

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting
Commercial and Business Users Constituency Meeting
Tuesday 16 October 2012 at 13:15 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Man: This is the commercial and business user's contingency.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you everyone. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm the chair of the business constituency.

When we do the role call in just a minute which (Benny) will do for us, we'll ask the other officers to introduce themselves. Please, when you introduce yourself just say if you're a BC member, a want to be BC member or guest because some of you I know are meeting with us to talk about what the business constituency does and whether it fits your interest to become a member. So we really welcome everyone that's here.

And we'll be meeting today from 1:15 to 4:30. At 4::30 we'll be moving to the room where the GAC - the Government Advisory Committee - will be meeting with the board. And that meeting - the doors don't open until 4:45. So we will end in plenty of time for people to be standing at the door so we can try to get a seat for everyone.

We have a number of guest speakers and a number of sensitive topics that are time sensitive to deal with today. And so I'm going to ask (Benny) - our Secretariat - to do the role call for us. And (Benny) you can do that either by

asking people in the room to identify themselves first or go to the microphone
- whichever one you would like. Let me leave that to you.

(Benny): Thank you Marilyn. So I can do the role call for the people that are
participating remotely.

So we've got (Jempson) in the audience and on Adobe we've got (Angela
Hanson) participating remotely. And then I'd like to turn over to the people in
the room to announce themselves please.

Man: Thank you. John may I ask you to start?

I thought you were going to ask me to start - I'm sorry.

John Berard -- GNSO Counselor from the Business Constituency.

Aisha Hassan: Aisha Hassan International Chamber of Commerce - BC member.

Scott McCormick: Scott McCormick from McCormick ICT - BC member.

Man: (Unintelligible) and the first speaker when we come in together.

Steve Van Gelder: Steve Van Gelder policy coordination.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper -- PC Rep. CSG Rep to the BC.

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow BC Vice Chair financed operations.

Angie Graves: Angie Graves, BC member - Web Group Incorporated.

Jim Baskin: Jim Baskin, Verizon - BC member.

(Mary Joe Cueclar): (Mary Joe Cueclar) Administration - BC member.

(Arginold): (Arginold) guest and want to be baby.

(Anne Dickinson): (Anne Dickinson) guest. That was (Anne Dickinson) guest.

(Helena): (Helena) from (unintelligible) group and I'm a guest.

(Arthur Shooter): (Arthur Shooter) with (unintelligible) group and I'm a guest.

(Emilio Keith): (Emilio Keith) amazon.com - guest.

(Chris Shanson): (Chris Shanson) Delta Airlines - guest.

(Fidel Smirnoff): (Fidel Smirnoff) ICANN Fellowship - guest.

(Allen Sullivan): (Allen Sullivan) Sully Consultant - guest.

Man: (Unintelligible) guest.

(Jack Colacha): (Jack Colacha) ICANN staff - guest.

(Eva Norekelshneck): (Unintelligible).

(Benny): Okay. I want to introduce - oh, there we are. Sorry.

(Steve): Hi, this is (Steve) - Contractual Compliance with ICANN.

(Dell Ducave): Hi, this is (Dell Ducave) - Airline Starters.

(Nadia Garcia): Hi, this is (Nadia Garcia) - Contractual Compliance.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. And I think we missed Bill Smith from PayPal.

Bill Smith: Yes, Bill Smith and PayPal retired.

Marilyn Cade: And...

Patrick Ryan: Patrick Ryan with Google.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. We'll update this a little bit later as people come in but at this point what I'd like to do is introduce our first speaker. And I always feel very privileged to have the opportunity to introduce Patrick Falstrom because of the number of years in his previous incarnation working with Cisco where I think sometimes he and (Art Riley) thought that I thought they were my technical advisors in the days that I was at AT&T and we were going to international meetings.

So Patrick has moved to Netrod and I tried to make it a condition of his employment that his role of giving me technical advice would have to continue. But as he is the chair of the SSAC he actually is in a position to help all of us at ICANN. And we've asked him to focus on two particular areas that are very high priority to the business constituency as well as any other topics that the SSAC chair would like to mention. And the two topics that we prioritized were dot less domains and the implication and the true meaning of the SSAC report on the Whois review team comments.

We're very fortunate that in the business constituency we had the CSG representative Susan Kawaguchi to the revue team and two of the independent experts - Bill Smith from PayPal and Lynn Goodendorf were also on the Whois review team. So we were very, very blessed to have a good and deep understanding of the work of that review team. And we welcome (Bill Corwin).

Patrick Falstrom: And then if it is the case, we will get tricky questions and might get support from the SSAC members. Next slide please.

The slide that you have got includes much more information than what we'll go through. I will start by just because we do have time just to give you a brief overview of what we have done with SSAC lately and then dive into these specific reports where we will on request we will start with the report on both of those domains and then we'll simply go on until we run out of time. The slide itself should include enough information at least for you to be able to reach out to us if it is the case that you have follow-up questions. Next slide please.

So the role of SSAC is to write reports and come in with advice not only to ICANN board but also all the other supporting organizations advisor committees and also to the general community. Next slide please.

We are at the moment 38 members. They are appointed of three year terms. So we rotate one third every year. We have as you can see from when we started to do it formally in 2010, we have rotated between five and three. So we're changing about four members a year so far. Next slide please.

The work activities that we do have at the moment thanks in part to the membership committee that has finished their work to review the members that currently are up for renewal. We do look at registration dates of validation. We look at a few metrics for measuring abuse and use of domain names. And we also look at the key rollover for the root key for DNSX in the root zone.

We also participate in a number of cross constituency and committee working groups and you see some of the names of them there. Next slide please.

We do our work at ICANN meetings and also between ICANN meetings we have regular meetings not only to the SL's and the AC's. For example this meeting is one example of those. We also for example this week and also for the last couple of meetings that we have had at the ICANN meetings, we have had meetings with law enforcement.

We also have briefings and meetings with other community groups both at the ICANN meetings and also between the meetings. We do for example a whole host session if they are coming into the governor's forum in Azerbaijan in a few weeks. Next slide please.

We have this year so far published as many as seven documents which is a quite substantial amount of dead trees if you read it on paper or words and such. I would like to point out though that we do have an internal program on what the success of SSAC is. And we do very explicitly say that success is not to produce a large number of documents or a large number of words. It is to try to measure whether what we produce is helpful for the community or whoever the receiver of the message is intended to be.

