't want to say no but I don't fully understand the obligation yet so - but we can talk and I'd like to learn more about that. I think the SSR is very important and I think some of the other review committees are very important.

And providing to the community a signal of what outside experts think of the stability, it's one thing if ICANN says, "Oh, you know, L root's really stable."

Patrick Jones: And, you know, one other thing to keep in mind is that this Working Group was a cross-community reaction to an original Staff proposal, and so while we want to be supportive and help facilitate we don't want to be seen as trying to drive any direction at all for this group.

So let the group do its thing and where we can provide input and suggestions from our own experience as subject matter experts, certainly offer to do that. But we don't want...

Jeff Moss: We don't want the implication that or perception that it's Staff feeding...

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to sort of comment on that for a minute maybe Jeff, and ask others to comment on that. I think we were taken aback by the - how far - how well-developed or how far-developed a particular concept, which may or may not be a good idea. It's an idea but it was allowed to move so far that before the community became involved it was a proposed solution to a perceived problem before the community agreed on the perceived problems.

And I think that was unfortunate because we didn't spend enough time understanding the problems. We had a very strong community reaction, including from our constituency against this particular solution.

The DSSA group, to me, is a vitally important group. And I think we're going to learn a lot from it. I spoke yesterday about what we were thinking about when we established ICANN and what its scope of responsibility might be in certain areas.

This morning at the Cost Constituency Breakfast with the ALAC we debated and discussed what ICANN's role should be in acting in the public interest. And I think some of the things that are going to come out of the work of the DSSA are going to be informational to the entire community within ICANN, and those of us who work outside ICANN, as well.

So I really appreciate the comment you made about not leading but supporting. But I think there's an important message for all of us that this set of issues is vitally important since one of ICANN's core activities is to support the secure and stable operation, and for the BC, our first priority for ICANN.

It's not new GGLD's. It's not IVNs. Right? It's security and stability and predictability of the unique indicators and of the functions that ICANN's responsible for.

So we really welcome the interaction. I think you'll - you should expect us to continue to focus on SSR at all of our meetings and to hear more from the SSR Team in Senegal and the Begue team, as well -- the committee, as well.

Patrick Jones: Right. I thank you for comments there because, like I said, as sort of an outsider you have to speak. Nothing else works if you don't have security and stability and reliability. I mean, that's the foundation on which the house is built. So it better be a really strong foundation. And that foundation's going to be tested as more and more things are put into a DNS infrastructure.

Jeff Moss: Just to wrap this up, something that I want to clarify. You know, Patrick--and this is mostly - I mean, we could take this offline--but I think it's important enough that we say it out loud. And that is that one of the things that we're trying to do in the DSSA is built trust. Not just between the constituencies and - but also between the constituencies and the staff.

               So don't be too gun-shy about coming up with ideas. At this stage of the game I think the issues that caused the DSSA to be formed has passed and we're now in a place where we need to step closer to amore collaborative relationship rather than, "Holy shit, they're thinking we're cramming something down their throat.'

               And I don't think we're at that stage anymore. And Marilyn will recall from about four years ago when there was this Reserve (Names) Working Group. And from a staff perspective I was actually quite heavily involved in serving a collaborator-facilitator with - across community work.

               And that group actually came up with some really critical information that ended up in the - what's now the Applicant Guidebook.

               So I look back to that experience as, this is another time where, as from staff I will be a collaborator-facilitator with the community and will not hesitate.

Marilyn Cade: We're going to have to hear from (Steve). I'm going to give Wolf's - I think actually I'm going to hear from (Jonathan), who was in the Cuban entity and then we're going to wrap up.

(Jonathan):   I just wanted to raise maybe some questions for the group as a whole -- just brainstorming. You know, with cyber crime on the rise, including the misappropriation of business information and customer data, I'm thinking about, on the Internet governance level and the relationship with security and

stability, is there a need for more cross-functional teamwork with private sector organizations like the IAB and the Business Constituency?

And at what level of the Internet -- or is it more than one level -- do we need to be able to address some of these abusives, and is there a role for us as the business constituency to play in that?

Jeff Moss: Is that directed, or just an open question?

(Jonathan): Just an open question for everyone to think about.

Marilyn Cade: To answer the question the idea that the Internet Architecture Board would have a relationship with the Business Constituency?

