

**ICANN Singapore Meeting
Registrar Stakeholder Group Part 1
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 21 June 2011 at 08:00 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.

Man: All right, everybody, we're about to get started. We're having an issue with the Adobe Connect. We're trying to get that resolved before we kick off but if we can't we'll go ahead and get started and let the tech team work things out but let's wait maybe two more minutes.

Okay, good morning, everybody. We're going to go ahead and get started. (Matt) and (Corey) are still working on the Adobe issue but in the meantime we don't want to waste any of our meeting time so we're going to do the agenda today.

So unintelligible) call, I'm sure you heard our (unintelligible) sitting up here. I have a couple of housekeeping items for us before we get started.

The meeting structure today is unusual to what we're used to. Usually we're here in the same room and we have business that we discuss and guests come in and out during this presentation. We're still going to have some today but at the board's request our meeting time with the board is going to be in a room with them instead of them coming in there.

Same with the GAC. We lobbied for and were given time to meet with the GAC today which we're fortunate to get because they turn pretty much everyone down including the GNSO.

So at 11 o'clock we will leave this room and go meet with the GAC. At 2 o'clock we'll leave this room and go meet with the board. We will conclude with the board at 3:15, then we'll come back in here, all right?

And we're trying to find out, it'll save us some time if we don't have to pack up all our things and go so (Matt) is trying to figure out whether or not it's okay to leave our things in the room. Probably it (won't) be.

So there's that. At 9:30 we'll go into closed session so if you're not an accredited registrar at 9:30 you'll be politely asked to leave the room and our closed session will go until 11 o'clock.

At that time at 9:30 our friend, Bob Mountain, has provided coffee for all of us and he'll be bringing Starbuck's in for everybody. Thank you, Bob.

Oh, Bob needs volunteers to help carry the coffee in here so if we could do that, that'd be great.

Next coming, any notes or additions to the agenda?

Okay. Okay, so we're all set. So let's do a roll call and then we're going to turn it over to the registrar who is on the team.

So we'll start with James, please.

James Bladel: Good morning James Bladel, (Cincinnati).

Man: Third one the other way?

Tim Ruiz: Tim Ruiz, GoDaddy and on the GNSO council.

Man: (Unintelligible) from Germany.

(Greg): (Greg) (unintelligible).

Bob Mountain: Bob Mountain, (Meet) Media.

Rob Hull: Rob Hull with (unintelligible).

(Jennifer Gore): (Jennifer Gore), (Register.com).

(Matt McCord): (Matt McCord), Web.com.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Susan Crawford: Susan Crawford, (Domain Heights), United States.

(Doug): (Doug) (unintelligible).

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin, (unintelligible). I'm also the secretary of the (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Mason Cole, Oversee.net, United States and shareholder group.

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock, (unintelligible) Solutions. I'm vice-chair of the stakeholder group.

(Jeff Beck): (Jeff Beck) from (unintelligible) and treasurer of the stakeholder group.

Rob Hull: Rob Hull from (unintelligible) in Canada, and I'm your (unintelligible) the nomination committee of ICANN that picks the new board members and GSO members.

(Steve): (Steve) (unintelligible), ICANN.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Bruce): (Bruce) (unintelligible) from India (unintelligible).

(Stephan): (Stephan) (unintelligible), (Internet-X).

John Berryhill: John Berryhill, (unintelligible) still in the Cayman Islands.

Helen Laverty: Helen Laverty, Dot Alliance, British Columbia, Canada.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Dennis Cai: Dennis Cai, (unintelligible).

(Adam): (Adam) (unintelligible) from (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tatyana Khramtsova: Tatyana Khramtsova from (unintelligible) Center and our company, (unintelligible) part of the group of companies would like to present our CEO, Mr. (Alexander) (unintelligible) and if (unintelligible), I can (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), Canada.

(Pete): (Pete) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: All right, we'll save the friends behind us the trouble of introducing themselves for now because we don't have a portable microphone at the moment.

All right, thanks, everyone. Welcome to everybody who's your first ICANN meeting. It's good to have you all here. So I want to turn the floor over to (Tim Cole) and (Brian Krebs) on the registrar liaison team for ICANN.

Oh, (Brian); I'm sorry, (Brian). Yeah, I hate it when I do that; (Brian Peck).

So, gentlemen, what was yours?

You knew a (Brian Kreb)?

(Brian Peck): Sure.

Man: Wow. There you go. We need (unintelligible) there. Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Tim Cole): Yeah, sure. Thank you so much. I'm (unintelligible) go do that.

All right. Thank you, everybody. We decided this time to sort of just sort of winging it and we would have a slot later in the day and our time would be used up before we actually got to speak so this morning (unintelligible) was kind enough to put us on first thing and try to wake you all up.

I don't think we're going to have nearly as exciting or entertaining a presentation as my colleagues in compliance will have but we'll try our best.

We wanted to give you just a quick overview of what we've been working on over this past year, what some of the current things are that we're working on and what's on the horizon and just going to ask you for feedback as to how we might be able to do a better job for you.

And - (Matt)? Again? Okay.

So just to give you an idea of some of the key activities that we've been working on over the last year is we pretty much have completed the

development of the Registrar Training program. We'll go into a little more detail about that and how the implementation is going to proceed from here.

We've enhanced the application process to become accredited both in terms of revising and updating the application and aligned materials and instructions and then we also have enhanced due diligence and some changes in fee structures that we will talk about in a few minutes.

And one other thing is that we've done quite a bit of translations of some of the key materials on the ICANN Web site both in terms of providing greater support to our non-English speaking or at least not English as a first language speaking colleagues but also to enhance compliance and overall understanding of the process.

We're seeing more and more applications from around the globe and we're trying to do our best to provide greater support to the folks that are coming to us from that.

Now I'm going to ask (Brian) to talk a little bit about our current activities and initiatives because he's kind of representing the rest of my team here and he's been involved with almost all these things. So I'm going to ask him to take over from here for the next few slides, give you some background on each of these activities. (Brian)?

(Brian Peck): Thank you. We'll start off with the main program. Those of you who might remember, we started a dialogue on developing the training program back at the Seoul meeting and we're pleased to announce that we're now waiting to roll it out and initiate the roll out for general availability for the community in the next couple of weeks.

We have just recently completed the beta testing. As a matter of fact this last week we had eight volunteers including from China, Japan and India as well as from the U.S. and other North American locations.

Most of the comments we received were very positive and useful. Again we think we're ready to roll it out and make it available to the general community within the next couple of weeks. There will be also translations available by the end of this month.

And, you know, we think in terms of writing some sort of deadline for completion of it, we're still (dealing) with that. We'll (unintelligible) of course with the stakeholders' computer but once it does become available we'll certainly provide a notice to everyone.

As you know, is required by the 2009 RAA for either the primary contact or designating a way to complete the training program. But again based on the feedback we've received, the beta testing, we think (unintelligible) be pleased with the product and hopefully will find it very useful for you in terms of complying with the RAA requirement but actually providing, you know, some very useful, educational (unintelligible) for your registrar and staff.

Next?

The next activity that we've been working on will have an immediate impact on your registrar enterprise is the registrar rights and responsibilities. We talked about this a little bit in the Silicon Valley - San Francisco meeting. This is a document that has been completed after input both (unintelligible), the registrar's stakeholders group and other members of the community.

We have completed the document and it has been reviewed by the registrars and also have had it translated into five U.N. languages plus Japanese and Korean.

We are planning to post it at the end of this week and at that time we'll provide a notice to all the registrars. As you know, again under the requirements under the 2009 RAA is that once this is posted that registrars

are required to provide a link to this document on its Web site in any location where you are dealing directly with your customers.

So again our group (unintelligible) is complying and sending notification after which registrars will have 30 days to provide a link to this document on the Web site.

At (unintelligible), an ongoing activity we're working on and putting a lot of attention to is translations of key Web pages and documents on the ICANN (unintelligible). We have begun to do that and after the first tranche of documents last trimester after the, prior to the Silicon Valley - San Francisco meeting.

We have another set that is currently being posted at this time, has been the last couple of days, again using the slides, (different) languages and Japanese and Korean initially. We think that this is very useful not only in the sense of reaching out to the broader global community registrars and registrants where English is not the first language but for all of you we think this could be a useful tool of perhaps again providing links on your Web sites if you do so, help with the registrants for example (unintelligible) and scrolls have been translated, transfer policy, REE specifications.

So as Tim mentioned, I think this will be very useful for the broader community as ICANN reaches out to more non-English speaking communities as well as helpful for compliance in terms of registrars and helpful information for your customers. registrants in terms of both procedures and the core rights and responsibilities of those roles as (unintelligible) will be useful for the registrar community as well.

In terms of monitoring, as you know that ICANN Web site, you know, goes through a visions and updates. We're setting up a system so that we will be able to keep up with that so if a deed in the English-based Web page or

document is revised we would insure that the translations are also kept current and updated as well.

(Tim Cole): So yeah, I better turn my mic on. So thank you, (Brian). Some other areas where we are also currently active are the enhanced due diligence review for accreditation. We are engaging a third party company to do some background checks on applicants as well as just, you know, we're doing and we have always done some checks and we're not changing a lot of our procedures however we are also going to do some additional background checks especially for brand applicants that we have no relationship with till this point.

And so we'll be looking to things like finances and certain legal, you know, past legal activities or checking to see whether they are actually where they say they are; some of those kinds of things.

To offset the additional cost of doing that the board approved an increase of the application fee from \$2500 to \$3500 (unintelligible). That's the first increase with the application fee in 10 years so we really think that's, you know, a reasonable modification. That will be going into effect with the new fiscal year of July 1st.

Another key thing that you may be aware of is that our Iron Mountain contract expires in November of this year so we are doing a review of, you know, what options we might have, whether there might be an option for replacing them or continuing with them.

We are working closely with them on improving some of the services that they have provided up to this point and we'll see how that plays out. But for the time being I don't think registrars need to worry too much about any sudden changes. We would certainly; if we do make any changes there would be plenty of lead time and you'd be fully informed.

And as you all know, the Dot Triple-X agreement was approved, the contract was signed since the last ICANN meeting and as a result we've had quite a bit of activity with regard to registrars applying to be approved for a Dot Triple-X appendix. And so that has definitely been one of the things that has kept us a little busy over the recent (unintelligible).

Just a bit about what's on the horizon.

Yes; sorry. Question here?

Man: Yes, sorry, just a quick question about the Iron Mountain and the escrow. You said they expire in November but if for some reason you change vendors, you made that decision, what would be the deadline where we'd all have to (unintelligible) vendor that...

(Tim Cole): Well, first of all we have a three-month advance notice from Iron Mountain so if we were going to change we would have to make that decision by August 1st.

So that's just the first thing but secondly, you know, there would be no sudden change that already someone would have to start using a different vendor (tonight). Like if we did anything it would be a closely developed transition plan and you would be all involved in consultations on that.

But yeah, I hope to alleviate any serious concerns about that but, you know, in time we are - it is a contract. We want to be sure that we're spending your money wisely and that we're getting you the best service possible for what we pay for.

But, you know, fair question. All but two registrars I believe are using the Iron Mountain service so, you know, it would clearly be something that would require quite a bit of lead time to make a sudden change.

On the horizon one of the key things that you probably all can understand is that we are, we need to be preparing for the new TLD environment. The first area that we focused on over the last few months was some of our automation needs that will be enhanced.

As you can imagine right now, you know, with close to 1000 registrars and fewer than 20 gTLD (registrees), you know, that is one relationship. If we suddenly turned that around and say we have several hundred (registrees) and perhaps a 1000-plus registrars, that really, you know, alters the entire playing field for us.

So we are looking at ways in which we can automate processes that are currently handled manually. One of the key areas that we're looking at is the whole concept of the appendix. Right now the RAA requires every registrar to have a unique appendix or (e-registree) that it does business with.

Perhaps the ultimate and ideal solution to that would be to amend the RAA to either remove or modify that requirement. But in the interim we need to plan for the existing situation and how we'll handle that.

So we have, you know, automation tools, we've considered three main scenarios and are recommending one of them but hopefully by the time (unintelligible) the timetable that was announced yesterday, when it comes to that point we should be well prepared to utilize that.

And then of course we also need to prepare another way with regard to staffing, whether the department structure is properly set up so we will need to look ahead, the impact of vertical integration (unintelligible) for relationships with both existing partners and future partners.

So we have quite a bit on our plate in terms of preparing for that.

Yes, a question?

Man: Got a question, Tim.

Man: Yeah, just kind of backing up on the appendices question. The option, you said you're actually recommending one. Is it a paperless option at least through the process of getting this signed by the registrar or are we still going to be looking at having to having to (unintelligible) things in physically?