So we are very much relying on feedback of the document - not only whether the document was good or bad - but also things like the readability, the overall technical details in the document, et cetera. We are working lots with ALAC specifically to help writing documents and also getting them translated to get a bigger outreach specifically to developing countries at the moment as one of the examples.

I also can take one document as an example. SSAC 50 that we produced a few years ago. We worked extremely hard and extended the time that we worked the documents to get it down to two pages. So those are the kind of initiatives that we're doing. It was first about five or six, seven pages and we said no we can actually change this to two pages by just concentrating a little bit more on removing text that is not needed.

So please come back with feedback on these documents. So, next slide please.

Let me just start by asking if people have general questions about SSAC.

Marilyn Cade: I do have a generic question. I think I probably know the answer but I'm not sure Patrick and I know we're starting a few minutes early so this may give some of your folks the opportunity to also arrive. But this question has to do with the membership of the SSAC.

I guess I am going to make a request again that the affiliations of the SSAC members be shown with their name. I can certainly go data mine the bios to find out who they're affiliated with. But most business people - they kind of don't have all that tolerance. And it's helpful for them to be able to see the breadth of the membership participants.

But my question is really from my knowledge of the SSAC members, I don't see many business user companies represented or many ISP or application companies represented. And I wondered if you could speak briefly about what the process is to maybe identify. I'll pick on a company - Visa or Amex or, you know, some of the different kinds of travelers insurance. Some of the companies who have perhaps particular interest in some of the security issues. There are others inside of the BC as well of course.

Could you comment on that because it might be something that would be very interesting to our members.

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you very much. Is it possible to go back to slide four please? That has SSAC members at the top. That one, thank you.

So what we started to do in 2009 as you understand that resulted in these changes that we did in 2010 was to clarify and make the process more clear related to the topics that you explained that you just bring up.

First of all the members of our sect are appointed as individuals based on not only of course where they're employed but what kind of skill set they have as individuals because the goal of SSAC is to write technical reports based on objective inspection of what's going on. So what we're looking for is people

that really do - individuals that have the ability to draw those objective conclusions.

If you look at for example the document that they have about blocking. You will see that we write very explicitly that regardless of how much rumors there are about blocking, it's very hard to find facts. And as long as we cannot find facts, we will not write the documents.

So the other thing that we started to do in 2009 was to have an internal skill set survey where each individual had to explain to the membership committee what topics they're working with and what kinds of topics they're interested in working on within the infinite architecture as a whole. And that includes business models. That includes DNS IP routing and a quite large number of items and the survey is not sure.

What we have been working on since then just because of these rotational members are two parallel processes. The first one is to insure that we do have a database internally with a compilation of the total skill sets of all individuals in SSAC. And the second thing we have been doing is that the membership committee - which (Jim Galvin) Vice Chair of SSAC and also just arrived - that the membership committee is trying to change the way they're working into looking into what kind of skills do SSAC need as a whole and what is missing. And then map the needs of SSAC with the contents of this skill set survey database that we keep track of.

So when someone applies for membership for SSAC - which by the way anyone can do - the membership is evaluating not whether that person has this skill that we think is required to join SSAC but if the skill is at the moment needed and fills a hole in the skills required.

So for example in the works that we have had with law enforcement and if you look at the new people that we have appointed you will see that one of the skills that we obviously were missing were experience or direct

experience from the law enforcement side if you look at where they were coming from.

Regarding your specific question regarding experience from application providers and developers and you took a couple of examples. We are thinking about how to explain in this process that we are working on in public because it's not the first time we got this question. But at the moment the whole process we are using is very much still in the flux. We are not just because we have not even had all three rotations since we started with this program.

So I think a year from now we can answer a little bit better how this system works and how for example you and other parts of ICANN can help us to insure that we still have the skills that we think is required to be able to do our job. So that was sort of the long explanation of where we are. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: And in the mean time if lots of folks contact us and say who do we talk to, can we send them to (Julie).

Patrick Falstrom: If it is the case that an individual wants to self nominate himself or herself of course or if it is the case of direct proposals then of course. (Julie) is our secretary staff and what she cannot keep track of, of course we have absolutely no way of keeping track of because she's so good in doing what she's doing just like the other staff we have. But of course it's possible to contact me or Jim as well. So it doesn't really matter what part that is.

Jim do you want to say some more about the membership now?

Marilyn Cade: Let me just take this moment to welcome Jim Galvin - the Vice Chair for joining us. And later when people ask questions, we'll make sure we say our name. I'm Marilyn Cade.

Patrick, back to the topic.

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you very much. Patrick Falstrom again.

I can also talk about the just like we mentioned - the structure that we have in SSAC because it differs a little bit between the SO and AC's. We have made the decision in SSAC to have a leadership team consisting of three people where I am the chair and keeping contact with the leadership of ICANN as a corporation, the CEO, et cetera.

We do have Jim Galvin - the Vice Chair - but is specifically explicitly the Chair of the Membership Committee. And then we have (Ron Moe) which is our Liaison to ICANN board. So that is the division of responsibilities between the three of us.

So with that, go to slide eight please.

So we have this report on dot less domains - slide 53 - that we published a long time ago. Next slide please.

And the background to do this is that there were lots of informal questions that SSAC members got both as part of their role in SSAC but also their role in outside of the ICANN that basically was if it is the case that I registered doc something, will I be able to use the label something alone in the URL like `httpcrawler//something` or as part of the right hand side of an email address like `user@something`. And as a follow-up, what happens if I do that?

There was a discussion that popper up in the ITS and a few other technical communities where people even inside the technical community sort of was guessing. Let me jump and say that.

So first of all what is important for the rest of this presentation is that we in SSAC call that kind of domain name that consists of a single label without a

dot - we call that a dot less domain just to make the terminology clear. Next slide please.

So just because we got all those questions and there was some kind of confusion, we decided to be ahead of the train and we felt that maybe we will get a question about this from ICANN board or from someone. We need to have an answer if it is the case that we get that question. So we decided to start to have a look at what, will this work, how does it work, et cetera.

So the findings - if we start from the back - is that there is a solution of dot less domain names that's used in user interfaces and applications and operating systems in the world is neither consistent nor universal. It differs depending on what web browser you are using on the same network on the same operating system. It varies depending on what local area network you're on with exactly the same equipment and software. It varies depending on what DNS stablesolver you're using which means depending on what ISP you're using.

And it varies depending on for example what email client and what email server you are using which means that just because your two cards are communicating, you have four clients and at least two clients and at least two servers communicating. It depends on the implementation and configuration of all of those. Next slide please.