(Jonathan): I wasn't going to answer that question. I could take a shot at it, I suppose. You know, I had a triple major in college, I can just come up with something.

But I was going to talk about the fact that I think one of the opportunities that we sometimes miss here at ICANN is the cross-universe collaboration opportunities. Not just physically to the IAB but, you know, we are a really interesting group of people that stretches into all kinds of interesting nooks and crannies all over the world.

And it's pretty unique, and we should take advantage of that. And we're somewhat peculiar, too. So anyway, I, for one, would support the idea that, you know, to the extent that we represent an already convenient group of very diverse interest and expertise, we should take advantage of that.

Marilyn Cade: To really back wrap this up quickly, I'm going to hear from Jeff and then from Fred, and then we're going to wrap.

Jeff Moss: Yes, a quick point. When we met with the FSAC this morning they emphasized how they view themselves as having an external role that's

bidirectional, so they participate in things like the MOG and the (NFHN) Marketing Group. And, you know, they have put their work products into those groups and also, you know, participate and feel like they can also be a way to bring those issues into ICANN.

But I think that is worth thinking about that ICANN has a -- not just an organization but has, like you were saying, a collection of people that really should be looking for ways to try and think about the other important organizations out there and security.

Patrick Jones: And just a quick clarification. We said the IAB -- the Interactive Advertising Board or was that the - by - the...

(Jonathan): Internet Architectural Board.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

(Jonathan): I was only thinking about them as an example of some - an organization that plays a role in the technical coordination of the Internet, and thinking about the technical coordination of the Internet and the business constituency and how those interplay on the Internet governance level just to combat cyber crime.

Marilyn Cade: There's actually some IAB members that occasionally show up at ICANN wearing a different hat. So we might catch them to get them to explain what it is the IAB does.

This has been fantastic to have you come and join us. And we will work with Patrick to - I'm - Patrick, I should disclose that Patrick and I are plotting, trying to organize a meeting in Washington, DC to have a wider audience. Then we would ask Jeff and Scott to sort of take a lead in working with us to do that and we could broaden the attendance and advertise it broadly to the trade associations and others in business.

So we'll continue to work toward that. And thank you for joining us. Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Yes, one last bit and, you know, Marilyn you're aware of this, as well from the previous session that the BC did in Washington back in October of last year. You know, there are different groups where some of you are also members that touch on business. So TechAmerica is one.

But previously it, you know, came to the San Francisco meeting and encouraged the Chief Security Officers to come. And we did the first CISO roundtable at the San Francisco meeting.

There's also groups like the IT Sector Coordinating Council that I sit on as an invited subject matter expert and there are many more groups like that, that you're participating in. And there are ways to broaden the outreach to the greater business community and to, you know, introduce what the issues that we're facing here and how it's important to them.

So if that's something that can be done in Washington or in other venues, then we would support them.

Marilyn Cade: Join me in thanking, and thank...

Man: Hey, Marilyn just so everybody knows, the (board GAC) meeting's been postponed to 15/30. Or sorry -- 17/30, (doctor).

Marilyn Cade: Fantastic. You have more time to work. Thank you.

Woman: Why'd you have to tell Marilyn?

Man: So Jeff, thank you very much. We're glad to have you.

Jeff Moss: Thank you for having me here.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. We are going to try to wrap up in a succinct period of time so that you guys can take that deep breath before we go into that next meeting.

But there's three things we will need to do. And one of them is we need to get up to date on any remaining council topics that need to be addressed by our councilors tomorrow. And (Steve) is going to kick that off and lead it. And Fahd and John are both here.

We're going to talk about who's participating in what sessions throughout the rest of the week and (Steve) will kind of walk through that and see who's volunteered to cover different sessions so that we can make sure, since some sessions compete with each other, we have BC participation and attendance.

And then finally, we're going to spend at least ten minutes, guys, coming up with our topics for the public forum. I have to turn those topics in today to Tony, so that they can be submitted. And we are actually influencing the public forums, so we want to be sure that we have some good topics that we want the time to be devoted to.

So think about that. That'll be the last thing that we do before we go to the board and get interaction. Thanks, (Steve).

(Steve):   Thank, Marilyn. Sunday morning we distributed the (Halsey) calendar and it included the full agenda for the council meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. (Saradin) and John, I reviewed what we sent around Sunday morning and what is currently posted.