(Tim Cole): We're looking at wherever the contract will let us, to eliminate paper to the extent possible. As you may know now, when we do renewals we no longer have paper copies of the appendices. We simply say, all of the appendices that were in force as of the expiration will remain in force so we don't issue a whole bunch of new ones.

But at present new accreditation applications are handled electronically and, you know, they're electronic copies for the most part, electronically signed. But I'm hoping to take it a step further and say that we don't ultimately need the appendices, you know, at all if we can get to that point but that would require an amendment to the RAA.

So, you know, that's something to keep in mind as we consider possible amendments.

Could I just mention that there are people online so maybe people want to identify themselves when they...

Man: Oh, yeah. Let's say that after (Rob's) question.

Rob Hull: (Unintelligible). Is it possible under the existing (unintelligible) to move to an appendices that lists all that you're in as opposed to having a separate appendix for every (unintelligible). It sounds to me...

((Crosstalk))

(Tim Cole): It's not that we issue a new one each time you add it.

Rob Hull: Sure but at least you're not (unintelligible), you know, 100 of the 500. You're not adding, you know, 800 pages of paper to me in duplicate for 100 registrars and, you know, it's (unintelligible) spending thousands on FedEx.

(Tim Cole): Yeah. You know, as I said, we're currently doing most of that electronically now as it is and with both electronic signatures so there isn't all that paper going back and forth like there used to be.

Rob Hull: Still it's, you know, 1000 or 5000 documents to sign even electronically so if there's anything we can do to help you with that process...

(Tim Cole): Yeah and that's...

Rob Hull: ...or free up this logjam of being a separate one for each one. I'm with you. I'd rather see us accredited in all of them automatically. We still have to go and negotiate and sign a contract with each one so it doesn't (unintelligible) but it seems like just an artificial logjam.

(Tim Cole): Yeah and that is currently under contracts written but yeah, I don't disagree with that. Obviously I'm more affected by it than you are so I'm certainly interested in seeing a load of improvement there.

But as I said, there are, you know, I think that's the most current thing we've been dealing with but there are many other aspects of the, you know, the preparing for a new TLD that we have in our - in what we need to be looking at.

Man: I'm trying to advance it but I'm not having any luck so I may need (Matt's) help here.

(Tim Cole): All right, we're going to start a liaison department. It's here for you. Here's some of the things that we just do in general role terms. You know, we are perhaps the primary two-way communication for the whole true liaison is intended to be communicating to you and listening to you and communicating within ICANN.

To that extent we are often the ones that the folks on my team and I should, you know, I apologize I haven't mentioned that the (unintelligible) part of the liaison team includes myself, Mike Zubke, (Brian Peck), (Steve Gopan) out of Brussels, Mike is working out of Boston, (Steve) is out of Brussels and (Kimberly Austin) is (unintelligible), she's based in (Unintelligible) del Ray. She's our coordinator.

We are probably going to be expanding our team especially with regard to operational (unintelligible) but those are the people that I'm referring to when I talk about the registrar liaison team.

You know, the things that we do is represent registrar concerns into the organization. So with compliance, with policy, with legal and, you know, others within the organization; we're often the ones that are saying this is important to registrars and here's why.

So that's one of the reasons it's very important for us to understand your issues and so that's why we try to keep an open ear on all of that. Important to try to, for us to understand the different business models that are reflected in the community so that we can also indicate that inwardly as well as, you know, to staff that supports ALAC, staff that supports different policy issues, compliance team, legal.

It's important that someone will be there to communicate registrar issues to the extent we can.

Next?

We host regional events. Some of you were recently at the - let's just see a show of hands - who was in Munich a few weeks back or the regional? And there were a couple from our compliance team here, yeah, and policy. So I think, you know, it was a pretty successful regional event and we sometimes find that in two days we can actually condense a lot of information that otherwise you are spread across a whole week or more at an ICANN meeting.

I often am communicating with Mason, the chair of the stakeholder group, either in person or sending materials off to him and asking him to share with the group. It's one of our primary means of communicating with the registrar group.

Less frequently we send mass distributions to all 970 registrars; more frequently we're dealing directly with the stakeholder group with that, you know, that's a way to sort of minimize the amount of extra communications that are floating around out there.

We manage the bank account for the stakeholder group some would say more effectively than others but it is a challenge because the stakeholder group does not - correct me if I'm misstating this, (Jeff), but it's not a legal entity itself so it can't really have an account per se. So I can manage as a bank account within our larger bank's relationship to support that. But I don't know; you might want to add just as treasurer.

(Jeff): Yeah, just to be clear. If we wanted to have a bank account it would have to be in somebody's personal (unintelligible) business here so ICANN is gracious enough to hold that bank account for us.

You know, a lot of the industries sometimes we all send checks to them all the time, sometimes they get new supplies so we have to work out some of those details but the process is getting better and it's just, I think it's

(unintelligible) for all of us that funds are being held with ICANN because just in case this was one of us personally or in a business, if something happened we wouldn't want (unintelligible) stakeholder group. So if anyone was curious why it's done this way, I think it's the most aboveboard way we could think of.

But if somebody has another suggestion I'm always open to it.

(Tim Cole): Well and but you know, for example some of the problems we have is that the same registrars that are sending in their fees to the stakeholder group also (unintelligible) ICANN for their quarterly fees or annual fees and so forth, so we pretty much constantly find ourselves having to take money out of one bucket and put in another because it's gotten (unintelligible).

So to (unintelligible), when you do make your payments to the stockholder group for your annual dues, you can clearly identify that. That'll certainly make our accounts receivable folks happy.

We also manage the annual fee approval process, which you've all participated in at one point or another, where, you know, at this meeting the board presumably will be adopting a budget and once that budget is adopted, the registrars have to - for us to collect the fees from the registrars we have to have an approval by two-thirds of the registrars (unintelligible) fees paid.

So that's a process that we have to run each year that's a little labor intensive, but I think we've gotten better at it and, of course, (unintelligible) have gotten much more responsive at it so that helps too.

(Matt)?

And so basically, finally, what we really want to talk - want to say is these are something of the things we've been working on. These are the kinds of issues that my team and I spend time, but we also, you know, want to know what concerns you guys have that aren't being addressed.

How could we serve you better and, you know, are there things that we aren't doing that you'd like to see us do? So I'm just going to kind of throw that out there and see if I have any input from anybody here.

Man: Questions, comments for Tim? (Unintelligible)'s on the line too by the way.

Man: Okay good.

Man: Questions for him.

Man: Good, good.

Man: Clearly, this means you guys are doing a great job.

Man: Well, thank you. Seriously though, if you have ideas, if you have suggestions, please feel free to either drop me note, give me a call, grab me in the hallway, you know. We're always looking for input.

Man: Actually, I do have a question. On the training programs, you said it'd be able to roll out in a couple weeks. Does that mean there'll be an expectation that we will start sending representatives - or have our representatives in each of the companies participate in that or will it be a window in which we have a certain amount of time to complete the educational...

Man: That was the key DD on the slide. You know, we haven't completely figured out how, you know, how we want to roll that out in terms (unintelligible). We want to collaborate with you on that. Obviously, we don't want to say the training program is live, you have a week to complete your responsibility or else you're going to be in, you know, jeopardy of, you know, noncompliance.

So, you know, we clearly need to work out a means for making that rollout efficient and effective. We want it to be something that's constructive and

helpful, not something that is an onerous task, so we'll probably be looking to you more closely has a (unintelligible) the best way to implement that.

But I think we have, as Brian mentioned earlier, we have had some feedback from the beta testing. We've done some demos. I think we've gotten pretty positive feedback and I think once we roll it out people will find it worthwhile to have members of your team go through it.

We're still looking at ways to distinguish between fulfilling registrar requirements and making it available (unintelligible) for, you know, ongoing training purposes, but all of that is, you know - we still have to finalize that, but we would do that in full communication with everyone.

Good question thanks.

Man: Yes thanks. I wonder if you can talk about any sort of plans you guys have got internally for broadening the (unintelligible) radar and if that's going to become more of the vehicle that we do for a lot more of the interaction between (unintelligible) and ICANN.

Man: Excellent question. When I mentioned before that we've looked at three different options in terms of the automation, for example for (unintelligible) etcetera, we are - as an organization we're exploring, you know, some totally new software platforms that will collective allow us to integrate finance, compliance, liaison team.

And it will all be build on a platform that whether it's the current radar as you know it, the interface will probably not change a lot, but the guts of it may be something that maybe somewhat different.

But, you know, my ideal is that you should be able to manage your WDPRS, you should be able to get copies of your invoices, all of that through one stop

login and I think the company has got a similar vision, but it's in the works but it's going to take a little time.

But thank you.

Man: Okay, I have one question. Can you Brian or Tim, whichever of you would like, could any of you address with new TLDs coming online how much risk does ICANN face in terms of losing staff in the - you know, as the marketplace develops for new TLDs.

Man: Well I think you're asking the wrong person, but I think, you know, Rod mentioned yesterday that that's going to be an ongoing concern for ICANN in general.

I think, you know, we not only need to worry about losing knowledgeable staff, but need to figure out how to recruit knowledgeable staff. And so it's a two-way street.

I think we are going to be competing more and more with, you know, a lot of different business models for some of the same talent. Brian didn't have a good background in (unintelligible) or (unintelligible) when he came on board, but yet a pretty thorough policy background and legal background and came up to speed really fast so we're going to have to do some of that.

Hopefully get some talent from the community generally, but, you know, we also have to recognize that some of the people on our team may also be - find it attractive to pursue other options with the advent of new TLDs. And that's about all I can say.

I think there is a risk there, but, you know, hopefully we'll be able to manage it.

Man: Okay thanks (unintelligible) it's going to be a concern for all us as we ramp into selling new TLDs and we've got, you know thousands of signatures and, you know, we need to get our own technology online, we're going to need ICANN's support as much as we can.

Man: And we're going to have to do as much as we can (unintelligible) to address a lot of that as well.

Man: Right. Okay we're about five minutes over. Any other questions for Tim and Brian before we go to compliance?

Okay thank you. Gentlemen, thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: All right, (unintelligible) would you like to join us?

(Maggie Sherada): (Unintelligible) the mic. I'm too nervous to sit down.

Man: Sure. Everyone this is (Maggie Sherada) if you haven't had a chance to meet her. She's new director...

(Maggie Sherada): (Unintelligible). Good morning.

Man: Go ahead (Maggie) take over.

(Maggie Sherada): I'm really excited to be here. I'm nervous not because it's my first time (unintelligible), because this guy has put me under the pressure here. He said - (unintelligible) said we did so well in Munich that we have to really continue on delivering that way so I'm hoping we will always meet your expectations and always exceed it.

So my name is (Maggie Sherada). I'm the newcomer for ICANN from the contractual supplies teams. I've been here for two months now and I wanted to stand up here (unintelligible) so I can see the audience, because if I sit down I'm going to miss some faces. I want to be able to talk to you and get to know you as the week goes.

Man: (Maggie), I'm sorry I need to stop you for a minute. Make sure you're speaking in the microphone if you could because it's cutting out a bit and we want to make sure people online can hear.

(Maggie Sherada): All right is that better? All right it's not Karaoke night but we can go there.

Okay (unintelligible) the audience before I get started with the introduction of my team. I'm very lucky to have with me today 14 members of the team. I have (Sam Mitchell) whose going to be presenting. I have Stacy Burnette. I have Khalil Rasheed and (Carlos Alvarez). So is that enough compliance for this audience this morning?

One ground rule if I may ask of you to hold your questions until the end. We have a very short slideshow to share with you, but we will allot a lot of time for Q&A. Is that okay? All right.

So on the agenda we have a few things we'd like to share with you. And who's doing the slideshow? Is that you? Okay thank you.

Who am I? See the spelling of my name? I will answer to (Maggie), (Mague), (Magway). This is (Maggie) my real name. I've been with, like I said, with ICANN two months, but I have - I come with a wealth of experience.

I come though from a non-internet company. I come mostly from (unintelligible) industry, but I have spent over 20 years in that environment working in different roles and capacities.

While working in that industry, I also went through specific certifications in the sixth sigma area and that was really critical. As you know, with automotive industry, the last few years the way we've been going. Thank God now it's going back up and our bonus from my previous company's going to be good year.

So to be able to meet the challenges of any industry your in, you have to always add those skill sets that's going to help you improving it better. So by obtaining my master (unintelligible) sixth sigma certification, I was assigned at my previous employer to lead different strategic projects to help bring (unintelligible) results, improve operations and absolutely customer satisfaction is always the first objective.

I am fluent in French, Arabic and English. Sometimes I tend to translate my language, but people seem to understand most of the time.

My style and philosophy - I like to put that out there because first of all I want the audience to know I'm not a lawyer. All right? I came from a business background. However, I'm very fortunate. I have four amazing lawyers on the team who know the exhibits, who know the contract, who can guide into all of those topics.