And the reason for this is that it has been a very long standing assumption for everyone that is developing software that if it is the case that you end the user interface and find something that does not have any dots, it is assumed that it is within the organizations trust there in a very general sense. And that could lead to further problems both for sick children because you trust in some cases that we have found the operating system trusts the data that you are fetching given a domain name without any dots much, much more than things that deflect the influx.

They do believe there are software operating systems that place that connection in what is called the local security domain. Other things that can happen is of course you try to reach a dot less domain and in term what this actually sent as a DNS query is not example but instead for example like you've seen in your browsers the query for....example.com.

Or if you - for example I work for NetPro SC - if I type in example, my applications might query for example.netpro.sc. So if it was the case that the dot less domain was just past to DNS, it would absolutely work. The problem is that you have lots and lots of things that happens between the user interface where people enter the dot less domain and the actual DNS query. If it is a DNS query at all that is the end result of whatever the application is doing. Next slide.

The cause of these things which are outlined in the report and I encourage people that are interested - we came up with some recommendations. Just because dot less domains according to our findings will not be universally reachable, we in SSAC recommend strongly against their use. We also recommend that the use of the NS resource records which like A, Quad A, MX Record in the apex of a top level domain be contractually prohibited where appropriate and strongly discouraged in all cases. Next slide.

So that was the SSAC report. And now the question is what has happened since. So now I'm explaining what is happening in the ICANN community - not what we in SSAC are doing. The next thing that happened was that the ICANN board fosters a solution that requests ICANN staff to consult with the relevant communities regarding the implementation of site 53 and then provide a briefing paper detailing the technical policy and legal issues that may arise as a result of implementing the recommendations from SSAC lifting various options and per mitigating such issues.

So SSAC wrote the reports. ICANN board asked us to come back with the information on what the actual result would be to if those recommendations were implemented. Next slide please.

To be able to answer that question from the board, I can start open the public forum on August 24 where the requested community input on the SSAC recommendations. And it's really important to understand that this is not SSAC that asked for input. It's ICANN staff that asks for input to be able to respond to this question from ICANN board.

The comment period closed on September 23 but the reply period is still open and is so until November 5. So anyone that is interested in replying to any of those comments that I sent in can still do so. And of course the follow-up question is will you SSAC reply to any of those comments. And we are looking at the comments and we are still thinking about whether we should do that or not.

That's it. Questions?

(Ron Andruff): Thank you Patrick. (Ron Andruff).

I'm intrigued by the comment about the dot less domain and I wondered what does that mean to business. It sounds to me it's a little bit obscure. And I'm thinking it's about shortcuts for brands or large businesses that they may just use that or people might type that in because I'm not understanding the dot less domain concept. Could you help me with that please?

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you for your thoughts on that.

So one can talk about dot less domains as two different ways of innovation which are conflicting with each other. One might be that someone that has registered for example a top level domain that is example. Of course it might be in testing for example that brand owner of its sample to be able to receive

emails for that example and nothing else. So that might be sort of a big interest of having those kind of shortcuts or simply a way of contacting the organization.

(Ron Andruff): So would that be then info@example.example.

Patrick Falstrom: No. Infor@example.

(Ron Andruff): That's what I'm talking about. No, he's shortcutting it to then info@example.

Patrick Falstrom: Yes. We are talking about the cases where we do not have a dot at all in the domain name.

(Ron Andruff): Right. And that's to shortcut that?

Patrick Falstrom: Correct.

(Ron Andruff): That's very helpful. Thank you.

Patrick Falstrom: And what we've found is that that kind of innovation within the DNS. A different way of sort of explain what our report is talking about is conflicting with the innovation that is going on in the name space where people - if you for example go on and I use Safari on my Mac. I now have one field to type in both search terms for the search engine, keyword system and the domain name. And one way of Safari detecting which one of these I'm entering is whether it's a dot.

And so we already have innovation in the name space which is that user interface and application detects that oh, it's without a dot. Then I can do all kinds of other funky stuff and not be in S query. Okay, so that's why - so these two things are sort of conflicting.

But the other thing that is also important is this trust issue that we have found that's specifically in Microsoft Windows. If it is the case that you have something that you are addressing with just one token is within what Microsoft Windows calls the local trust domain. Those of you who know Windows, you can like reconfigure are you at home, are you local network, are you in a public space. And that means you might access a global resource but you will apply local trust to that global resource.

And on top of that, that global resource - because of the search costing with the DNS - you type in for example and it fetches for example. And when I'm on this network here at ICANN, let's see. Okay, I don't really see that. But anyway if I type in example it would look up examples of icann.org. Which means that is not even the resource I was after. And then on top of that applying local trust to that thing is the wrong thing that I'm fetching - it's that comminatory effect that makes us nervous in SSAC.

And let me just take the advantage of explaining how do we in SSAC make up our minds whether we think something should actually be written in an advisory. We are very much in favor of innovation. Let me start by saying that specifically in the business environment. And anyone should have the ability to making business decisions and trying to implement things that will not work, okay. They are just destroying for themselves. They are shooting themselves in their foot. You're welcome. That's part of innovation.

But if what they are doing has impact on a third party that is not part of this innovation, that is when we trigger. Thank you.

Man: Patrick, the traditional user has usually dispensed with the WWW in front of a domain name. I go to google.com and name servers there redirect WWW as their sub domain. So people are kind of getting used to in their browsers - not their email addresses - but in their browsers they're getting used to shortcutting. They're not really worrying about the WWW.

And when dot Google comes up in the new detailed round, somebody may well be thinking I could just type dot Google. Now that's not a dot less URL. It has dot Google, it just doesn't have anything through the second level domain. So when you looked at dot less, did you also think about where there is a dot but there is no second level domain as in I go into my browser and type dot Google. Does that fit into the same report which I need to read. I haven't read yet but I'm anxious to see that.

Patrick Falstrom: There are many people who ask those questions and I will try to fight myself to be short. One of the things that we look at is the dot or space alone in the beginning or the end of this domain name is sometimes cut off anyways. So whether you have a dot before or after - that's not going to hurt. The question is whether there's a dot inside the domain name which means that you have characters on both sides of the dot.

Man: Patrick, thank you. It's a fascinating subject actually and really I say to anybody I say that's not who doesn't have insomnia or has not read this report - it's certainly a good one to start with.