And it isn't different. It doesn't look like the agenda has changed substantially. But if you're aware of any changes, either in the agenda or in the motions -- John, I remember you had a couple things you want to bring up -- let's update

the members only on the basis of what's changed since Sunday morning. And we don't need to start from scratch here. Thank you.

Man: The motions have changed. John, do you want to go ahead and take the motions?

John Berard: That's an aye.

Man: So there's a new motion up on the Wiki, basically. It's going to be very confusing because each and every result actually has a different threshold and we a completely different matrix now.

Marilyn Cade: And the topic for the...

Man: Oh I'm so sorry. There is one - there was only one resolution in that part. I'm confused. I apologize. This is the (thick) resolution of the adoption of the RITP-B Final Report of Recommendation. So that's the one everybody's been listening to in the Saturday-Sunday sessions.

                 The main thing that really concerns any of us, I guess, in the BCU or in the CSG is being the issue of result C, which as the UDRP mentioned. And even though the first time it was brought up Tim was quite amenable to have it removed, we found that when the actual presentation took place on Sunday the working group members became a little more staunch about the fact that, no, this is something you've discussed. We don't see why we have to remove it. It's in the report and we're not going to budge.

                 Tim (Silts) can back and said, "It does - really doesn't make any difference but I'll have to go back to my constituency and figure this out."

                 We have not seen any discussion on the lists with regard to this. I don't see anybody moving. What I do understand is that there's a 35% of one house and the majority of the other house, it has to pass this.

If it's only going to be IPC and the BC that say that we object to this and everybody else signs up to be in (New York) and votes in favor of the UDRP Resolve C, then it will go through. So maybe we need to do some discussions with the IPC folks, with (Christine) and others to see where we want to go with that. But that's really the only issue that we have with IRTP report.

Mikey, would you like to come in and speak about this a bit? Could you read us IR number C please?

Mikey O'Connor: It's only one sentence long.

Man: Right, let me get to that in one second. Yes, the council recommends that if a review of the UDSO -- very sorry -- if a review of the UDRP is conducted in the near future, the issue of requiring the locking of a domain name subject to UD operative proceeding is taken into consideration.

So it's subject to if it ever happens, et cetera. The concerns (Christine) arose was twofold. One, it presupposes the fact that locking is not required at the moment. So that's an issue.

And, two, it sort of lays as a resolution on these end that there will be, or it's conceived to be, a review of the UDRP. And that's obviously something which is considered to be now part of the issues reported in the UDRP.

So, you know, it has been overcome by greater events. Mikey, would you like to say something? And, you know, Chris wants (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Conner: From my vantage point, I don't know why I am so echoing. I need to change mike.

Chris Chaplow: Whilst Mikey's arranging himself, just on the list everybody's seen we've
                   posted to the list, I posted the list yesterday, the items just to make sure none
                   of the members missed that. And they can see the - what (Wakey), what I
                   and what Berry supported, and our orders of importance.

Mikey O'Conner: Just trying it out. Oh, that's a lot better.

                   This is really kind of an operational thing. The current situation in our registrar
                   is that it's not required to lock. It's available and a lot of registrars do do it. But
                   it's not in policy.

                   And interestingly enough I think the impetus for this came from WIPO. And so
                   I was a little surprised when Marilyn - when (Christina) sort of said, "Wait. We
                   don't want this." Because it was sort of like, what up with that? John, do you
                   want to clue me in?

John Berard: The - I think the IPC is fixed on a view of not to open up UDRP.

Mikey O'Conner: Yes.

John Berard: And so the nuance isn't really an issue. It's the core. It's the basic issue,
                   which is open it or not. In terms of this particular resolve, I think it's been
                   overtaken by events, myself. Okay? So the UDRP - in fact, it's the three most
                   important things that have to do with council work are not happening in the
                   council. Right?

                   It's the UDRP hearing tomorrow, it's the Competition Consumer Trust and
                   Innovation hearing that's happening tomorrow. And, well, and the cross-
                   community working group discussion that is born from the council but is now
                   sort of moved out and maybe getting a life of its own.