So philosophy and my style, it's very simple guys. It's communicate, communicate, communicate. You can never communicate enough and we all know that communication comes in different forms so we'll talk about that in a few minutes.

I like to keep it simple. I have a life to live and I'm sure everyone does. Keeping it simple makes the message easier, makes our tasks easier, makes our interactions easier.

Fact-based decisions. My teams knows it. This is not about a feeling and it's not about - what is driving this decision. Accountability, I'm very, very high on

accountability, career goals and responsibility and I manage with results so I just wanted the audience to know that.

Short-term plan. Since arriving at ICANN and for the past two months, you know, you put forth (unintelligible) plan. First of all, you have to continue to support the current activities that the team's undergoing, while I'm personally am ramping up on my knowledge of ICANN.

But what I've done is taken on my strength to bring it to the team so that's the value I'm bringing to the team. I started assessing our current state. What I mean by that - what is the organization that I have that I'm going to be leading? What are the processes that exist? What are the tools that we have? What is our business?

So I'm assessing the current state to help us identify the opportunities so we can truly put a long-term plan and worth towards. The (unintelligible) is to understand the ICANN model.

I've worked in contractual compliance for many years. ICANN model is really amazing. It's different than any environment I've been in. When I think I've learned it, there's more things to learn. So the diversity, the stakeholders, the ICANN model is new to me and I'm trying really hard to learn about it, but most importantly, to understand the interests of the stakeholder groups.

I know that we have a contract with registrars and registries, but we all know we have other groups that influence many decisions in many things we do. So by trying to put yourself in the different shoes, you try to understand what they're saying and where they're coming from. It helps you understand and manage the challenges that we face in contractual compliance.

Last, but not least, which will be an ongoing process is (unintelligible) the relationship to the community. This is not a one-time thing. It's going to be ongoing and going into that and with everybody's help.

So the major initiative, staffing update. I'm pleased to tell you, as of my last hire, the team is back up to the number of full-time employees they had a year ago. One month prior to my arrival another new member arrived, (Carlos).

So the contractual compliance team has been working under staffed maintaining the momentum and the demand and, you know, and delivering the services to the community in that perspective. So now we are up to the full-time headcount that we had a year ago, but we're not stopping here.

So out of assessing our current state, like I said, (unintelligible) organizational structure. So what are we doing here and how we're going to move is really critical to our success. We have approval in the budget for additional staffing for 2012 so assessing current state. We're assessing - I'm assessing the skill sets, looking at future growth, where do we want to be and what do we need.

Another initiative working towards that is the, you know, the operational (unintelligible) which really talks about everything I'm doing. The organizational structure, as I said, assessing the skill sets, looking at the requirements for the new hires that we want to bring on board, but also trying to finalize on what are those roles and responsibilities for the new hires.

And we're looking at the gaps so hopefully our model in 2012 in going to grow from an organizational structure to be able to support the demand but also to be able to be more of a proactive player with the community.

So that's from a people perspective. Organizational perspective is (unintelligible). Looking at the processes that we have, making sure they are clearly defined, the roles and responsibilities and we will be reviewing all those in the next trimester trying to ensure there are no laps in the processes and roles and responsibilities are all there.

Tools, last but not least, we all know we depend on technology and it's an ongoing effort and you heard some speak earlier to the question asked about radar. We're doing the same thing about our contractual compliance tools.

We know we have many opportunities to improve from the (unintelligible) tools, from the WDPRS. We have a lot of tools we use behind the scenes, all customers (unintelligible), but we're trying to see how can we leverage those tools, make them better, but also help us do our job better.

(Unintelligible) compliance area. One of the major initiatives in that area I would like announce (unintelligible) and the team, but ICANN realizes how important accuracy is for the community. So and from day one when I (unintelligible) my (unintelligible), we need (unintelligible) and I said who is what.

So I wasn't really sure, but now that I've been here two months we have recently appointed Khalil Rasheed as a senior manager really focusing on who is activity. The (unintelligible) team will address WHOIS (unintelligible) businesses running.

Now we're trying to put the focus on some of the major areas and with Khalil's appointment and a supporting staff member, he will be able to oversee the WHOIS activities with direct activities and enhancements, but also direct streamlining and working with the community on it, overseeing compliance growth, overseeing (unintelligible) in there.

From a tool perspective, some of the major initiatives from WHOIS compliance (unintelligible) monitoring tool. You know, we always regularly do that monitoring to make sure the access is there for everyone on (unintelligible). In the past, we used to do it from an ICANN IP address.

Now we've been able to add some other addresses that are non-ICANN to also ping on Port 43 and do the tests. So that's, again, different approaches to how can we monitor and be proactive.

On the WDPI system, Khalil is leading an effort to understand - not just to understand the scope, but understand where do we want to take that tool and how can we serve and work from a different compliance perspective so a lot of opportunities for enhancement that he will be working on with the team.

And (unintelligible) communications, you know, that's where part of my philosophy is, you know, I said communicate, communicate, communicate. Communication - we all know when we are short staffed, I can testify to it in previous roles, the first thing that goes is communication.

Communication can be customer facing. It can be newsletters. It can be just a present, attending, and other stuff.

That part always goes because you have to really focus on running the business and make the operations work and our staff realizes all you have to do is go on our Website and you know (unintelligible).

So we know we have many opportunities to enhance our communication from the customer facing, from a newsletter perspective, from face-to-face interactions. That's - we call that model a proactive. Newsletter approach will be looking at what is our strategy for the newsletter approach.

In one of the facing updates that we're working towards in having what we call a reporting person who's going to help us stay on top of it and bring to our stakeholders and to the community valuable (unintelligible) time updates on the information that is contractual compliance, but it's appreciated and needed by the audience, by everybody.

So from another aspect of communication, we're looking at a team. We all know with the ICANN model how global it is. So when we're thinking about our team, we're also looking at new resources to not just (unintelligible) because if you've seen the ICANN model, you know you are my counterpart. We have such a global presence.

So another thing we're looking at is to look at a staff member who has a regional presence to be able to drive us to deliver a better communication with respect to the diversity to that culture, to that audience.

Collaborative effort - that's right when I (unintelligible) that (Jeff), I said hi (Jeff), I'm (Maggie). I recognized the voice. I've also had the pleasure to talk with Mason many times on the phone to introduce myself, talk to him about, you know, what are some of the stuff we'd like to work and engage you guys to collaborate with us and you'll hear some additional updates about some of those initiatives we'll be working with you on.

And I've had the pleasure to (unintelligible) them on different conference calls to get their perspective and guidance on some of the initiatives we've been working on.

New GTLD readiness. As we (unintelligible) the pressure of resources, is compliance ready, is compliance going to be able to handle it. Yes, we will be ready. We will be ready. Everything we're working on today is going to make us better and ready, not just for new GTLD, but also for our current challenges and our future challenges.

So by having our people processes and tools in place and the right skill set, we will be able to address the new GTLD and work on that.

Last, but not least, what I wanted to say - what I'd like to say to you is I want to assure you I have my management support on the activities that we're

working with. Why is that important for you know? (Unintelligible) it makes our life easier when I have a management that supports me.

But it's important because when you talk about change, I'm the new kid on the block. You bring change in, you bring different ideas, you ask for staffing, you ask for new tools and I have John's support every step of the way. So that's the last thing I wanted to say before I turn it on to Pam.

Pam Little: Thank you everyone. Okay it's great to be here. Can I ask you to put your hands together for (Maggie). Isn't she just great?

(Maggie Sherada): Thanks.

Pam Little: So she has only been with us for about two months. She has brought new energy, new ideas, new perspective (unintelligible) to have her on the team and I'm sure you will all enjoy working with her.

So with the rest of the ten minutes, I'm going to share with some of the new things we are planning to do in the future and also give you a very quick overview of what we have been doing in terms of compliance activities in the last six months or so.

The three important major issues I'm going to talk the registrar assessment tools so we can turn to the next slide please.

The purpose of this initiative is really to implement a proactive and scalable approach to assess registrar compliance requirements. I hope the pictures will speak a thousand words there.

Really if you look at the ICANN model, the (unintelligible) stakeholder model, some people would say that is an experiment. And when it comes to contractual compliance, our contractual compliance model so far to date is also a bit of an experiment.

And the people who sit in this room probably know that among the option stakeholders (unintelligible) ICANN. But so far what we've done is we have (unintelligible) and we conduct various audits to assess where the registrars are in compliance with their IA obligation.

So we do selected audits rather than the crop RAA obligation comprehensive audit. So we've been thinking how do we make this contractual compliance model fit with the option stakeholder (unintelligible) better.

And (Maggie) mentioned about roles and responsibilities and we all know there are different option stakeholders in this eco system that have different roles and responsibilities and we believe compliance with the contractual obligations of different parties really should be the primary responsibility of the contracted party.

But in the past, we tend to do it the other way around where ICANN sort of (unintelligible) monitoring for assessing auditing (unintelligible) registrars are in compliance. We believe that obligation really should be mainly with the registrar. So (unintelligible) the monitored the constant monitoring and assessing whether you are in compliance, to me should be with the registrar as well.

So (unintelligible) it should be a known, whereas noncompliance when you need your contracted party, ICANN, to intervene and to enforce compliance should be (unintelligible).

So based on that belief we should - the model should evolve to a registrar self-assessment model where we would then - so that's our plan to develop an online tool where the registrar can respond to a series of questions in a questionnaire and make it an annual exercise requirement.

Next slide please. So what's going to happen? We are just still developing this. There's (unintelligible) early stage. We are aware your time is very valuable as registrars have your business to run so we want to make sure we come up with a questionnaire that's most appropriate for this purpose because compliance is our only goal. So we have to be (unintelligible) but yet it's easy for you to do in a very effective and efficient way.

So then at moment we're just sort of thinking what will be the best way to do this in terms of the format, the content of the questionnaire and then we'll move on and develop the questionnaire and develop the online tool and (unintelligible) just to make sure it all works well.

At the moment, we don't have a fixed timeline when we'll roll this out. We are thinking sometime in 2012 and then it'll have to be sort of every 12 months exercise.

Next slide please. So I want to jump into registrars and ICANN. Once you do (unintelligible) compliance should be an ongoing effort. Right? You put your business practices, processes in place and you make sure you are - at least strive to be compliant at all times.

But then at every 12 months we will ask you to complete a survey and you will respond - you will provide us with (unintelligible) online tool (unintelligible) review and analyze and verify your responses and we will follow up noncompliance by maybe further review, further investigation or further audit.

However, (unintelligible) doesn't change. Our user compliance process doesn't change. (Unintelligible) noncompliance issues arising out of the self-assessment, we will still give registrars opportunity to work with, to make sure you overcome the problem and that you have an opportunity to put a bridge on the noncompliant issues.

And thing I mentioned early about is online tools that we are really (unintelligible) is how we can design this tool so when we ask registrars to complete these questionnaires every year, we can actually pull meaningful compliance data from this tool so we know what compliance areas you have noticed a problem to become compliant or what area's actually really very successful in terms of registrar compliance and then we can report to the community all of this relevant compliance data in transit.

(Unintelligible) used for the registrar stakeholder group and also to the community in general as a whole.

And also, can I just go back to that slide a little bit? Just want to mention that throughout the year compliance as I said should be ongoing effort on the part of registrars and so it's - if throughout the year you feel there is non-compliance sort of that you've become aware of, we do encourage you to come to ICANN, to come to us and say, we have this problem, how should we deal with it, how should we, you know, overcome this problem.

And if that is what you do, I think further down the track, when you complete your self assessment (unintelligible) reporting and, you know, (unintelligible) will be looked very favorably upon - by ICANN and ICANN compliance.

Thank you, next slide. This problem is probably not as relevant to...

Man: Pam, sorry, we have a question.

Man: Before we move on I just had a question about the self assessment. Specially, what aspects of our business or operations would we be expected in this self assess? What are we going to be assessing?

Pam Little: Okay, we will be assessing basically all - most of your obligations done at the (unintelligible) operational but your contractual obligation. So it's nothing - you know, it's similar to what you are already doing with (unintelligible) policy. So

you do that every year, right. We think you'd be (unintelligible) when you have to complete, I think, six or - questions.

But this one we're obviously not going to modify (unintelligible) by so many policies and so many contractual compliance provisions. So that's why we're thinking about the format and the content, how do they get really user friendly, sort of compliance that's meaningful. Does that make sense? So basically we'll be audit of your contractual compliance obligations under the RAA.

Man: Yes.

Tim Ruiz: Hi, Pam

Pam Little: Hi.

Tim Ruiz: Good to see you, so I'm thinking that the self-assessment is a good idea and it's interesting and it certainly will help you guys leverage some of your headcounts to covering more activities. But my question is, you mentioned up there that it was an annual process or it's going to be something that is a recurring process and that it will be mandatory. Where is that mandatory coming from?