I was reading it actually on the way here and I noticed the recommendations are reasonably strong. Am I correct in was there an earlier version that didn't have such strong recommendations or divergence to mention that?

Patrick Falstrom: SSAC only releases one version of each document. So the answer is no.

Man: Thank you. And the second quick question was - I mean, if we could look it up - how many public comments were there and was there much meeting them?

Patrick Falstrom: I don't remember how many there are in the public comments at the moment but they are probably about 20 or something. And they are all over the place from SSAC, you were too mild in your recommendation. It should be absolutely prohibited, et cetera to SSAC, you are completely wrong. This is

not dangerous to do. So I think it's all over the place. So it will be - I'm feeling really sorry for staff that has to draw some confusion out of this. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just going to say before I go to (Lanre) that for BC members, if you're interested in reading one particular comment quickly to see what another large corporation has said, I might send you to the Microsoft comments. That would be a quick place for you to go. (Lanre)?

(Lanre): Thank you very much. It looks to me as the doctor said, the moon is quite variable. Okay, thank you.

I'm saying that it does look to me to be very desirable - especially if you go to otherinfo@icann or info.somethng@icann. And if you are good at it - if that's a variable and people will like it, I know I met a couple of challenges to attribute to that. Is it not possible to start working towards eliminating those challenges. For example the (unintelligible) have given some timeline by which they will start factoring the dot less domain into their programs.

I'm sure those challenges highlighted could be somewhat material if we put our mind on it. Is it something that you think we could work on and do you think someday we could launch a dot less domain?

Patrick Falstrom: You're absolutely right. And this is what I tried. You're expressing it differently than what I did - exactly the same thing. This has to do with user interfaces, applications and configurations. We don't talk about protocol standards. So if only to be able to work better than what we found in SSAC, we just had to upgrade for example Microsoft Windows on all machines on the planet that do Microsoft Windows.

It is possible. It is doable. It would probably take a while. So but it is an implementation issue, so you are absolutely correct.

Marilyn Cade: However I'm - it's Marilyn Cade. However I'm going to ask a question. Actually, I didn't think it looked desirable and I guess that's because I was struck so much by what I was seeing as some big risk factors and some huge distributed implementation challenges. So I wanted to go back and ask it's not consistent today and it's not universal. And I couldn't see how to get to consistency or universality from where I was looking at being a non technical person who just likes to read really well written reports. And that by the way was very well written.

So you can do a lot of things technically. I used to work at AT&T and the labs was marvelous. But I don't know that they can always be universally implemented.

Patrick Falstrom: If I don't - my comment now is not attached to this report specifically. But I think in the technical realm if you generalize any kind of innovation, it sort of calls to walk on the line. And the question is then what side of the line are you walking and are you taking too large steps?

So to some degree, stressing the system is one way of driving innovation. But this was a general comment. For the dot less domains - we in SSAC have done this calculation and we came to the conclusion that obviously if you look at the comments of other people come to other conclusions when they do the same kind of risk calculation, we came to the conclusion that dot less domains at the moment with today's deployed software is by far on the wrong side of the line.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to wrap this up and just commend to all of you that there are a couple of other SSAC members in the room. (Robert) thank you very much for joining us. (Robert Dineros) if you don't mind raising your hand. And I think behind me I sense (Liman Chapan) another SSAC member. And hi, welcome. So we're very pleased to have so many SSAC members joining us.

We're going to go to a topic that is near and dear to the business constituency's heart and that is Whois. You would be hard pressed to find a priority that is higher to us than - oh, we do? Fantastic. Can I actually - let me introduce a topic and then ask you to introduce the rest of the SSAC members. Let me just finish the topic.

Near and dear to our hear is Whois. And as evidence of that, the business constituency had three members who worked on the Whois review team and we're very fortunate to have two of them here.

We transcribe all of our meetings and I can tell you for sure that the third one (Lynn Guddendorf) although she's not online, she promised to be reading all of our reports. So Whois, is very important to us. You guys did an SSAC comment on the review team's final report. And maybe I'll ask you to make a few comments about what you think it said because I think maybe we're hearing some other interpretations or extrapolations that may be making us a little nervous. Thanks.

Jim Galvin:

In the interest of time - this is Jim Galvin - we'd just like to jump into responding to your things.

Although we do have a whole set of slides here and they've been distributed to you, rather than going through the slides I'd like to make three points, okay. So the first point is what SSAC did was step back and realize that there should be one step that should be done in front of the Whois review team recommendations. And that's the first part and the first recommendation that we provided which was to answer the question what is the purpose of recommendation data.

In fact if you just go forward a slide here or two - two slides I think - the next one. Yes. So what is the purpose of registration data?

I think that we have over the years built up an assumption of why we collect the data and this is not actually documented anywhere. There is no explicit statement of what the purpose of the data is and why it exists. And I think what we had decided and our assertion is if we can come to that conclusion and make that statement first, be clear about why we're trying to collect data. That will drive the answer to the question of what we need to collect. We now understand the purpose. Once we know what we're collecting, we can separately talk about access to that data and what you would do with it.

And the things you might do with it would be where you would store it, what kinds of escrow that you need for various kinds of transition activities. It would also help drive the policy interactions that need to happen to determine what kind of access is necessary. Once you know what you're collecting and the purpose of it, you can then talk about different applications of that data, different uses of it, different purposes. So you can have a separate discussion about access to it, why that access should occur and who should have it and who should authenticate them. And that's the set of questions really that are up there.

And our specific recommendation at this point in time given all of the various, you know, Whois discussions and Whois related things is the first thing that should happen going forward before any other registration data activity is engaged and executed is to answer that question what is the purpose of registration data.

The second point that I would make and you can now step forward two slides I think. The next one, okay.

So the other point that I would make is SSAC is actually very supportive of all of Whois review team recommendations. All we've done is comment a little bit on them and, you know, perhaps make a few suggestions for how they might be done a little bit differently. But we're otherwise quite supportive of all of the Whois review team recommendations.

The second activity that we did - so that's the second point. The third point is we divided up the recommendations into three priority levels - a high, medium and a low. Our basis for that distinction is to observe that we believe the high priority work items, high priority recommendations provide input and feed into the medium priority recommendations. And similarly the high and medium would feed into the low priority recommendations.

So an inference to take from that is we're not actually trying to prescribe when these activities should start and obvious interpretation which is not what we had intended is that you should only do the high ones and then do the medium ones and then do the low ones. And in fact that's not really our intent. We weren't trying to prescribe an ordering of execution.