                   Those are three things that we should be paying close attention to and I think
                   we are. But in terms of the Resolve C taking it on, you know, having it

overturned by - overrun by events, the UDRP and the issues report, which said and perhaps not to do a PDP, had, you know, three, four pages worth of process changes that could be implemented without it.

And included in there is about locking the domain. So, you know, there are couple of different ways to get this thing done at this point.

Mikey O'Conner: Yes, and that's, you know, that's essentially my take is that, you know, if you back me into a corner and say how important is this in terms of the sense of the working group, we talked about it, we agreed that it was a good idea, we put it in a report. As John said, it's been overtaken by events.

If it gets voted up fine, if it - you know, this nuance of having the words UDRP show up in anything -- and that's a big bugaboo -- is I think being a little over the top by the IPC. But on the other hand I don't think it's anything to go to war over and so it's way down on my hit parade in terms of importance.

Man: This is - so to be summarized is that Mikey, (Berry) and Chris feel it's yes on everything? Right, (Jonathan), you're next. It's yes on everything and we don't really need to go into too much detail on this because as John indicated, there's still more to come tomorrow.

So with having said that, let's see if we can wrap this up quickly. (Jonathan), do you have a question on this point, on UDRP?

(Jonathan): I don't have a question. I had a comment. Just in terms of the UDRP process itself, as a business I think that it's critical that we - that businesses have the ability to lock down domains in order to be able to enforce rights against domains that are important.

It's probably the - one of the most single most important aspects of the UDRP that I personally would rely on in order to secure rights. I'm not sure that I'm

seeing something different than what anyone else is seeing. But just in terms of the UDRP process and locking down domains, I think it's critical.

Man: Let me invite you then, (Jonathan), to join the drafting team that's currently working on the BC's comments on the UDRP Preliminary Issues Report. Elisa Cooper of MarkMonitor is leading that.

And if you wish, I can add you to that group. It will mean taking a pen and doing some drafting in time to get it from the BC members by July 1. You interested?

(Jonathan): I'm sure I can help out with that.

Man: Great. Thanks a lot.

(Jonathan): Just let me know exactly what it consists of.

Man: I will.

(Jonathan): All right.

Man: So I hit on Mike, so I hit on John. Anything more you want to say about council tomorrow? Thanks very much.

Next step would be to quickly scan the agenda that we have in front of us to see if there are places where a particular interests merits BC attendance. John, you mentioned the work that you and I have been doing on trying to get the consumer trust, choice and competition.

John Berard: Right. That's at 12:30 tomorrow?

Man: Yes (but I'm not sure of it). We're not going to go through the whole agenda.

Marilyn Cade: But we actually, I just want to be sure (unintelligible) starting tomorrow morning with an SSR briefing. And I wanted to ask Jeff, this is a security, stability and resiliency briefing? Is this your group or is this a briefing - this supposed to be a briefing by ICANN?

Jeff Moss: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Jeff Moss: That's like the one - it's like all those other ones that we...

Marilyn Cade: I just - okay, I just wanted to be sure.

Jeff Moss: It's not the - it's not the (repay). And then...

Man: Our public session.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, yes. I just - having seen it...

Jeff Moss: It says that the ICANN Secures Team will provide an overview for assistant staff.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry back to - you want to review our previous?

Man: All right. So one of the items tomorrow is that there will be a workshop at 12:30 on a board resolution about defining - definitions in metrics for three key phrases that will be used in the affirmation of commitments to review that will be done a year after the new GTLD program puts new TLDs in the root.

                  And John Berard and I have worked closely with Rosemary Sinclair to be sure that the BC had a draft definition for all three of those. So we are going to participate on that workshop. And I'd like to encourage any members here,

especially those of you who have contributed to that draft, please attend the workshop and we have a very interactive session.

And this is a very disorganized group. It's going to be up to us to sort of lead it a little bit. And it would be so beneficial to have people participating from the audience, as well as the panel, so that it looks like more of a groundswell of trying to achieve some organization.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: So there's the UDRP session in the morning for two hours that everyone will be interested in, right, largely? That's 8:30 to 10:30. Is that right? And then there's constituent stakeholder travel support. And Chris and I will catch up on how that can be covered.

Then there's the GAC session with the GNSO from 11:00 to 12:30. Is that right?

Man: There's another one tomorrow, Wednesday.

Marilyn Cade: That's Thursday? Maybe that's Thursday?