Pam Little: Well, we're thinking in the 2009 RAA there is a provision that would allow ICANN to conduct audits. But instead of we go out and conduct audits or various times (unintelligible) or (unintelligible) RAA audit, we actually ask it in registrars, please do this yourself. And obviously you have to set a cap. It's not just an exercise of taking the office, right. You have to really make a true representation of what the status of affairs is in terms of new registrar's compliance with the RAA.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, so this would be considered an audit, a self-assessed tool is an audit.

Pam Little: Yes, self-assessment, self-audit.

Tim Ruiz: Self-audit.

Pam Little: Yes.

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Pam Little: Does it make sense?

Tim Ruiz: It does. There are penalties for not complying with this. There are registrars out there who ignore that requirement.

Pam Little: Yes, no, I think we have a bit of challenge. Most registrars are under the 2009 RAA so that will be a major (unintelligible) requirement. And yes, you should provide truthful, accurate, you know, assessment rather than just ticking at boxes. Does that answer your question, Tim? Thank you.

Okay, we can move on. This (unintelligible) should be about the registrar's data escrow audit. So I just run through this very quickly, similar to registrar data escrow program and we're going to - we're planning to do some audits on registrar data escrow just to make sure - to assess whether the data they escrow we think compliant with the different registry agreement.

So again, we're going to use a phased approach with each registry. It's the first time we doing this type of audit so we sort of try to sort of go develop as we go and have a phased approach. And hopefully in about 12 months period we will have run through all the registries that ICANN has contact with. And then there after then we will probably assess whether we do annual. At the moment the clients do annual but with the new gTLDs we might be doing it differently. So that's the plan at the moment.

Next slide please. Now this is a little bit - I believe a topic very close to the them, to the registrar (unintelligible) group that you are also working with the law enforcement community and so I think part of this is to formalize the processes. Of the past - and again, this is going back to the heart of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model where everyone has a roll to play and we believe that the - you know, one of the ICANN core mission, as you guys know, is really to preserve the security and the ability of the Internet.

But ICANN also has limit contractual authority and (unintelligible). So we need better collaboration with the different stakeholder groups in the community and we believe the law enforcement community is one of - a very important stakeholder group.

And in the past we've also come across real risk of abuse that we think that it really - mislead formalize this process where ICANN refer (unintelligible) law enforcement and receiving contractual compliance will (unintelligible) the compliance from law enforcement. And at the moment we just really feel working around - defining the roles and responsibilities of the law enforcement agencies in ICANN and also the (unintelligible) the criteria for those referrals potentially.

Next slide please. Okay, now in the next few slides I'll go very quickly so we can get through these. So this is what we do, right? So we're talking about self-assessment. So at the moment we monitor consumer compliance through the (unintelligible) system and for the last six months or so we receive about 6,000 complaints. You can see this little colored ones, these mainly relate to customer (unintelligible) issue.

So normally we don't really deal with to - those complaints much because we believe that's your business. We don't intervene how you do your business, how to provide your customer service, although I understand you have a customer support obligation that (unintelligible) you have with registries. So presumably you are taking care of that side of things.

But also it also has been very much on the transfer-related compliance through which related compliance and through the (unintelligible). You can see transfer-related compliance still continue to talk, the complaints we received.

Next slide please. And from the previous slide and from other sources like, such as our own ongoing monitor and the monitoring in our - and the complaints we receive, it's sort of escalated to this chart where we actually took compliance action by sending compliances (unintelligible) for those (unintelligible) entitled issues through the last month or so.

And again, consistent with the previous slide, because we received most complaints about a transfer problem, and so most notice we sent out are related to transfer issues and they the other issues, more number - much smaller number.

Next slide please. And these are the escalated compliance actions, including breeches and some elimination notice.

Next slide please. He start off (unintelligible) all of the non-renewed or terminated RAAs.

Next slide. Many of you already mentioned (Paul)'s (unintelligible) monitoring so I'm just going to skip this one.

Last slide I want to mention is the IDE notices or compliance efforts we've been doing in this area. I think because we've been following up with registrars who are either not (unintelligible) their data or they deposit who are not successful. So you can see from January up to June, some registrars would fix the problem after they receive the first notice from ICANN. Some would take the second one. Some would even take the third one.

So we did issue a first notice very recently to a registrar who consistently failed to deposit data or their data - the deposit they made were unsuccessful, means it did not meet these specifications. And I'm very pleased to report, as of yesterday, that registrar actually has made a successful deposit.

Next slide please. So that concludes my part of the presentation. Any further questions or comments would be most welcome?

Man: I'll take the queue.

Man: Questions now for (Maggie) as well?

(Maggie Sherada): Sure, yes.

Man: So welcome, (Maggie).

(Maggie Sherada): Thank you.

Man: And we hope you're around for a while and we wish you great success. There were a few things that you mentioned that gave me a little bit of concern. You've been in about two months and, you know, just to make sure that, you know, sort of where your inputs were coming from at the start.

And so I think one of the things that you should hear from this room is that for us, you know, we see a lot of the other stakeholder groups look at us as the dumping ground for either their perceived problems or for the ability to just sort of create busy work and activity because it's completely costless for them. But it's not costless for us and it's certainly not costless for you and the organization.

And so, you know, I'd really like you to, you know - you were mentioning which I thought was great, you know, you guys all need to realize there's other people out there and, you know, we have - there are stakeholders too.

We all agree with that. But I'd really urge you to have - especially early, to have a filter on a lot of that input and to maybe use some folks here just to check in on what other sides of the story might be.

So I'm not going to say they're wrong and we're right, although I deeply believe that. But I really encourage you to keep an open mind about that and to engage and I really was very encouraged to see your Six Sigma background because I think that will hopefully make you allergic to waste. And when you were talking - two other small notes.

One is when you were talking about a growing - you know, you need to grow the organization next year, was that a - you sort of - before you talked about new gTLDs now, were you referencing kind of your - you were prefacing that, I know I need to grow the organization with new gTLDs? Or did you see a built in need for, you know, you have bigger departments absent new gTLD needs?

(Maggie Sherada): It's a combination. We need additional staff that we already have a headcount approved that we're looking at being onboard to help us with our support team and performance management and communication. But also we need to plan for the new gTLDs that are coming onboard, bring in the resources so we develop the skill sets and the knowledge to be able to be up and running when this all come into fruition.

Man: So, you know, I'll tell you what I think, you know, just - again, on that, what I'd like you to hear from me that I think historically compliance has done a much better job than they've been getting credit for. The people that complain about compliance are complaining because, again, you know, they - you know, they're - the long string of demands have been met so I really look at it - kind of have an open mind about what the current needs are as well.

The last thing - and when you were talking about (unintelligible), you know, again, these are just thoughts I want you to hear from this room, you know, I

think that - again, I don't want to speak for the room but I feel pretty comfortable because we've been talking about WHOIS for ten years in saying that, you know, the problem with WHOIS is a policy and definition problem, not an enforcement problem.

We certainly know that there are others in the community, law enforcement who has some genuine needs and intellectual property who have narrow commercial interests in terms of their needs who would love WHOIS to be a drivers license for the Internet. But that's not the point of WHOIS and what we're primarily doing is trying to shoehorn something that wasn't built for a specific purpose into it.

But again, I'd really encourage you to keep an open mind around where WHOIS need because, you know, we think as a strategy problem, not a tactics problem. Thank you.

(Maggie Sherada): Open mind, that's the word.

Man: Welcome again.

(Maggie Sherada): Thank you very much.

Man: Anyone else?

(Maggie Sherada): May I add one comment on the open mind? I think Mason and I - Mason can testify about it, he contacted him on a couple of things to get his opinion or his direction on his items. And I know the team before my arrival used to do the (unintelligible) with some of you.

So what I'm trying to do is just (unintelligible) the model that exists today and then get that in front of Mason, when is the appropriate time to open mindedly come to the audience further. So, yes, absolutely.

Man: So I - if you wouldn't mind, Maggie, just talking a bit more as you and I did about the law (unintelligible) and how that came about and what it means for this group, if you would just provide a little more detail on that I think it would be helpful.

(Maggie Sherada): Okay, as far as presenting it earlier, you know, we are all - if you put just ICANN word outside, all of us have obligations as community members, not ICANN - as people on this universe, right, for the safety and security of each other, of the - so we also have always interactions with law enforcement. This initiative came about - actually it got started with me on my personal interview with (Rog).

He said, we know today law enforcement engages us to help in certain areas or it comes directly to you guys because you have that source and you work with law enforcement today. I know ICANN, when we were in Munich presented a lot of the efforts that go on there. We looked at it as, okay, how can we support this law enforcement by putting together a process that clearly defines what is criteria and roles and responsibilities.

We know under our contractual agreement it's not just open book. We're not law enforcement agents, let me just say that, all right. But they come to us and when they come - we're doing today as has been done in the past, we engage with our legal team to get direction because we don't have a formal process. So we're trying to understand what is the criteria, what are the requests that are coming our way, and we're trying to put together that process to help us and guide us.

We don't want it to be in somebody's head or different people who get contacted to do it differently. It's still being defined. We started to make a dent and, you know, the team here - we've also talked (unintelligible) to our team. We've talked to (Paul)'s team. We've talked to - we're going around. We've talked to registries. We've talked to - actually we're going to be talking to registries. We've talked to law enforcement also.

So we're trying, like you said, keep an open mind and trying to understand what are the demands or the expectations. And then we have to take a step back, what can we do. Is that make sense now from (unintelligible)?

Man: Yes, that's very helpful. I think that - I think as you and I talked (unintelligible) we wanted to understand clearly what the objectives of the interest dialog, the compliances having with law enforcement, those objectives are so that there's no misperception inside the stakeholder or anywhere else really about compliance inappropriately serving a law enforcement function, you know, when that's not its role.

(Maggie Sherada): Right, and that's what I said. Today the process is not finalized. We don't have the criteria and I honestly tell you, when we have a request we work directly with our legal department to make sure we are following the guidelines and expectations from an (unintelligible) and ICANN staff.

Elliot Noss: Yes, you know, our engagement with law enforcement has been going on for quite some time and I think we've been making good, constructive progress. Are you planning to be here for our 3:30 timeslot with that?

(Maggie Sherada): We have a (unintelligible) today.

Elliot Noss: So you are all - if you are at all able I would strongly suggest that given that it sounds like you won't be, there's two things, again, that you said that concern me.

The first is, you know, we talked about roles and responsibilities and in the document that we'll be discussing at 3:30, what were laid out, the roles and responsibilities of registrars, we have been clamoring for the roles and responsibilities of law enforcement, not of compliance, of law enforcement because the hardest thing for registrars operationally is to have a vetted

process for who and what is law enforcement, who and what is a legitimate request, and to have some educational function for law enforcement.

We all spend a lot of time educating law enforcement from around the world. And the (unintelligible) thing is you, again, rightly said, you don't want the compliance department to be performing a law enforcement function. We're going to be discussing a document at 3:30 where law enforcement explicitly wants registrars to perform law enforcement function.

So we share exactly your wish. We do not want to be law enforcement agents. We're not trained in it. We're not accredited. It's not appropriate in the same way that you are not. Understand that's a big part of this dialog, thanks.

(Maggie Sherada): I don't think they want that.

Elliot Noss: Well, they do want us and we can show you the draft.

(Maggie Sherada): They want the collaboration, that's...

Elliot Noss: No, they want the investigation, that's not collaboration. When you say it's your understanding, again - please, take an open mind and try and learn what some of our operating equities are, what some of the specific requests that are made of us are, where they come from, and what the expectations are, thank you.

Man: Okay, thanks Elliot. Other questions?

(Maggie Sherada): Could I just add to that - what Elliot just said? Part of our plan is to really help the law enforcement community better understand ICANN contractual compliance role and its limited contractual authority as well. So then it will have sort of unrealistic expectations and what we can do with registrars or even domains. I see a smile.

Man: All right, anyone else? Okay, Maggie, Pam, thank you all very much.
Appreciate you being here.

Woman: One more question if I may?

Man: Please.

Woman: Michele (unintelligible), all right, thank you.

Man: All right, thank you. All right folks, we're going to take a five-minute break for mom to bring the coffee in and we're going to go into closed session. So we need a minute to get the audio arranged so that that's not being broadcast. Yes, and so at this point if you're not a paid member of the stakeholder we'd like you to be excused from the room. So we're going to start in about five minutes. We'll conclude that just before 11:00 when we'll go meet with the gang. All right, so back here in five minutes. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You know, long day.

Mason Cole: All right a couple more minutes folks. Let's start taking our seats. All right everybody. Let's start taking our seats please. All right everybody thanks. Hey how about a hand for the coffee? Thank you Bob. Much appreciated. That will do.

All right. Okay just a note about this. We're going to go until probably an hour to an hour and ten minutes from now, but rather than have the usual parade of people coming in here and giving us various updates, we wanted to set aside some time for us to talk about issues that are important to us. You know in just an informal freeform way so that everybody is on the same page about where things are.