It's more expressly about the closure of those work items - the completion of them. It's natural to assume that the high ones will probably start first. But you could reasonably start some of the medium ones in parallel with the high ones or immediately after them and similarly with the low activities. The essential point is you should not complete the mediums or lows until the high ones are done because they have input to the other priorities. And that's really what we were trying to express in the high medium versus low is the completion dates.

So three points - what is the purpose of the data? We divided them up into priorities and otherwise we're supportive of all of the recommendations, you know, subject to the comments that we made a little bit about different execution details about some of them.

Marilyn Cade: We have time for a couple of questions. I know we're running late but I want to recognize Bill and then I wanted to see if (Susan) had any comments after Bill. So be thinking about it. Bill?

Bill Smith: Bill Smith.

Jim Galvin: Hey Bill.

Bill Smith: So I actually wanted to say both to Patrick and Jim - thank you. I think your report and your comments on the report are excellent. I can't speak for the review team because the review team doesn't exist anymore. And even if it did I couldn't speak for the review team.

But my read of your comments is that, you know, where they differ perhaps from what we might have recommended - my analysis was if the SSAC report was implemented the community would get everything that the Whois review team had requested in one way or another, you know, to some standard of deviation, you know, but very small.

One other comment would be that I certainly believe that in the Whois review team's report where we said establish a policy - certainly from my perspective - we may not have been clear on this but any good policy will start with a purpose. And I absolutely agree that ICANN needs to determine why we are collecting this data, to what use it will be put forth, et cetera and that had ICANN done this a decade ago when it was first suggested by the article 29 working group that we would be much further along.

So it's an excellent recommendation. I think it's in line actually with what the Whois review team suggested and from my perspective I would like to be able to say that as a member of the review team, I support the SSAC comments 100%. I think they're absolutely in alignment with the review team's report. And I am encouraged actually by the new CEO's comments both very public ones, some private ones I've had in meeting with some of the new executives. And I think one of the things that I would do would be to encourage them to begin work on this, you know, on the purpose of Whois.

That would show, you know, and the community worked together on that. That would be a very nice fresh start for this community.

Man: Patrick, any response to that?

Patrick Falstrom: First of all thank you very much Bill and thank you for all the discussions that we have had during the lifetime of the Whois review team. Let me stand that to everyone in the Whois review team but also the last couple of days.

I think ICANN as well put the cards on the table here that of course there have been reactions on SSAC's recommendation that it will delay implementation of the Whois review team document. We are in SSAC. We are participating in real discussions. Our view is still that yes, potentially short term it might be a delay before you actually start. But to be able to really resolve all the issues, we do believe that you cannot do things in parallel but you have to do it sequentially.

Now exactly how to do that implementation so that we don't get unnecessary delay is something that we are - just so everyone knows - that we are part of that discussion and also with other individuals.

And the next thing I would like to say is that from our perspective - from SSAC - Whois discussion have been going on for more than ten years. And we are talking about something that should be implemented first. When we are talking about something that could be done during 90 days or something. So we're talking about maybe a 90 day delay or something that we have been dealing with for ten years.

Man: That's great. Then you can move onto peace in the Middle East when you're finished with that.

Susan, Marilyn asked whether you wanted to add anything.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I'm Susan Kawaguchi for the record. But so the title of your report - Blind Man and Elephant - was very interesting because there were many

times in our Whois review team's review of Whois that that's what we felt. We were blind because like where is the policy. Oh, it's here. It's partly there, you know. And I must thank Bill for really harping on that early on - where's the policy.

And but that's what we were tasked with. We were tasked with reviewing the Whois as it is now. We weren't tasked with let's come up with a new plan for Whois. And there's a lot that I agree with in your report but that was outside of our scope. And then we argued stringently to stay within the scope of the AOC.

So having been part of this Whois discussion for a lot of years and who, you know, I've worked with companies that struggle with inaccuracy in the Whois and the records not always being available. I am really hesitant to have anything out there that would delay even 90 days in developing a new Whois protocol.

It is what it is unfortunately. And if we could implement our recommendations now and move forward in that discussion, I'm all for that and supportive. But to not make some movement at all because maybe what we do need to do as a community is to blow up the Whois and start over. Maybe that's what we need to do. But that was not the Whois review team's mandate. And we did our job. It would be really hard to find that all of these recommendations were now derailed.

Jim Galvin: So, let me say thank you. This is Jim Galvin again speaking. And we recognized fully - we recognized fully at the time that the Whois review team did exactly what they were tasked to do and certainly have no issues with any of that.

One might say that, you know, SSAC has the privilege if you will of providing advice where it thinks it's appropriate to do that and we're not scoped in that way. So it was an opportunity for us to insert this in front of the discussion -

the need for answering the question what is the purpose. So we used the opportunity and we did that.

I think with respect to the timing I'll just acknowledge that, you know, I heard you. I understand what you're saying. I mean, there's always a rush and an urgency with the Whois stuff. I mean we've been rushing and urgently trying to get multiple things done over the years. You know, we kind of are where we are. So in some ways maybe us proposing to answer the question what is the purpose - one could interpret that as a blowup if you will. Sort of the nuclear option. It's time for a reset.

I'm not opposed to that characterization. I think that SSAC would say that that's certainly one way to interpret what we put out there and that's okay. But we do feel strongly that the purpose has to be answered. It really should happen first. And, you know, we're both reasonable people and we have a view about that. And, you know, what ICANN is going to do with that is going to be interesting. So, we'll see. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I am going to wrap this up but I am going to conclude with this. This will be our response to this. It will probably take us a little more thinking. But I just don't lose sight of my opening comments about how near and dear Whois, is to our hearts for a number of reasons that don't need to be restated.

Patrick, could I just ask you to recognize the rest of the SSAC numbers who are here and then we'd like to thank you.

Patrick Falstrom: Yes. So we have in the back there (Mark Cultures) (Paul Ricksy) and I don't know whether you pointed on (Manny Kincado) (David Conrad) (Robert Guerra) (Yapakan House) (Rick Williams) myself, Jim Galvin. Is that all? And (Liamon Escaze). And (Liamon Champagne).

Marilyn Cade: And you could recognize (Julie Headlind) as well.

Let us thank you for coming but let me just say to those of you who are new to this - the SSAC is a tremendous resource to ICANN and to all of us. And for some of you who aren't that deeply technical, you may have deeply technical people in your company who actually would be thrilled to know about the skill set and the expertise that the SSAC brings to ICANN. And we may even have to start thinking about a few tough questions to lob their way.