Man: No, I think you're right. I think you're right.

Man: Yes, we're just looking online right now and that's it on the date I think.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: I think you have the only one.

Marilyn Cade: So can you just go again with what's in the morning then, that's of interest to the members? This is out of date. Is the first thing at - because there is a GAC...

Man: There's a GAC WHOIS for your team.

Marilyn Cade: Yes?

Man: There is one. And there's a constituency stakeholder travel support from 11:00 to 12:00 -- yes there is. It's in The Orchard.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: On the right-hand side.

Marilyn Cade: But there is no council GAC interaction? Okay.

Man: Right. And all of you have full access to the schedule so that it's not necessary, I think, to walk through the entire schedule in the next two to three days. I thought perhaps we would highlight things that are of particular interest where BC members are participating, or that we're looking for a particular coverage, right?

                But I think we would end up using too much time here to go over each and every event. That was your intention of (Streckle).

Marilyn Cade: My - I think (Manny) has sent out a marked-up calendar so that you guys could all see the topics that are - we think are of interest. Because some of the meetings should have attendants from the BC if at all possible.

                UDRP's obviously going to be - when it comes up it's going to broadly interesting, WHOIS. But some of the other stuff we need to either make comments back or be prepared to deal within the public forum.

                Is there anything tomorrow besides what coverage you think fits into that?

Man:			There's a trademark clearing house implementation.

Marilyn Cade:		That's pretty important to us, right?

Man:			(Unintelligible).

Man:			And at the same time there's council -- there is the WHOIS review team interaction with community, as well.

John Berard:		Yes, that would be an interesting session to sit down with the registrars and registries.

Marilyn Cade:		Actually, there's two, John, right? There's one with the registrars but there's also an interaction with the community from - with WHOIS, which is parallel, isn't it?

((Crosstalk))

Man:			It's parallel with council.

Marilyn Cade:		Right. It's parallel with the council.

Man:			Right.

Marilyn Cade:		So I can go to that because I know (Steve) and John and Zahid need to be in the council. I can to the WHOIS thing. Is there anybody else that can go to that?

Man:			I think you'll be there.

Woman:			Yes, I'll be there.

Man:			So will Susan.

Marilyn Cade: You'll be speaking. I thought you wanted people in the audience to...

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Anything else from that?

Man: No, that's it for Wednesday.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. What are we going to say about the metrics for competition, consumer trust and consumer choice? Is that - do we have a speaker on the panel?

Man: Yes, I'll be a speaker on the panel, and we are trying - endeavoring to get someone from each of the other groups that the board resolution requested an answer from. And the board resolution from Bruce Tonkin requested an answer from the GAC, from the ALAC, from GNSO and from CCNSO.

So Rosemary was controlling that about who's going to be on that panel and we met yesterday preliminarily and she agreed to get at least somebody from each of those groups, although she doubted we would have a GAC representative -- a reason she'd probably understand.

And what we've done -- we also discussed the affirmation and commitments, the resolution from the board and then a couple of outline points on these three points.

And I did introduce the three draft definitions that were in the document that Philip Sheppard led the preparation on. And I think when we put them up on the board tomorrow it'll be seen as straw man. And you can bet that many members of this workshop may have a very different view of where it's going.

So we'll do our best to explain what the BC was thinking. We're trying to take a leadership role in framing the idea in a way that really pays attention to the

interest of registrants and users. By defining the consumer as registrants and users I think we can hopefully steer it in a concrete direction.

And again, the objective is to get definitions and metrics which would then be used by a review team that won't even convene for about two years -- two to three years.

Marilyn Cade: (Steve), we're struggling with the consumer trust now because that's a key term in the WHOIS review team. So I think that could be very helpful.

(Steve): I doubt our work will be done in time for you. But if it is you can use it. And of course, we're going to discuss tomorrow the fact that your team recently requested from Mikey $125,000 to fund a survey.

Mikey O'Conner: (Unintelligible) from Chuck.

(Steve): Okay. A survey of consumer groups to determine their perceptions of consumer trust.

Marilyn Cade: It's actually part of the outreach plan. And looking at the affirmation of commitments the thought was that our outreach plan was only internal to ICANN because (unintelligible). And we felt like we had to figure out a way to get some type of input from consumers.