So we have six or seven issues. Each will be led by - the discussion will be led by somebody on the ExCom (list) and I will take a queue as usual, but there are some issues that we really want everybody to put on, so we're going to conduct the next part of the meeting that way. And before I forget, when we break for the GAC meeting and then for lunch, you can leave your things in the room. They will be safe. Lunch is on your own. We have lunch break from 12:00 to 1:00. We were not able to cater lunch or anything of that nature, so we will do that from noon to 1:00.

Okay so on the agenda you see on the screen, there are several issues that we are going to cover, so I'm going to ask Jeff to open the floor now with discussion of membership and recruitment for this group.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks Mason. So as Mason said, I don't want this to be - you know (me at this). I want this to be a discussion about (unintelligible) everyone's input. We need to get to a new point of view. Right now our membership fee has been at \$500 for I can't even tell you how many years. I'm assuming you know it's at least five, seven years, or something along those lines.

And you know unfortunately we have had a reduction in the last few years in the number of paying members. Each year we are sort of dropping off by two or three members, and this has something to do with consolidation of the business. Some people have just dropped out and are no longer registrars and have given up their accreditation. So but on the flipside as you can tell, there are still more and more issues that are facing us, and you know for a lot of the people here we do not have the time ourselves to work on papers, to do events. We all have actual businesses to run.

So one of the things we've been thinking about is possibly - one we need to try to get more members in. we need to get sort of new blood into the group you know not only to help on the fee basis, but also to work on the PDPs, the work in all of these working groups so we have some more people. As you can tell from the other groups there are a lot of either (unintelligible) members

or they have a very robust membership group. Ours has been sort of stagnant.

So I think I've said this before. As registrars, if you know other people in the industry and they aren't coming to the meetings, aren't involved, or maybe aren't paying members, I would highly encourage you to reach out to them and to see if they would like to join. They don't necessarily have to come to these far-flung places around the world. Remote participation seems to work very well for a lot of people, so they can do that and try to get them to join.

But on the flipside, we have to sort of - we have to plan. If that doesn't happen, do we need to make changes to the fees? And I don't know if I want to just throw it out there to the floor. You know if I said, "What are your thoughts of you know - if we needed to change the fees to say \$750 or to \$1000 so that we could hire you know more professional help to help us put in especially in the comment periods - to write papers for us."

You know somebody who is a lawyer or maybe somebody who has done this before to write these comment papers for us. Because there is always something open for comment and a lot of that affects us, so I don't know. I will throw it out to the floor. What are people's thoughts on that?

Man: Sorry. Bob and Michele, can I ask you guys to close your laptops? Sorry. Not to be - but cool. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: I can't close mine because I have the agenda up there, but thank you for asking.

Mason Cole: All right I will manage the queue. We have Bob and then who else?

Bob Connelly: Michele. Yeah this is Bob. Jeff I'm just wondering. Have we done any formal outreach or recruiting in terms of bringing in registrars to the program? You know email, mailings, that type of thing.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes so what we do is we get a list of all of the new registrars from ICANN and we send out recruitment notices to - recruitment emails to them. And then we also get the list of all the ICANN accredited registrars and then we send emails to them as well.

You know I - we haven't been calling them, but we have sent email notices to them as they join. That's been you know the extent of the outreach. If you guys have suggestions other than that I'd love - you know we are all open to it, but that's been the extent of it so far.

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just with respect to the fees, personally I would absolutely have zero issue in paying a higher fee to the stakeholder group if it meant - about the stakeholder group being in the position to hire somebody to work on position papers, comment periods, and everything else. Because ultimately, the way these at the moment - well if one of you doesn't do it, then it has got to me, or James, or somebody else. And it's - there's only so many hours in the day and I've kind of reached the point now where I would quite happily pay to make the problem go away.

Man: Sorry Bob. (I'm nervous with the door opening). I can...

Bob Connelly: Yeah if you have a piece of paper and can (unintelligible) it. So one of the things I struggle with - and I've talked to some of you about this. It's what do you all want out of the members of the stakeholder group? So for those of you who aren't necessarily - I didn't want a diet coke or anything.

Jeff Eckhaus: (No other than that) - we had a queue. I thought you were just responding.

Bob Connelly: Sorry (I didn't know you had a queue).

Jeff Eckhaus: James.

James Bladel: I like where Matt was starting to go with this, so I'm going to kind of just pile on a little bit and I think just segue nicely into the response I think you were headed for, which is I agree with Michele. You know there are a lot of things that are falling onto people - or I'm sorry the organizations that have the people to spare. And I think the answer is that there's an upper limit to that and you know especially when it comes to these PDPs, the review teams, and I will go ahead and throw myself on that grenade.

So I guess the question is what is the practical upper limit for membership? There's 980 some accredited entities, but there's how many real registrars. And who are the people that aren't real?

Okay I know Jeff right there is holding down 712 chairs or whatever he is sitting on, but how many other real you know heartbeats can we put behind those things. And I think more importantly dues checks can we collect respectively from all of those different entities? And can we work backwards from there?

But I'm with Michele exactly. You know the advocate position is important and probably we could improve upon what we were getting out of that position in the past and I will just leave it at that.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay go ahead Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: So just to sort of follow up on that. I think it's where Matt was going, which is why I wanted him to shut up so I could say it, but I think that we need to promote the use of the advocate. I think registrants fail to see is that especially for a small entity that (unintelligible) potentially hire a full-time policy person. You get the benefit because you're effectively getting a proxy policy person that can help. You can input to that person and they can help (unintelligible) and that's the real benefit. So if you have dues to pay - you

know \$500 or whatever else a year, you know that's a real tangible benefit and I'm just wondering if we couldn't articulate that better to our members or actually non-members in order to get them become members.

This is a real resource that is at your disposal. You don't have to come to every ICANN meeting to get all the benefits. We should provide for example summaries of the ICANN meetings, what goes on, you know use it as an information portal as well, and so on and so forth. We could do a few of those things to make it feel like they are a part of the community and engaged to the community even though they (didn't have the financial windfall potentially or resources to do so).

Jeff Eckhaus: Matt.

Matt Serlin: (Greg).

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay Mason.

Mason Cole: (Matt wants in the queue too).

Jeff Eckhaus: I've got it.

Mason Cole: Okay so I agree with much of what has been said, especially the part about what Michele said about sort of reaching the upper part of everyone's workload.
I mean participation in this group takes a lot of time. ICANN's model is based almost entirely volunteer labor from the participants. And because of the level of activity that is coming at us, coming you know towards us in our direction, the practical reality is we are going to need some help. And it's not only (position papers).

If you look at things like legislation in the U.S. that is meant to protect intellectual property rights, the implementation burden of that legislation is

heavily on registrars, and on registries, and others. I mean there's a need to educate policymakers about things that they don't understand yet. I mean these are the kinds of resources that we are talking about. And I'm going to cover that a little later on in lobbying, but just - I don't want to limit it only to say the advocate function. I'm talking about things that are much more broad than that.

Jeff Eckhaus: Matt.

Matt Serlin: I think it's for everybody including myself actually that that is obviously the main reason why people join the (RC) as you just said. So with the outreach that we're doing to both existing and new members, where (are we falling down)? Because we have the conversation every single meeting and it seems to me we are either stagnant or going backwards a little bit.

So what can we do to reach out to those people? Is it case where the people of the (RC) should be assigned existing members - to be assigned almost as a buddy to make a phone call to meet new people? (For existing) people to try and encourage them to come onboard? And if that was the case, I'd be happy to share that workload if everybody else is willing to.

Man: Let me just run this by you. Do you think what we've done so far is the email outreach, but if you think that's something that we need to do or that would be more effective beyond email, then you know definitely send it to me or send it to somebody in the ExCom. But you could send it to me and we would love to try it. As long as it is you know something cost effective, we could definitely work on it.

Matt Serlin: I guess I'm trying to encourage the whole group here because you know it looks like (it has been ineffective). Am I right in saying that?

Mason Cole: Yes without a doubt.

Michele Neylon: I would agree with Matt.

Mason Cole: I mean that's why we are having this discussion because the email has been ineffective. We need to figure out new ways.

Matt Serlin: Okay so there's my point Jeff. Let's see if we can all agree to actually making those phone calls between those people who participate. And as the new people come onboard, they get distributed to (a roster) to make the phone calls and give feedback to you guys the result of the call or something like that. Something really simple that (means that a buddy) calling rather than ICANN trying to sell them or whatever you want the procedure to be.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. (Greg).

(Greg): I think also part of the problem is a little bit of the message. You know if I weren't kind of enlightened or we weren't enlightened, I'm sure we might think to ourselves hey this is kind of a (free rider) issue. We don't have to participate and someone else will think about these issues and someone else will pay the dues. And new policies that are generally kind of (unintelligible) what I want. So I think part of the messaging has to be a little bit more about the discrete personal benefit, the discrete corporate benefit to the registrar.

And one of the issues that I have there is certainly you know if you are going to have someone to call about an issue and its impact on you as a registrar, you know the ability to call someone who is - I guess you could call you know (unintelligible). But if you are not coming to these meetings, you probably don't know someone to call. And you probably certainly want to - I mean you may not want to call ICANN. You may want to call Tim, but there's a little bit of kind of concern about how we think about you know talking to the regulator about a question you have about a particular issue.

So I think some of our description of the benefit of being part of this group and specifically maybe getting enough funding to have a kind of more active

staff person is that there is someone to call that isn't going to turn around and also be - kind of get you in trouble as it were. But I do think that we need to think - I think there's a serious (free rider) problem with talking about the policy being kind of the driver and so maybe thinking of some other things might be beneficial and more persuasive.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay (Alexander).

(Alexander): Going on (unintelligible). Is there like a one-page leaflet available that describes who are we, what do we do, what are the benefits for joining, and what do we get out of here, why should I be part of this group. This could be helpful in order to contact people and maybe you could even call somebody and just send it afterwards to try to convince people to join our group.

Jeff Eckhaus: We do have a Web site and a lot of that information is on there. So that's the answer to your question.

(Alexander): Let's bring that message over.

Jeff Eckhaus: Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah I think the - excuse me. The idea Matt suggested I think is a good one. That perhaps we have a reach out committee if you want to call it that that actually contacts new accredited registrars pretty early on after they are accredited because it's easy to get sidetracked. You know you've got your accreditation. I've got to get busy and get everything wrapped up. I've got to work with all the registries going through the testing, getting accredited with them. I think the sooner we can remind them about us you know the better off we are.

Another suggestion that I had was you could take it perhaps a step further and I don't know how palatable this would be to ICANN, but perhaps there could be some sort of reciprocation if they (fake) or whatever you want to call

it one the fees to ICANN to become accredited if they should become a member of the registrar stakeholder group. so if they pay you know \$500 or \$750 to the registrar stakeholder group, you know they would get a (break) you know up to equal that amount off their accreditation fees.

And part of that process you know would be an education about how you would make that choice or why you would want to make that choice. But again, somehow getting involved in that decision early on or getting them involved in that decision very early on.

Jeff Eckhaus: I have Michele, James, Tatiana, Rob, and then (Adam). And then we're going to cut off the queue after there because I think we have some other items. So Michele.

Michele Neylon: You know Matt's view is probably the simplest and easiest. Having to run things by the ExCom every single time on an ongoing basis - I don't see that as actually working.

Man: We don't want it.

Michele Neylon: I mean ultimately - okay I'm very hung over so you will have to excuse me. I'm probably stuttering and stammering this morning.

It wouldn't make sense to me that there be a call it a (standing committee), call it an outreach team, call it a marketing team. But I think ultimately it comes down to marketing. Screw the policy. You know you're talking about making the idea of the stakeholder group being - perceived to be of value, to be of use. I'm not sure who - I think it was Adrian who mentioned something about you know providing summaries of ICANN meetings. I think you know that kind of stuff is practical.

Other organizations that we are members of - we get you know a newsletter once a month, once every couple of months, and it gives you bullet points of

you know this is the legislative (crap) that's going on (at the EU) that could potentially affect your industry. You know click here to read more about it. And you kind of go oh crap I didn't know that was coming.

Personally I'm more than happy to volunteer to work with Matt and other people within Europe to talk to registrars. But the thing about talking to only new registrars I think is pointless. The real issue isn't with the new ones; the real issue is with the existing ones.

Jeff Eckhaus: I just have a quick response to that. You know sort of like when you think about - in your businesses are we willing to invest dollars into marketing ourselves. Because I agree with a newsletter and other things, but will people be okay with saying hey you know what? We're going to have to raise fees. I will just make numbers up - \$1000 instead of \$500. And we're going to use you know \$100 of that from each member towards the marketing. You know if the (membership) is okay with that, you know this is our decision. And I'm happy - you know we could go forward with that, but we need to raise funds to invest in that marketing outreach.