So thank you so much for joining us.

And I should say thanks to all of you SSAC members who work on those great reports.

I'm going to ask our next two speakers to join us - Jeff Moss and Patrick Jones who I think are in the back of the room and I'll ask them to come and join us here. This has become something of a tradition for the business constituency because the first meeting that Jeff attended - he made the mistake of letting himself be introduced to me by Patrick. And I think we were the first constituency that said come along and tell us what you're going to do and then tell us how we can help.

And so we've certainly made it a part of the tradition of our meetings at the ICANN meetings. And for those of you who don't have a copy of the business constituency newsletter, Chris will share a copy with you. It's also on the website. For the first time we have featured an article in our newsletter about why (Ethezar) is important to the BC and then an article by - it's just a short introduction there that I wrote. But the article is written by Patrick and has some great information in it.

We've also managed to convince them to do even more with us to update an article between now and February so we can have it translated in Chinese. And we'll have an article and a newsletter on our website in Chinese before we go to Beijing. So let me turn this over to Patrick and to Jeff.

Patrick Jones: First off, thank you Marilyn very much and thank the BC for the opportunity to have a section about ICANN's goal and remittent activities and (Ethezar). I think it turned out very nicely. I really appreciate that platform to share our message with the business community. And as much as we can be helpful, I know it's helpful for you to, you know, have our message in there for business because security is so important to businesses. So I really appreciate that.

I'll turn it over to Jeff.

Jeff Moss: I was going to say that the two comments that you provided on the SSR are key and really useful. It's funny how difficult sometimes it is to get well reasoned feedback from the different groups. And so we were appreciative of your taking the time to provide us feedback.

So we don't have too much of a set agenda. We wanted to try to have more of a conversation since we just briefly seen the BC in Washington, DC. So we assume you're fairly up to speed but we did want to talk about a couple of things happening right now.

One is we expect on Thursday for the board to vote to accept the 28 recommendations from the SSR RT team. And so we expect that the mail direct staffing will have to start implementing those right away. Two or three of those we actually haven't completed. They're underway and they'll be completed soon. But those are efforts that we had already started prior to the recommendations. We kind of knew where the recommendations were going or they were things we were already doing.

One of them - recommendation number four - is another great opportunity for the BC to comment on. And this is something that we're going to go around knocking on everybody's door. Number four of the SSR says - from the 28 recommendations - ICANN should document and clearly define the nature of the SSR relationships it has within the ICANN community in order to provide

a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between organizations.

And so you'll notice there's sort of a theme here of trying to get clarity around what does it mean for ICANN to be the global coordinator, you know, what does it mean to coordinate. That would really help me in my job. But along the way we're asking these other questions. What are the different bodies involved. So that would be fantastic if you could provide feedback. Do you want to say anything?

Patrick Jones: So that was the message that we shared with the GAC this morning and they were very receptive to that. I think from their perspective there was a lot of discussion around understanding rules and responsibilities in other areas outside of just traditional SSR. And having clarity and input from the community would be very helpful in those other areas.

Now this also presents somewhat of a challenge because - and I mentioned this in Washington - how do we engage with the business communities and those who may be part of a business community but don't participate very actively in the business constituency in a way that's outside continuing to ask for public comment. So how do we move this call for input into more regular operations or just regular engagement with the business community and just add something that would be useful for the constituency to provide some ideas and guidance.

Marilyn Cade: So Patrick, one thing that's happening as a result of the grand awakening of the march of the grand's is that more companies are - rather than just staying home and being worried - they've been able to convince their management that they need to show up. And I'm serious about that. It's been very hard for a number of companies to get management to pay for them to come to a weeklong ICANN meeting.

But the good news is that once they come, if they find meaningful work then they're able to justify. And SSR to me is much more effective for some companies. And I will use names like Amex and Visa again and Travelers, you know. And the outside attorney for A&A for instance, the majority of her clients as you know - and I'll just mention this because I hope some of you Patrick, I'm looking at you and Bill - I hope some of you will want to get involved. The outside attorney's primary clients are the CSO's in the major 400 corporations that are members of A&A.

They're not the trademark side of the business. And so I'm just going to mention something that came out of the meeting we held in Washington that Patrick and (Margie Millins) spoke at. We came away from that meeting with an agreement to collaborate with Patrick and with Jeff and with others to put together a session with the CSO's of some of the companies. And I am particularly hoping that AT&T and Verizon and PayPal and Facebook and Google and others - I know Angie, you and I have spoken - will want to work on that event.

It will be an event focused for them on security topics. So even though the intent from the business constituency perspective is to talk with them about coming and participating in ICANN, the topic needs to be our focus on SSR. And we're going to really need to turn to you guys to help drive that. And I think that's another way through groups like that. That's another way for us to try and reach into audiences who need to be aware that they should be listening and responding - even if they don't become involved in ICANN.

Man: So yesterday we did a expert's panel on DNS security. And I don't know how many of you in the room were able to catch some of that. I know it conflicted with the intact meeting and a variety of other things that were happening at the same time but I was really happy with the way it turned out. And it was a way to have a discussion about ICANN's role in security but also just security in DNS in general in an interactive way. In a way that was no presentations, short speeches. It was more question and answer directly with the audience.

And we had good feedback on that. We're going to repeat it in Beijing. But that wasn't something where if there's some of the members of the constituency who would be useful and (Jeff Rudeman) we were really happy because of his involvement with the SSR review team was able to be a part of that. But we'll be reaching out again for experts to be a part of that group and for ways to improve that conversation.

Marilyn Cade: So one hot tip I will start us all out with before I take a brief pause for an announcement is gee, we got to stop using the term DNS when we talk to business people. Most of them go what? And then they think too technical for me. So one of the things we're going to have to do is also think about how we better package, you know, customize our communication when we go into the more commercial oriented.

It may be okay when we're bringing people into ICANN to refer to it but I think that's the other thing that we're going to be thinking about is how do we decode this. I'm going to take this topic further but first of all I need to pause because I think Aisha wanted to make an announcement.

Aisha Hassan: Thank you Marilyn.

We just wanted to recognize a board member who's going to be completing his term. All of you must know (Ron Rausch). He has come from our community - from the business community. And we have been very pleased to have you serving on the board. You've made some very important contributions to the board and to ICANN since 2006 and we thank you for all of the time and energy and devotion that you've shown to a variety of topics from compensation and finance to many, many others. So just on behalf of the global business community, we wanted to thank you, recognize your contributions and wish you well.