So it's more than a survey. It's going to be focus groups. But - and we don't - hopefully we won't spend all of the money. We tried to ask for more than what we think we really need.

Man: And then looking at the agenda for Thursday, Jeff Brueggeman security team is presenting interaction with the community on Thursday morning. The thing in particular is do that and support your efforts, then?

(Steve):   You know, I think last time there were a few folks who just sat in the whole day during the session. So if you're interested, the first hour, I think, will be, you know, probably a similar update to what I just provided. But happy to take any input if anyone wants to jump in.

Man: Great. Then at roughly 11 o'clock on Thursday. There's several events at the same time that we'll want to cover -- the IGF workshop. There's support for new applicants that (unintelligible) the (jazz) working group discussion. And I know Ron Andruff will be there.

    And then there's a best practices to address abusive registrations. You know, all these are at the same time, at 11 o'clock.

Woman: And I think there's another (session). Thanks. I know myself, and often Marilyn and others have made a point of going to the Public Participation Committee -- consultation our meetings. And this time I have a prep session at 10:00 o'clock for the IGF session, because I'm on that panel. So I'll go for half an hour, if somebody else would like to go, that'd be great.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going, but I wondered, Chris Chaplow are you available then? And I don't know Chris if you're not.

(Chris):   Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. What about Chris...

Chris Chaplow: Sorry, I was just researching something about that day. What was the question again?

Marilyn Cade: The Public Participation Committee is meeting from 9:30 to 10:30. It's probably really important that we go to that. I'm also going to go to the summit discussion as well. There's a little confusion that's coming out of the...

Chris Chaplow: I'm okay on that, yes - Chris speaking.

Marilyn Cade: ...yes, the Public Participation Committee on who's responsible for encouraging participation of different groups. Is it a centralized staff driven initiative or does it focus on support to constituencies to also encourage participation? But I'll be there and Chris, I think if you're able to come, that will be great.

Chris Chaplow: Sure. Can I just bring up the study group on these names for countries and territories closed. And that's the one that all the (geography) went on in the GNSO and when (unintelligible) the picking of the people for it. And we're not on it, but I'm sort of stalking it. There are - and it's not going very well, they've had one call. So of the eight GNSO people on the list, only six attended the call. So, I can compare the two lists. Well I'm going to go in the meeting, I might get thrown out. We'll see what happens - we're watching for appointed GNSO people. We want BC, because BC should have a person. And if any of them are absent - three went out or two went out, we're watching sort of thing.

Marilyn Cade: Well Chris, this is a workshop, so it's open, right?

Chris Chaplow: No, it's closed.

Marilyn Cade: Eleven to 12:30?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Oh sorry, I was looking at Geographic Regions Review Working Group workshop.

Man: Okay, so that's close.

So the only other thing we have on Thursday then is the public forum, which scheduled from 2:00 to 6:30 - an extensive one. And I think that brings us to the topic Marilyn wanted to cover, which is topics for the public forum.

Woman: There's also a session for - just so - I don't want people to miss this, because we've skipped over it. There is a session from 12:30 to 2:00, right? Getting rid- Understanding the Applicant Guidebook Questionnaire. So some members may be particularly interested in that. The - right now we have a tentative 45-minute members huddle, which we may have to have right before the public forum. Depending on what actually ends up on the public forum. One of the good i- good things is that Elisa's asking for information - asking for ideas on what should go into the public forum. The bad news about that is, you don't know until Tuesday night or Wednesday morning what the topics are. So, without commenting on the pros and cons of that, can we just hear a list of the priority topics that you think should come up in the public forum, realizing it's going to be (widowed) down.

Man: Any one idea?

Man: Okay.

Man: I found that this morning's breakfast with the ALAC on the topic of Definition of Public Interest to be no secret. I thought it was a great topic and it was well done. I wouldn't mind at all seeing a little momentum in that direction, with defining public interest. So, I might suggest that could be a topic we suggest for the public forum.

Woman: What...

Man: The same way you phrased it?

Woman: Yes.

Man: The same way you phrased it in this morning's breakfast.

Woman: Okay. So I might say something like, "Given that the affirmation of
                commitments includes...

Man: Multiple references.

Woman: ...multiple references to ICANN acting in the public interest," blah, blah, blah.
                So that's one, okay. I'll type out the blah, blah, blah.