James.

James Bladel: Michele and Tim kind of covered my point.

Jeff Eckhaus: Tatiana.

Tatiana Khramtsova: So is (unintelligible) participation from different registrars that wasn't (unintelligible) with (unintelligible) about five or six (unintelligible) registrars and only one is presented here. So we actually don't (view any blockages) of the participation and (unintelligible) will have (unintelligible) problems within (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) and the United States. (They said) we couldn't (resolve) them because only five registrars are from the United States. Maybe (unintelligible) for others because we (unintelligible)

stakeholder group (unintelligible). If you can help me with the text (unintelligible) by myself.

Jeff Eckhaus: That would be great. (Adam).

(Adam): I guess it was kind of mostly covered in terms of what Michele and Matt were saying around you know talking to registrars. I think we should call the program Registrar Buddies by the way.

But we all know - I'm pretty sure we all know one established accredited registrar who is not a member who we could just talk to and say hey even if it's not a formal program, you know why don't you come join. And I think it is kind of a perceived marketing program like Michele said in that they just think we're a bunch of policy heads that kind of sit around in a little clique and talk about things they don't understand with a lot of funny acronyms, right.

So one quick question about what we do do around marketing. Do we send out the same thing kind of every year on a regular schedule? I don't think I've ever seen it.

Man: What does it look like?

Jeff Eckhaus: You mean about internal recruiting? Hey registrar check out the (RC).

Man: Yeah we get - sorry Jeff for answering your question here. When we get - we do get (unintelligible) they join and you know can you tell me more what it's about and we will answer those. When it is renewal time, we do an articulation of you know what the benefits of membership are. We don't really have - and I'm not sure if we still do because I don't think we do. But we used to get notification from ICANN about newly accredited registrars and then we would send them a communication saying you know you really should consider joining.

And you know we have a stable and good membership. I mean we could always use more - I mean (Greg) to your point about being a (free rider) problem I think is accurate. I mean everybody needs to contribute and we've got a nice membership, and what we need is the ability to (unintelligible) out of the group and help the ExCom do some of the workload and then add resources to our base.

Jeff Eckhaus: And the last one is (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you gentleman. I think that I just want to call one issue to having (unintelligible) between ALAC and GNSO, and I'm quite surprised that the only focus that was made was on helping you know the applicant in (unintelligible) country with the structure of (unintelligible). But I did not see anything point out (unintelligible) regarding the registrar in the region, so there's nothing to (unintelligible) the development of (unintelligible) different country if you look at the numbers.

For - in African countries it means nothing. I mean and the more representatives we've got worldwide I mean the more interesting it's going to be for our (unintelligible) and (unintelligible). And I think that we need to (unintelligible) in this working group because the working group between ALAC and the GNSO.

And the only point that I would raise is how are they going to develop and (unintelligible) the increased number of applicants in terms of (unintelligible) and I also provide that I did not see anything mentioned regarding the development of registrar. And in fact on the market is - we just have (unintelligible) control market because the (intermedia) that we have on the market will not help protect the registrar at the end and this is really (unintelligible) environment.

Mason Cole: All right thank you (unintelligible). And thanks everyone for the good input. I think that was helpful.

All right this isn't on the agenda, but the ExCom discussed this yesterday and I want to make mention of it. We have some elections coming up that are going to be pretty important. Two of our GNSO reps, Tim and Adrian, are (getting off the council). (They are term limited). Their seats will be up for election in September so the new GNSO councilors can take their seats at the (Senegal) meeting.

This is my last year as chairman. I'm term limited out. Jeff is term limited as treasurer; Matt is term limited as secretary. So next June we will need potentially three new ExCom (unintelligible). So if anyone is interested in fulfilling one of these roles, approach me and let me know of your interest so that we can have a discussion about that. So I just wanted to put that out there on the table.

So with that - yeah go ahead.

Man: The term limits (set) in our bylaws. Is there an opportunity to relook at our bylaws?

Mason Cole: Except for the GNSO.

Man: The GNSO yeah. Is there an opportunity to relook at our bylaws?

Mason Cole: Sure. Rob has volunteered to work on...

Rob Hall: I think it's (an anonymous screening) (unintelligible), because we've got other issues with the bylaws. So I volunteered. Unfortunately I am responsible for some of the original ones, so I figure it out myself with the ExCom to go through these, but some kind of membership issue that we need to discuss around bylaws too. So I think it's (later in the agenda).

Mason Cole: Yeah way to clean up your own mess Rob. I appreciate that. Okay questions about that. All right with that as a segue, then Statton is going to talk a bit about participation.

Statton Hammock: I think my colleagues on the ExCom conspired to undermine exactly what I was going to say by mentioning and covering everything that I was - that was on my sheet. So I'm standing up here (flubbing) for something to say.

Yeah participation goes hand in hand with membership. Participation means - just to put a fine point on it participation in our working groups. You know it seems that a lot of the working groups and policy groups have some of the same representatives from the registrar stakeholder group participating. It would be nice to get some additional voices and additional input. So that's one way I would encourage greater participation.

The other is oftentimes we send around requests for comments on particular issues, statements that the registrar stakeholder group may make on behalf of the members. I really encourage you to add your two cents, your comments, your points to make sure we are capturing and everybody is (unintelligible) and that we're not overstating our position as a registrar group that is not shared by everyone.

And the final point, which Mason just made, I was going to say that you know I am just starting here as vice chair on the ExCom, but all of my colleagues are term limited and done. And so one of the other ways I would encourage participation is to consider leadership roles within this organization because we do need your leaders. We are all working for employers and our companies and we need some work with the kind of work that we do, so please consider increasing your participation in this group.

That's all. Thanks.

Mason Cole: And Michele - yeah Michele is first. Okay.

Michele Neylon: Yeah just with respect to the participation - the traditions. To date I've only received one bit of feedback from one registrar on the budget. So the position is going to probably be they want too much fucking money full stop. So then, you know, it'd be helpful to get feedback (unintelligible).

Man: This may throw us off track here a little bit, just to be clear on what the bylaws say about term limits, you're term limited not by (excom), just to the position you're in.

So if I can call it the (Bob Conley) maneuver, you now, if you recall back years ago (Bob) went from -- he was term limited to treasurer - or secretary. Went from treasurer for a year and went back for secretary for another three terms.

So we don't have to lose our (excom), they may just have to shift positions around. So that is another option available on the current bylaws. But I'm with Elliott about changing it.

Mason Cole: Statton.

Statton Hammock: When I was sort of running for this particular position I reached out to many of you about your feelings about the (excom) and what I did get was it'd be nice to, you know, get maybe smaller registrar participation and points assimilated and expressed.

And so, you know, I'm hearing from you that you'd like that and so I'm asking to step forward.

Mason Cole: Okay, anything else on that subject? Yes, (Matt).

(Matt): (Unintelligible). It is just on your last point it was pretty strong. I won't be represented equally at the time to be in a position and then we get right on the ground which is past common already.

Statton Hammock: And there's nothing to stop us from changing the structure of the (excom) either. So when we're talking about bylaws everything's on the table. So we can add more, we've got seats specifically for a different size of registrar. We could, you know, it doesn't need to be just four, throw that out as related.

Mason Cole: Okay, all right thanks for that -- oh, I'm sorry.

Man: I was just going to say on that point I think there some very clear business lobbies that are represented here. So we sell (unintelligible) after market and it will be nice to see some of these represented with a fracture of the group.

But it would be nice to see representatives from each of those lines to take them all sort of even comment and voice amongst the group and potentially fill in, obviously, other countries as well.

Mason Cole: Yes, that's actually, I would say, looking at the makeup of it and that's actually how it is made up now. So it's sort of interesting I don't think we planned it but that's sort of the make up of it on the (excom).

Yes, if we - I think we would - we've all discussed, we discussed that we would like more international participation on the and also for the GNSO account source as well.

(Clark): (Clark). Yes, I was just going to pick up on that first point. You know, they probably haven't had the opportunity to have the same voice right? I mean a small registrar with a thousand names can contribute just as much as James can go.

And (Matt) made a third point about the bandwidth issue and to the point but I think, you know, there's a lot of different business models in most of our community. But everyone has the same opportunity to contribute.

And if you don't speak up then your voice isn't going to be heard. So...

Man: I would caution against trying to jury the bylaws over the structure of the (excom) too much. The reality is all of you decide you who sit up here. So everybody has an equal voice in building this off.

So if there is a grounds say lets put this type of business model on the (excom). You can do it easily, there's nothing to stop it now.

Mason Cole: Okay, other comments? All right, thanks everybody. All right, I want to move our attention to two things that are in play of policy wise right now. One is the RAA and then I'm going to skip over the engagement issue and go straight to the law enforcement code of conduct.

So I just want to update everybody on where we stand with the RAA in terms of how we're presenting our position to the rest of the community. This is the - the RAA is our top agenda item with the board when we meet with them later in the afternoon.

So just as context I know that everybody's here has been paying attention to the RAA issue. The (excom) is extremely concerned about the community's perception of the RAA.

I think we can all agree that there's a misperception in the community that the RAA is treated like a policy document. That it's the funnel or sort of the, you know, the bucket into which the community wants to put all of its policy requests.

The idea to being, you know, if we put it in the RAA then it becomes an enforceable document and compliance can enforce it on the registrars and then, you know, our problems go away.

Obviously, that's not how ICANN's structured. ICANN's a policy development body not a contract unending body. So when we get together with the board - - and this by the way is on (Bruce Tompkin)'s advice. Because obviously, he's a member of the board and he's been helpful to all of us on RAA issues.

So we're going to present to the board several concepts about the RAA what it is what it's not. What we're prepared to do in terms of amending the RAA and what we're not prepared to do.

And our basic message is the RAA is a contract between two parties. It's not to be used as a policy tool. ICANN's set up the GNSO as a way to develop policy from the bottom up. Not as a way to cram everybody's policy initiatives into a contract.

And that, you know, we -- our expectation is that we'll play by the rules the community's set up when ICANN was founded. And on Bruce's advice we wanted to do that not in writing we want to do it in a verbal presentation.

And because he is concerned -- and I share this concern like a lot of us do -- is because there's so many fences on the other side of the RAA debate. If there is an issue on power of debate that even people on the board are misunderstanding the purpose of the RAA.

And now that we're through at least this first phase of the TLD program, you know, we can get the board's attention on to this and re-shift their, their way of thinking, that's the objective anyway.

So does anyone want to add anything to that (Jeff), Rob, Statton? We can put it out for discussion James? Okay, then Michele?

James Bladel: This is James speaking. This is good segue to a conversation that continues to come up in the WHOIS Review RT4 which is that there is no centralized place for WHOIS policy.

And I think one of the reasons people confuse the RAA with policy documents because there are little artifacts and little nuggets of policy hidden inside of it.

So maybe -- and this is a big undertaking I know -- and maybe the long-term goal is to extract all of that stuff out of the RAA and just make it a pure contract.

And then have a separate policy document or appendix and then make that the living malleable document that can be changed through different ICANN policies but then the other becomes more sense toned.

And I know that you would get support from the RT4 on that especially with regard to all the different WHOIS requirements.

Mason Cole: Okay. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, I just have two things. One is, I actually, I love what James is saying because one of the problems with this entire RAA baffle is that we're on the back floats, we're in the defensive position.

It would be incredibly useful that we were to turn - if we were able to turn that around look at what we want to changed in the RAA as opposed to what we don't want to change in the RAA.

And the second thing -- and this is the one - I think it's going to cause the most headaches -- is how on earth can we communicate with the

(unintelligible) ICANN community cause we are not a bunch of assholes, we're just a core refusing to engage with them.

Because this is the entire thing that certain people are putting out there. You know, we're unwilling to talk, we're unwilling to engage, it's all this observer thing. You know what I'm talking about.

Man: So let me address that. First, if anyone makes that accusation I'm aware that those accusations are being made. They're unfairly made because we - this state collar group has intentionally contacted every other state collar group inside the GNSO and asked for either a meeting or a discussion or a meeting between (excom)'s or whatever.

Sometimes those are ignored, other times they're taken up. In fact, tomorrow we have or Thursday we have, we have meetings with the ALAC, with the IPC and with the NCUC.

And it's our first set of meetings with the IPC and the NCUC. So, you know, we're just trying to get the ice broken between those.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Yes. (Unintelligible). So I do think those are - those are accusations. I also think candidly that I think it's easier to sort of gasket registrars then to say, "It's a party of no." Right, rather than propose a constructive solution.

But one of the things that we're going to say to the board today is, no party no, you know, we're in the business of helping the community with its agenda, but what we need to do is look at the most appropriate way to get that part of the community's agenda satisfied. Not just to default with the RAA.

Man: I'm losing track (unintelligible). Is those on the list?