Man: Thank you. Thank you all for the support I've had. And it's been six years. I've seen some changes to our Chairman, to our CEO. I'm partially responsible for two of the CEO's coming on board so blame for some and credit for some.

I must say that what many of us in business think is one on one was not there in many of the outpatients in ICANN. It's definitely changed a lot. A simple thing like getting a dashboard in finance was a big deal. So simple things. And it got more transparency -- an accountability. So I'm happy to contribute. And thanks a lot again for your support.

I'm hoping that with the fleet of time I can improve my handicap in golf. So, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: You will all have a chance - members of the BC will be joining the board for a special event this evening. So you'll have a chance to wish him even a more personal word of appreciation. Thank you for coming and joining us. And Aisha, thank you so much for arranging that.

Now we're going to go back to SSR. The newsletter in the introduction to the article has a couple of quotes from us that comes from our comments. And what it basically says is that ICANN has to be attentive. I'm not reading it but it has to be attentive and aware of the decisions it makes and implements at the core and in what it does and the unique identifiers can engineer risk into or out of the rest of the internet. And the people who build and run the internet are business entities.

And I am not talking about the contracted parties. I am talking about the business entity - not to exclude the importance of the contracted parties. So we do call on ICANN to be actively engaged with other parties and other organizations that are in the space. And I know that is something in the past that ICANN has been - prior to you joining us Jeff - I think ICANN was a little allergic to.

And certainly there are, you know, I've been in this particular community - all 15.7 months of its preexistence and existence. And it's been a challenge to get some in the technical silo organizations to figure out how to interact with each other. But I'm seeing a lot of progress and a lot of openness. One of the big things that is mentioned there is the big long list of training initiatives.

And I wondered if you might talk a little bit more about your vision of what you think is needed in terms of interaction and outreach with other groups.

Man: So I think going back to the dawn of time - remember that historical behavior. I think the way the security team speak about our group is you participate in a lot of capacity building. A lot meaning a lot compared to the size of our group of four or five people. And it was never anything that we promote publicly. It's just something that we do. And in the last couple of years as there's been more attention on ICANN and more attention on security and stability of the internet, we're starting to get more eyelevel business or government attention.

And I think they're always amazed to hear that we do capacity building or we do training or we work with Interpol or the OECD or we work for - and they think that's great. Wow you're helping out the CCTD operators DNS find their zones. They wouldn't have those expertise but ICANN will come in, provide DNS sect training, DNS operations, best practices. That's really good so why don't you promote that more.

It's like we're not trying to fly the flag and, you know, do an advertisement on our TV. But there's sort of a growing awareness that there needs to be some sort of - we need to make that information available somehow so people realize that some of the money coming into the security team is used for these operations and it's just not going into a black hole.

And so that's why I think this is one of the efforts that we're trying to communicate with the different constituencies. And these are all the different

kind of training and outreach activities that we do and we have done for years. We just haven't been very good at explaining it to other groups. So partly that's been less important to sell the work that we're doing than to see the results.

And many of the CCTLD operators and the regional TLD organizations for them - they're not as interested in seeing ICANN, you know, right. But for us it's important that the GAC members see that and other members of the community who may be more questioning of what ICANN's doing in the broader sphere and see that there is good work happening and that we're doing good things and that it's helping to contribute to making the internet stronger for everyone.

So if there's ways to partner with business, partner with either this constituency or others with events that are happening, we only tend to go and do training where we're asked. So primarily that's been, you know, in the Caribbean with Carob Knob with the Caribbean telecommunications union. Now more with organization of American states with AP Nick, APRA Nick and other groups like that. But if there are events where you're having something, it may be useful to have that ICANN security meeting.

Or other events where there's a little more event planning. Things like that where we can do the training or education awareness and, you know, continue to do the things that we do for those communities but take it further.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Maybe Patrick and Bill and Susan did you - yes.

Patrick Ryan: Thank you. Hi, Patrick Ryan with Google.

We're seeing obviously a lot of opportunities for governmental and intergovernmental organizations to fill what is a perceived void. There is to some extent a void but the perception of the void is much larger than it is. And the work that you guys are doing here is tremendous. And Patrick I

mentioned to you privately that the presentation that you did at the Caribbean telecommunication union was extremely well received. I was there in the audience and heard the comments from people. And that type of outreach is extremely powerful.

I think the trick is going to be to, you know, help identify ways to scale that type of, you know, that type of work. So maybe recording videos is one way but just presenting a little bit more and having a more concrete outreach plan on that is really crucial and it's very urgent as well - particularly as we sort of approach, you know, the treaty conference over the course of the next couple of months. We really need those stories to tell.

And so thank you for all your efforts there and I think there's opportunities for further collaboration in the short term on that.

Man: I would say I like those comments and it would be great if you mention them also to some of our new leadership because they're in the midst - leadership's in the midst of devising the international strategy and the outreach strategy which will be a more engagement than what you've historically seen.

And so if you say what the security team is doing is good or that please, now's the time to do it. Three months from now is maybe not the time to do it.

Man: Thank you for that. I'll be sure to do that.

Bill Smith: Bill Smith, PayPal.

So I heard something at the very beginning. I think I heard. I may have misheard it. Jeff said that the SSR I believe that the SSR report was sent to the board to take action and that they were expecting action to be taken.

Man: We're expecting them to vote this Thursday to accept the recommendations.

Bill Smith: So my question is and you don't need to answer right away because I have another comment. But my question is how can that happen given that it's taken six months to get the Whois review team's report to that state? So that's - you can just - that was it. And then the second comment is more of - it's a comment and a request to Patrick and that is one of the issues at the upcoming wicket will be cyber security. And there are nation states that want to put in language about cyber security for a variety of reasons. I won't go into them now.

I can tell you that PayPal objects to all of them. We want none of them in there. And what we need are reasons why the current mechanisms that we have actually work. So to the extent that ICANN is part of a solution, it would be very helpful to have, from ICANN, here's what we do, all right.

At least in my back pockets of other - or nation states back pockets, to say when someone says, "But it's a mess. Nothing is being done," we can say, "Well, actually this is and this is and this is." Or if there's - a state says, "But ICANN isn't doing or the IPF or whoever," we need that information. So we need you to do a little sales job for us, right.

Give us a one, two page brochure that says here's what we do. Here's what we have done recently. And we don't have to post it on a Web site. In fact, it's better if we don't. But we need that information. We need to know what's real.