Man: ATRT...

Woman: Uh-hum.

Man: The Accountability Transparency Review Team implementation of issues is
                already on the Board agenda for Friday. So if it is, more than likely it will be
                on the - it will be on the list of public forum (unintelligible).

Woman: Let me write that down and come back and ask you guys a question in light of
                our discussion with the Board today. Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I was just going to say, you know, I support bringing it up. I - we did
                have a fairly robust discussion about it here. And I guess it's a question of do
                we want to bring it into the public forum and sort of have a broader response
                from the Board then that which they gave us today?

Woman: You know that's what I - thank you for raising that. I'm going to discuss - let
                me just park that and see if there's any other topics, and come back to that.
                Are there any other topics that people want to propose?

Man: I have another one, this is a BC adoptive position that during the .NET
                contract renewal, the BC, and in addition the ALAC - I even think the (DIBC)
                did it - requested specifically that ICANN staff press for the inclusion of SIC

who is in the .NET renewal. And we got no answer back from that. It's a topic for the Board to consider on Friday, so it ought to be discussed - the .NET renewal and the parameters of that contract. On behalf of BC, I repeated all the BCs comments and sent them to the General Council and to Kurt Pritz about a week ago. And neither has replied. I even saw JJ on the plane, and he said, "I'll do my best to reply." But we still don't' know the answer to the question, "Did staff ask the contractor to do (thick) is?" Because the next question is "What was the response?" If it isn't in the current renewal, it's up for vote by the Board.

Woman: Let me ask us to look at this, and I'm thinking about how to couch it, right. So, because that's a particular request we made. But the .NET renewal is what's up for discussion. We want to know, of the comments that were received, including this one, what is the disposition there? Because that's the requirement that ICANN has in the affirmation of commitments. Is to say whether or not they take comments into account...

Man: We could do it that way, that's right.

Woman: ...how, and if not, what the explanation is.

Man: And there were three - three groups. Three groups - three of the (co-members) asked for the inclusion.

Woman: Okay.

Man: The IPC, the BC and the ALAC. So actually what you're saying, "Phrase in terms of the ATRT obligations," the Accountability Transparency obligations to either document the response in (public forum).

Woman: And what is the...

Man: (Probably be a good) way to do it.

Woman: So those - that's three. Is there anything else? I have one in mind and I think it's along the lines of - but let's talk about the ATRT implementation of issues and think about how we're going to handle it. Because I kind of agree with Chris. I want to be - we had a discussion with the staff and some of the Board and we got answers about where they are in the process of responding. There are three documents that are posted. One of them is this running document, where the staff posts - list the things that they are doing that shows that they're making progress on the implementation. So the did a webinar on something, that was said. They committed to improving the publica- the schedule on publishing materials before the ICANN meeting. That's listed, they don't meet the deadline, but it's listed.

             See, when you go through the long spreadsheet, there's a huge list of stuff that staff have been asked to just put in there to show the motion of implementing the - but there's four or five issues. And I think those are the ones that we would want to - the major change for us, that we ask for - there's three I think. One is the change in the public comment approach and establishing a reply comments process. That is a major, major change that affects all of ICANN's public comments.

             And there is no information at all on how that's going to work. So the answer we got was we're not going to see anything until Friday, after it's approved. Isn't that the answer we got?

Man: Yes it doesn't make sense to have it on the agenda.

Woman: Well, I'm kind of thinking that we may want to report to the Board that while we appr- this is the public comments. We don't' have to just ask them a question. While we would need to be succinct about this. While we appreciate the - because I'm thinking about if we get the topic on the public forum, that means people are going to go to the microphone and comment about it, we

also need to think about what we're going to say. And what our purpose is of putting it forward.

Man: Maybe I misunderstood, but I thought what we heard today was they were going to put some things out for further public comment. (Unintelligible) in a proposal (unintelligible). Maybe I was confused.

Woman: No, that's what you heard. But you're not going to know until Friday what they are and what the timelines are.

Man: Uh-hum.

Woman: I think what I'll do is go track Denise down and see if I can maybe between us, Tony and I can try to talk more with her. I think they're under terrific pressure to implement, implement, implement, and say they're implementing. But I'm kind of like Chris, I'm thinking we raised it with the Board, we had a long discussion about it...