Mason Cole: Yes, I'll send it out. You know, actually I sent it out yesterday but I can resend it today. Okay, other thoughts or comments? Well, I really thought this one would take off.

Rob Hull: I want to come back to Michele's point because it's a thing -- I sat in the last negotiating committee that did the RAA with ICANN. And the first question they ask, "What do you want?"

And we kind of give them blank looks and, "Well, we're here to kind of help you and the last provision was all about trying to get more help to ICANN because they were under pressure to compliance and that sort of thing."

This one we need to start thinking about what do we want because we know what the other side wants. We know what they're list of demands that we're trying to negotiate is.

And I would encourage you to think higher than we usually had. So, you know, I hear James about taking some of these policies out of the document, they might be our best negotiating tactic.

For instance, we might want to charge for WHOIS why should it be free. If that's our starting point, the fact other community issues about WHOIS all of sudden.

So I want to be careful not to give away too much by making the context just about business and not the policies because those policies that are affecting us and costing us money that we may want to start negotiating.

But we need to come up with, "What do we want?" If our starting point, you would rather not it be WHOIS that may be a legitimate starting point too in negotiating. But we need to negotiate and find a middle ground. And we never seem to have anything we want.

Man: I think the good idea that I think that Rob said is that if you guys have to start thinking about your wish list. And getting it ready I mean I know for myself and I've spoken to this and I've spoken to ICANN, its removal of the bulk WHOIS provision in the RAA.

But I'm sure others, you know, will have some items that we should definitely get the things you want and then sort of be ideas of why you want that or something added or removed and I think that would be helpful.

Man: I for one as a European registrar of the bulk WHOIS one is, problematic for me. I mean it's - there's a huge kind of nasty area I'm just waiting to be sued. So I would be fully supportive of removing that from the RAA. I don't know what (Matt) thinks.

(Matt): Basically, it's almost removed. So we changed it in the last round of revisions in audits. Only if there is -- Elliott knows the language here probably more about if there's market power or if they come straight. You know, one registrar had a lot of market power. But we are there so I know a lot of registrars just stop giving out and said we believe this clause has no longer has affect.

So, you know, it's a risk that it might be found noncompliant but the reality is I think we're probably already there. So it should be easy to move it in the next one. I don't think that's a big deal or big deal on ICANN's part.

Mason Cole: Okay, Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I think registrar just stopped giving it out. I think there's good reasons why they aren't required to in any case. And then one of them being that it can't be used for marketing purposes of any kind. That was the change that was made a while back. So I think that helps.

But in regards to that I think that it would be helpful, you know, I normally want to collect what everybody wants. But if we had some sort and you need to organize it as a sort of process so we don't, you know, things won't go willy nilly all over the place.

And even if we don't take the consensus policy things out of the contract that's not where we go at least clarifying what those are. Because we all talk about the picket fence and that means something different to everybody.

And that was a huge issue with the last RAA amendments and with this one as well. So somewhere along the line there has to be a part of what we get out of this is defining clearly what is or isn't within that picket fence.

Man: I just want to make a clarification Rob just to let you know that on the piece of market power is, it's ICANN has to make that determination it's not the registrars.

So it's - if it was up to ICANN, you know, we could have our own opinions but ICANN has to make an official determination of the - if there is market power.

It's not up to the registrar but - just (unintelligible). Yes, and they are very reluctant to do that. Just because I - a couple of - I know a couple of registrars that have made official requests and ICANN either has not responded or has said, "At this time we can't make a determination."

Mason Cole: All right handling the queue. I'm sorry (Ted) go ahead.

Ted Suzuki: I was just going to respond to that. You know, we should, you know, continue to push on it because that's actually a change from the last time. Because originally it said that - I believe it said the department of commerce or something to that nature.

So we specifically pushed to have that change made to have it put in ICANN's hand so ICANN can make the decision. So I think you're right, but I think we need to keep pushing because that was exactly why we did it that way.

Man: So just to let you guys -- I personally something that I have been - I've been with (unintelligible). I've been discussing with ICANN is something that is high on our agenda and just you guys know personally I'm pushing to issue with ICANN if we had any changes to the settle I'll report back to the group.

Mason Cole: Okay, it's (Helen) and unless there's anybody else, we'll cut the queue at that point on this subject. (Helen)?

(Helen): You know, just back to the bulk WHOIS. I understood we were allowed to charge for it and I understand that we can charge whatever we like. So I've got my dollars spent.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Helen): Are you allowed to charge?

Man: \$10,000.

(Helen): Yes, okay. That was exactly the fee I said that they could pay and when I received the fee I said I would give it to them. And that's what I did, they lied to me, I'm not sure why.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Helen): So if we all agree that nobody's going to charge less than \$10,000?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Before we go down that rat hole on this one very tiny provision let's take it off line okay. All right.

(Helen): Well, we need to the bulk WHOIS...

Man: We are allowed to charge the acquired fee.

(Helen): Yes, I mean it really isn't necessary, is there any good reason for it. I really don't see why we shouldn't be revealing that information. I have an issue with the WHOIS anyway in that it should be private. Because people would give real information if they knew information is being protected.

So the whole idea of getting the bulk WHOIS is (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Okay, All right. I think - I think we're good on that.

Man: Yes.

Mason Cole: All right, lets move to, we've got two or three other things to cover. I just want to give everybody a heads up. I think everyone's aware (Bobby Frain) from the FBI is going to be here later on today.

He is going to discuss a draft document that the law enforcement community put together. I call it a code of conduct or a list of best practices or whatever.

But, you know, as you know we've been engaged with law enforcement for more than a year now on issues that are important to them. They're looking for ways to get registrar cooperation in their efforts to do something about online crime.

You know, the law enforcement community they work for governments and they need to go back to governments and say, "You know, we're doing something about the crime problem."

And they're looking for a documented way to do that. And this code of conduct is a way to do it. I think we've had a number of discussions informally about it.

I know several of us are hesitant to sign anything that would indicate that maybe there's a, you know, a binding relationship of any kind or to undermine the ICANN model by signing some kind of document with another party.

So - so I know there's hesitation about what he's going to propose. You know, that said, we do need to find a way to cooperate more proactively with law enforcement - law enforcement community.

Otherwise, I think the risk that we face and you'll probably hear this from the GAC today is, you know, legislation in some kind and that's an even bigger, an even bigger potential mess.

So I want you to be -- okay, I've got James -- I want you to be aware that this is coming and we should have questions for (Bobby) and his colleagues when they come in. So let me open the queue on that. James and then Elliott.

James Bladel: Hi thanks James speaking. You know, I think -- and we've discussed this maybe internally in small groups -- I think it's very important that we not let this document, whatever it contains whatever happens to it, be called the code of conduct.

Because that is specified in the RAA as something that is binding and I just would be concerned that it'd create a third avenue for changes. You know, we've got the contract, you got the PDP, now we got this code of conduct that people would want to try eek some changes into.

So I think it's very important that we get that, you know, hold the line on that that this is not a workable title for the document. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Elliott.

Elliott Noss: I mean I don't know it may -- I just seen a draft of the document before. Yes, so there was - there was kind of - there was two things I want to comment on. One is, Section 1 of that document and the second is some things that I think we've been asking for from law enforcement.

And for me are required for this dialogue to be constructive and move ahead and so with respect to the first Section 1, I was quite shocked when I read it. I was shocked for two reasons.

The specific ask, you know, "You'll investigate anything that is brought to you." And second how opened ended that was. You'll investigate anything brought to you by anyone, not just law enforcement.

And we would become Steve Metalitz's private police force with that current language. Now I don't know, you know, one of the things you've heard me talking about now for going on ten years is, if law enforcement wants cooperation from us, I think we've said repeatedly we would love to give it to you.

Now would you please shut the door behind you and not have intellectual property interest come in and leverage what you gain for their purposes. And this - that language was just completely, you know, it wasn't only an open door, it broke down the wall that the door was contained in.

So, you know, you're going to hear me talk about that at 3:30. And I'd love some feedback - can I ask for feedback from you on that one before I go to my second point?

Mason Cole: You're right.

Elliot Noss: Yes, so I mean did you express this to (Bobby). I feel like I've told him this six times already.

Mason Cole: We were very clear with (Bobby) in Brussels about that fact. If you remember we had that discussion.

Elliott Noss: Oh, yes.

Mason Cole: ...that we were all concerned they were a tool of the IP.

Elliott Noss: You know, we went through this again with (Carter Hainer) with went through this in San Francisco. I mean I'm just at an, I don't get it point. Okay, so here we go we'll do it again. And we'll repeat ourselves.

The second thing is around, you know, I think we should be very tight around two asks and they flow out of this. The first is that I think law enforcement, you know, whether that's Interpol or a group of clear sort of, you know, large law enforcement agencies need to provide a function here.

They need to - it's a two asks, one is there needs to be formal vetting for who's law enforcement. If you want us to take requests on an appropriate basis, I think that's great. I think that we would all say as we said numerous times, "You know, hey our compliance guys know who the FBI is when they reach out, etc."

But it's, you know, the Sheriff in Wyoming that is the challenge, no knock on Wyoming. I go most years and love it, it's a lovely place. The - in fact I am a sheriff. So, you know, I think that they can provide a really important role in vetting that.

We know who registrars are they're accredited through a very formal process. And I think they have to - they have to take some role here and second is around education.

Again, I think all of us big or small spend a fair amount of time educating law enforcement on not just the rules of the game but what is a registrar? What is a registry? What is a web hosting company?

There is very simple education that can be done and if law enforcement would take a -- that function upon themselves with input from us, it would be fantastic to allow us to refer requests that education resource first and I think, you know, I don't know how they can say, "No." to those two asks.

I really think we should just pound the table on that. Thanks.

Mason Cole: I got to stand in the queue. But to answer your point at the meeting in February in Brussels...

Elliott Noss: Yes.

Mason Cole: ...the idea came up with how do you validate the Sheriff in Wyoming? Or how do, you know, that you're dealing with law enforcement in the first place? And, you know, can there be a database of some kind that we can validate against to know that you really are the cops? If you call.

And we got pushed back on that quite heavily.

Elliott Noss: Yes, except that they are saying, "Hey it's your problem."

Mason Cole: I know.

Elliot Noss: I wanted -- talked about that in Stockholm by the way and I think that was 2001. You know, and at the end of the day this can be a simple process. You don't have to give us a database to validate against it.

We're going to send the request to you (Bobby) or whoever you designate. And if you tell us they're valid, they're valid. There should be some chain of title there.

Mason Cole: Yes, listen bring this up Elliott, okay. Stat.

Statton Hammock: Once again (Mason) you robbed me of my point. You know, it's funny the irony of that is that we asked law enforcement to, you know, tell us who they were or a prepare a database and they said they couldn't for privacy concerns.

And then at the same time they -- for privacy reasons. And then they turn around and ask us to, you know, you know, provide all this data and information about us or our registrants, so it was a real ironic twist.

Mason Cole: All right, we're getting a little close in time. I want to make sure we cover everything here. So any other points on this for now? Okay. You want to take your (unintelligible) issue now?

Man: Okay. I don't know how many of you are aware of, you know, of what a turf agreement is or how many of you deal with it but I have to do with the problem I think a lot of us have either faced or going to face and that's hijacked domains.

You know, a lot of our, you know, domains are being hijacked and being transferred from one registrar to another. A lot of times customers always say, "You know, my system was hacked." Where most of the time - where they think the actual software was registrar where in essence it's usually some simple password than it was socially engineered to get the domain out.

And I think as I said we've - you know, it's been sort of an informal agreement between registrars which is the transfer undo agreement and transfer undo request for -- yes, that's what (Frank) has done, yes.

You know, transferring to request form and it's been a very like quick less cumbersome method and sort of informal for registrars to get the domains back in. What we're saying is you say, the registrar will say to the other, you know, sign this piece that says that x registrar was a registrar and at the time of transfer.

And it helps to get -- then they'll send it to each other and then usually the registrar where the - I guess the gaining registrar will transfer the domain back. I didn't know how many registrar have the process here.

Or how many of felt it I don't know if you want to with a show of hands, how many of you never heard it or have used it before these turf agreements?

Mason Cole: How many have used it?

Man: Okay. So it's something like I say, I want to make you guys aware of. And I think because I think it's going to be more prevalent as this goes forward. Because it's sort of a non-legal document versus say the next step would be I guess in IA an indemnification agreement.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Man: And then after that there is a the CRP.

Mason Cole: CDP.

Man: Yes, which is almost impossible once you get into that step those are very hard to, to get the domains active. You know, I think, you know, as this grew it's something that we need to figure out because I think domain hijacking is sort of unfortunately in it's infancy.

And I think that it's going to go on so I mean I'm sort of putting it to this group about, you know, what the thoughts are about maybe standardizing an agreement or getting a process in place where if we get domains hijacked we can contact each other.

So I want to sort of open that up to the floor. I mean I have some thoughts about it but I want to open it up to the floor and see if we can get a discussion going on this.

Mason Cole: I've got the queue. Go ahead (Matt).

(Matt): So I think it's me, Michele and James. But I think we all have the same point. So (bitop) Part B which was specifically looked at things to address hijackings which is just included Michele shared it, James and I over on the working group.

How does that -- first of all is everyone familiar with the (unintelligible)? How does that play into these turf agreements?

Man: Well, I would say the turf agreements are sort of a legacy agreement that have been, you know, between registrars. I think if you guys would say, "What is the specific process that came out with the working group and what the recommendations were. Then, you know, when would those be put in place? What is that is going to say?" Maybe that will resolve this whole issue.

Michele Neylon: James this is Michele, you know the biggest recommendation was the transfer, an emergency transfer undo process between registrars that would essentially address exactly (Jeff) what you walked through.

Man: What, okay go.

Michele Neylon: The main thing which came out is the transfer emergency action tunnel as a contact. It's more to do with where it's all going which I think that we've never

been involved with this based on the conversation we've had with Network Solutions.

Those are the (Mark) the registrars who have had issues with hijacks. The biggest issue seemed to be getting the conversation going. Because it's all well and good that eNom and (Nextel) might play nice together on these things, but more often than not the problem arose that the receiving registrar was completely uncontactable.

So, for example, 18 months ago I got a phone call, Easter weekend, from a registrar trying to get in contact with another registrar that they thought maybe I might know something. You know, it was just ridiculous. It's not (unintelligible) undo; more to get the conversation going.

One of the problems that we had originally was that some of the aftermarket people got quite obsessed that it could be abused, or kind of seller remorse. I don't know if James wants to add anything.

James Bladel: Well yeah, just that there's no help coming on this issue from (RTTB). You know, we floated this out. We tried the ETRP as (Matt) said. It went nowhere. It's DOA. We get this thing now that basically says, "Answer your phone or else," with no else what. You know, nothing (unintelligible).

The (TDRP), I think, through our discussions very early on in the process, we were recognized (unintelligible) as a joke. And it's too cumbersome and too slow and just does not address the harm here.

So anything that we can put together informally as a group -- any kind of a process that we can use as a Band-Aid around this vulnerability -- would be great; although I think that, you know, when I saw the hands go up I saw a lot of large retail and wholesale registrars raising their hands that they use (TRP).

The hijackers are smart and they know who the small, you know, one- two-man operations are. And they know who's not in this room. And those are their, you know, recipients of choice for hot or stolen names. So let's, you know, let's just keep doing what we can within this group to address that, because there's no help coming from policy. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I will say though that I think this idea of an emergency contact is a good one. I think it does begin to go down the road of addressing some of the concerns we've been talking about through law enforcement agencies and even the IP community.

So I think we need to continue to try to address that as best we can. And if at some point we can come up with some sort of strategy about compliance for ICANN staff and what happens, that would work. That would be great as well.

The other question that I have, I guess, in regards to this is incidentally, you know, like (Gene)'s pointed out, a lot of us already have these things in place. And I think more than likely those of us sitting in this room aren't really the bulk of the problem when hijackings arise. I think we're all pretty willing to work with each other as best we can.

If you can get somebody you can talk to, that's half of the battle right there. So what's the goal in standardizing? Just to make it easy for those of us that are currently cooperating? Or is there some goal of trying to get those who we can't contact or won't cooperate? Because that's really the issue that I think we have and we'd like to try to resolve.

Man: Thanks. So I think there are actually two parts. I'd love to delve the contact list but, you know, I don't know what's the best method. But I think what I was proposing here and what I'd like to do is to see if this group could come up with a standardized (TRP) agreement.

Because right now all of ours have little clauses to them, and they're a little bit different. What I'd like to do with this group - and I'll take the lead on this and I'll send it out to the stakeholder group, you know, maybe if the small group wants to work on it so we don't have massive editing.

But to come out with a really simple standardized (TRP) agreement that we can all work with, because this way, you know, we want these things to get turned around quickly. And if somebody gets this (TRP) agreement and says, "Well I don't like this clause. I don't like that clause," and it goes back and forth, if we could all come up with at least a standardized template that we could all use, I think it would help in the process.

And I think parallel to that, Tim, I'd love to work on getting, you know, this emergency list, contact list, in place as well. And maybe that's something we could distribute to the group at, you know, sometime in the near future.

Tim Ruiz: All right. Anyone else? We're getting tight on time here.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, Michele. I'm going to cut it off at Michele. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just very quickly, there will be a vote in the GNSO on Wednesday, I think it is. Wednesday?

Man: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: On Wednesday on the IRTP recommendations. So if that actually is passed, then the transfer emergency action channel contact will become policy. And the key thing for people to remember is that it's only accessible to contracted parties. It is not accessible to external third parties.

Man: It's probably something that like would be stored in (VADAR) potentially?

Tim Ruiz: Okay, all right. Thanks. All right. Our final agenda item on this -- and then we're going to need to break to go to the GAC -- is the bylaws (unintelligible). Rob?

Rob Hull: Okay, so, we said earlier we're about to undertake a review of our bylaws. There's a couple critical things. The (unintelligible) kind of warned about this week that I think we probably should discuss, and I want to lightly discuss them if I can and then say to any of you if you're interested in helping with the bylaw review, I'd be more than happy to take it on -- have you help.

The one thing is the concept. And we talked about membership recruitment, and now we need to talk about membership classes a little bit, and whether we go down the road of creating different membership classes within our or supporting our, within our constituency or our SG -- stakeholder group. Thank you.

And here and why. So what we learned was the registries have recently their bylaws and are now undergoing another revision, because the fear they have is with 500 new TLD registries, they've been told by some companies like Warner Bros. that they can't wait to get a vote in the registry constituency when they apply for their new TLD.

I can imagine very easily that we'll have a lot of single registrant, single registrar, TLDs created in this world of 500 everyone's expecting. And I know that Warner Bros. and the IP lobby would love votes in our house or our constituency, as well as the registry one.

So we need some way to address different types of members, because clearly a registrar who only services one TLD and only has one registrant might be different than the type of registrars we are today. And as we're an advocacy group, if you will, I think we want to be very careful to ensure that we retain that voice.

You know, the last thing I would want personally is to be hindered with TLDs and new registrars created that are all owned by IP concerns, and all of sudden we're the IP lobby or, in fact, the whole house could be, right? Registries and registrars.

So what the registries - it's interesting with their bylaws. They said you can be a member of another constituency, but if you vote in any other constituency, you can't vote in theirs. So that's one option we could do. Different classes of membership's another option. Defining what a registrar - like different types of registrars is another option.

I want to be very careful here, you know, because it may be hard to chance some of these things. But I'm open to hearing any ideas about what might be possible, you know, or how we could structure this.

The problem the registries ran into is they changed their bylaws to if you voted in any other constituency, you could be a member of them. But if you voted, then you couldn't - then Warner Bros. immediately said, "No, we're good. We'll (unintelligible). They can take care of us and we'll vote in the registry one."

So now they're back to another round of how do they try and prevent that from them being overwhelmed. Because that would change dramatically the contracted party set-aside, if all of a sudden there was an influx of other interests, if you will, who are buying registrar or registries simply for the sake of getting votes in our house. So I'm open to discussion, but (Elliot)? Thank you. Sorry.

Elliot Noss: Yeah, I think this highlights something that we all better realize now. You know, yesterday was a day of great change. You know, there could be a lot of bumps in the road between here and there.

But I think we all better recognize that, you know, the concept of registrar was regulatory artifice, and that what it was was a creation in 1999 to avoid VeriSign having, you know, Network Solutions at the time having competition at the registry level.

And what that means is, you know, the quid pro quo there was, "Okay, you can keep your monopoly in com. You won't have to have competition. But here's your give." And they kind of cut the baby in half and chopped it up, and here we all are years later.

That's historical fact. And I think that we all need to remind ourselves of that and observe it. So, you know, Rob, I think what you said is great and I'm glad you've raised it. And, you know, I hadn't thought of that before. And, boy, that's a real issue.

So I think that really - I mean what I'm going to suggest, at least as a start to what an addressing of that issue might be, is to say that this, you know, we could, should, amend what we are to registrars -- the definition of this registrar constituency.

Maybe we become the, you know, registrars serving multiple end-user constituency, and define this group as what it is -- a certain creature who performs a certain function even inside of the many business models that this contains.

Rob Hull: I agree, but there's one little nuance there. You want them as a member. You just don't want them as a voting member.

Elliot Noss: Why do you want them as a member?

Rob Hull: Because they can create their own then (unintelligible) GNSO seats.

Elliot Noss: Well you know...

((Crosstalk))

Elliot Noss: So now we're getting into a different issue, right? I don't know if (Zip), for instance, will get a TLD or not. You know, I'm comfortable saying, you know, we'll probably apply for dot Tucows. And we would be a member of that constituency.

And, you know, there's room inside of that discussion influence. But I think that if you try and go down the road that you're talking about there...

Rob Hull: Yes.

Elliot Noss: That you're really, you know, you're pushing against the inevitable. You said give up GNSO seats. I think that, you know, there's going to be a fundamentally different world. And that's probably going to lead to GNSO reform, and probably should.

You know, I think that before they could form a new constituency and call for a GNSO seat or some split there, that necessitates GNSO reform. You know, the world post- whatever it is, you know, December 2012 or when things go live -- April 2012, they turn over the cards; December, they start announcing. Or no -- November, they start announcing.

I hope they don't move the Toronto date, so they're announcing them all in Toronto, which would be really cool. But I think that, you know, it's a different world. And we'll probably get out ahead of things if we start thinking about what proper reform looks like.

Because, Rob, the challenge with going - what you said again is a very real threat. But the challenge with going down the road is we're going to be piling artifice on top of artifice then. And, you know, then we end up with a creaky system that really struggles to react to whatever the real issues are.

Man: Hey, Rob, you've got a queue here -- (Grey) and Michele.

(Grey): I'll just echo that comment (unintelligible) about, I think, knowing who we are and being a little bit more specific about that, and then allowing the process of having other people who may have slightly different interests. And there could be more, but as we understand who the new players are going to be, you know, and let them participate.

I think that, you know, us focusing on narrowing it down and being very specific about thinking about who we are as an entity now, resisting, and maybe tailoring it more specifically to that.

Man: Michele?

Michele Neylon: This thing backwards and forwards between yourself and Elliot has kind of opened up a whole can of worms that I haven't even thought about. I mean originally I kind of thought, "Oh, yeah, you know, you can have voting/non-voting." But then that raises a whole other mess.

Man: Yes and no. So what the registries did was they went down the voting/non-voting route because they wanted to be inclusive of them all, so they didn't get another stakeholder group being created of brand registries. Because under our charter of the house, we have six seats split equally between all SGs.

So if another SG was created, in theory, which puts the six seats two, two and two. So that's how the registries handled theirs. We can look at different models and how we handle ours, but certainly one would be, "No, you're not in." Although right now our bylaws are we take any accredited registrar.

So and I don't know if there's ICANN approval process to (unintelligible). I don't know if there's an ICANN approval process of our bylaws. I believe they

did have to review them. But I think we'd be hard-pressed perhaps to say we're going to exclude some registrars.

I mean that would be a big change for our bylaws. Right now we take them all. So if we want to keep with that premise, then we have to get into okay, once we have them all, how do we deal with them differently. But I'm open to either, I mean, Elliot. (Unintelligible).

Man: Yeah, actually let's - so two things. One is your desired outcome right now is exactly what? Do you want input as...

Man: Yeah, I want people to start thinking about the problem and come up with different ways. I mean Elliot mentioned one that we've been debating which is, you know, is our membership class based on how many registrants, different registrants, you have. Not domains, but registrants.

So I think most of us probably have thousands of registrants. That's very different than a single registrant/single user deal, you know, registrar. So anyhow, I don't know what the answer is. I want you to start thinking about it, and if you have an interest in this, I (unintelligible) talk to me. All right, (John)?

Man: Hold on. Hold on. No, we're going to have to stop. So, Stefane had a piece of input and then we're going to go to the GAC.

Stefane Van Gelder: No, I just wanted to add to the situation that you were describing that the current system - you mentioned GNSO restructure -- oh, it was earlier. I forget. The current system is actually built so that the SG balance stays the same, but you can add constituencies.

So if you get splintered groups, then they will be added as constituencies. So the SG balance of that vote stays the same. And that's what's happened with the NCSG -- the non-commercial stakeholder group. They've had rogue constituencies come along and try and be formed. And that's causing them

problems because inside their stakeholder group, they're having to split up those six votes you're talking about. So I just wanted to make that point clear.

Man: (Unintelligible) be back here at 1 o'clock. Right?

END