Man: (Unintelligible) public, as opposed to...

Woman: Yes.

Man: I think you're right. Just leave it out.

Woman: So let me go talk to Tony and see what we synthesize out of that and come back by email to everybody. Because he actually has to aggregate the topics that go in. So anything that we're missing that you guys want to see on the public forum. Want to check on the health of any of (Rod's) special advisors who's joined the staff for recently?

Man: I can't (read).

Man: The main agenda on Friday for the Board, does include renewal of .NET.

Woman: Yes.

Man: So, we don't have to just couch our comment in terms of the accountability of staff. We can speak something...

Woman: Got it.

Man: ...but we can't vote on it the next day...

Woman: Okay.

Man: ...that's why I felt that was (unintelligible).

Woman: What else is it? Yes John.

John Berard: There are so many resolved in the motion before the Council, I knew it was in there somewhere. Resolve that is request an issue report regarding I think who is for all incumbent gTLDs which any (sensible being) would realize that's a ridiculous request when you could just go knock on (DerSigns) door. But, you know, we're heading down this road.

Woman: So did you just go back to - yes and would you just read it, Board.

Man: The Board main agenda for Friday includes ATRT recommendations and (Bob), this is the report we've been speaking of.

Woman: Oh, so it's on anyway, okay.

Man: That's where we would learn about...

Woman: Yes.

Man: ...Friday. Number two, renewal of .NET Agreement and there isn't a motion
                yet posted. So I don't' exactly know whether they're actually going to vote on
                approval. Number three is BFY 2012 operating plan and budget, which I
                know Chris covered extensively, today in the Board meeting. And then you go
                on to reports from the Board, GAC Working Group and several other items
                that are administrative.

Woman: So we also had an extensive discussion about the operating plan in the
                budget and I guess the thing I'm not satisfied that we fully addressed is the -
                how the participatory or input process is going to change to better take into
                account the consultation with the community. It's on the Board agenda. Do
                we have other things to say about the process or the amounts of the budget?

Woman: The different - there's one thing to think about guys. The public forum is
                public - there's a transcript, it is public. You had a private consultation with
                the Board, Jack didn't see it, nobody else saw it, it was strange. But you have
                to consider that a private conversation, versus whether you need to make a
                public statement. And I've just been kind of trying to think that through of
                when do we think we need to, you know, thank the Board for the conversation
                that we had in our consultation with them. However, we wish in the public
                forum to ensure that - to think a little bit about that and whether - so right now
                I have the definition of public interest, a question mark about ATRK, the .NET
                renewal and a question mark about the budget.

Chris Chaplow: All right, I wouldn't put FY12 on it (unintelligible) to the bottom. If it's there,
                then I think that is the thing that we need to speak about or I will or somebody
                else wants to speak tonight, we can split the two topics. And I think I would
                recommend saying the early (SOAC) comments that was put in place last
                time, it didn't work but give it another go, and I think that that's in essence
                what we should do.

Woman: I'm not sure if saying, "It didn't work but give it another go" is quite as detailed. So could you give some thought to, you know, what you might want to say. But I think you should say it as the Vice Chair of Finance Operations.

Chris Chaplow: Two or three minutes worth, whatever it is...

Woman: Yes, yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...then I'll, you know, prepare (unintelligible).

Woman: I'm going to give then - I'm going to give Tony those four and work out with him whether he thinks that there's something to say about ATRT, given that he led on that. And budget will be the fourth one, which we would expect might fall off. And dates of - guys, who knows what will end up in the public comment part. So right now, on Thursday I have scheduled a 45-minute session that we may need to get together and say this is what, you know, we can try to do it online if they publish the list soon enough. But if it doesn't come out until Wednesday night, we may have to have a huddle Thursday. I think we're done.

Woman: Any last words from anyone else before we wrap up here? Okay we can stop the recording. Thank you Shawn. And let me thank all of you. And let me ask you to thank Benedetta for her diligence. She has collected your - she asked you all to sign in for different segments because in the meeting report, she needs to show who was in. So thank you for our tolerance of that. And I'm sorry, I didn't explain it more clearly.

Man: I just wanted to say, I thought the preparation for this meeting overall was really outstanding. I mean from (Steve)'s policy review to what Benedetta been sent around to help the discussion, I really felt, I've had...

END