Man: So I have that for you. It's right here. Because you're not the only ones asking. And so - and we also have a slightly longer version which lists all the (unintelligible) and all the training that we've done. And unfortunately, I've made notes on this one but I've got another. I'll be happy to email it to (Maryland) and everyone and this document was built to specifically address the concerns you have.

Man: That's perfect. We can then send it to - well, and normally it would be delegations. Let's put it that way - so they will have it, right.

Man: So one of the things that we did right before this meeting was update the security team's page to provide this kind of information in a more - in a better way. But the next thing we'll do is actually send it out in either a short - a two-page document that shows exactly what you've been asking for.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan (Kawaguchi) from Facebook. So this is a hard sale for a business to send people two to three times a year to meetings I usually attend to. And - but I'm in the legal department and when I attend the GNS abuse forums and those, I get part of what's going on but I'm not technical.

I manage the domain names for Facebook, get part of the DNS, that's - but nobody lets me touch servers. So - but I'm always going back to the security guys I work with. I mean, my job, you know, goes into several departments that Facebook obviously - besides marketing and (biz net).

I'm always telling the security guys, "You've got to get involved." And they're like, "Okay, what?" And I'm like, "I don't know." But I know we need to be there. We need to be there and representative of the company. And I can handle the BC issues but definitely not the technical issues. So I need your help in helping me recruit from within our company.

I mean, occasionally, you know, someone will contact me and say, "Hey, can somebody from your company be on a panel," but that's not enough incentive to have somebody fly halfway around the world. And luckily the Facebook resources aren't hard to come by right now. So - but it is also a small growing company that, you know, so they have to have a good reason.

And occasionally someone will show up from our security team or from our more technical, but you guys - I mean, I don't know what that is. I don't know what I'm asking really, but I need help in recruiting.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: (Joe Sullivan), yes.

Marilyn Cade: Jeff, you know, I'm just going to say that within many of the companies there are those people and I happen to still know many of them from a previous large company that I might've encountered someplace. And I know that they would love to participate in a session that was designed around the kinds of problems that they are dealing with.

And maybe we ought to put not only our (CCSO) project but also think about something that would be specifically designed for - I think, (Scott), you interact with many of these guys as well. Because I think they could only help inside a big company when there're two or three reasons to be following and participating in ICANN.

Man: Oh, a suggestion. And that if for ICANN to go to the community. The security people meet in places, right. If you want to try and sell them to come to these meetings, you need to go there. And, you know, not just once but probably a few times as an outreach and then you probably get, you know, some people start coming. I still have my question about how is it that SSR is going to be a decision in days when it's taking months for us but that's (okay).

Man: And nobody can argue about wanting more stability, security or resiliency. Sorry.

Man: Act- well, actually I would then - I can't be here Thursday. I would like someone to ask the - it's a process question. We were told our report had to go to the board and then the board had to send it out, so...

Marilyn Cade: Susan, I think you colleague has just des- delegates something to you.

Man: Yes. I apolo- I - but it is important. I mean, we're waiting six months to get a response from the board.

Man: I have a comment for an idea. One of the things that also the security team does is we try to build awareness around DNS (sec) adoption deployment and find out from companies, you know, why are they deploying or why are they not deploying and then help try to find the documentation of the experts to support that.

And so maybe one of the ideas is we would get some of the larger companies that have contemplated DNS (sec) deployment and get your experts here to talk about why are they deploying, what have they learned, you know, why aren't they doing it? And then they'd be surrounded by other DNS type experts and then they might see, okay, there's a venue here for that.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Bill, you get the final word.

Bill Smith: Quickly on that one, the people inside our organization that implement it really don't have a lot of desire to come to explain it. I have to do that and I'm not an expert on it so I have to go to them, ask them stuff and I attempt to do it. And then I get more requests for more detail because I don't know the answers. But they really don't have an interest in - and I don't know why. I wished they did, but just a commentary.

Marilyn Cade: So I'm going to wrap up here. I just want to thank Patrick and Jeff again and mention something that on the - some of the upcoming SSR training as shown in our newsletter, we'll start sort of trying to keep track of what's going on in that space but also Jeff mentioned, Patrick mentioned that they will be at the IGF and they are also in a number of other places where business may also be able to encounter them.

So we will look forward to working with you between now and China and we'll be looking forward to you and working on the preparation of our (CCSO)

event and these other follow up items and thank you again. Patrick, final word.

Patrick Ryan:: So a bit of a plug. We've added a stream to the calendar in My ICANN, that's SSR events. And so that would be a very easy way to see what's coming up and if there's an event where we should be, let us know. We'll add it to that. But check out My ICANN for the latest on security.

Marilyn Cade: I think we have our next speaker already here and I sense this since I think she's behind me or maybe somebody told me. (Debbie). So it's going to be a little scary for me to tell these stories about - and when I do all the introductions because that convinces everyone of just how old I am.

But years and years and years ago, and I don't think (Debbie) even knows this - when I worked for AT&T Computer Systems, my claim to fame, literally, was an innovative project that AT&T labs did with the American Red Cross on the organ and body parts harvesting having to do with very, very vital elements of donated bones, et cetera that help you or members of your family in medical treatment.

And it was a very interesting opportunity for me and I got to spend 14 months in this special project including being detailed to the Red Cross for six months full time. So I have a very special place in my heart for the philanthropic work that the Red Cross does.

And I think we - I wanted (Debbie) and her colleagues to come and talk a little bit about the unique aspect of being an identity that is, on the one hand, a brand, but is actually a philanthropic identity that people around the world trust, that our (needs) change their behavior over when they see someone being helped by the - in a vehicle or people wearing the Red Cross emblem.

And I thought it would be helpful to us as we're trying to find ways to communicate more effectively with the board and the governments about the

purpose of why we're all trying to bring the different RPM mechanisms. And (Debbie) over to you.

(Debbie): Thank you so much Marilyn and thank you to the BC for this opportunity. I think I would be remiss if I didn't say on behalf of the American Red Cross and my fellow colleagues around the world, thank you for the way that your corporations and businesses partner with the movement and we certainly could not do the good work that we do and continue to do without the strong relationships we have with the business community as we execute our mission. So did want to start by saying that.

It's my pleasure to introduce to their first ICANN meeting, my colleagues. To my immediate left is (Christopher Rossi). He is with the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Cross Society. And you all may have remembered meeting (Christoff Lenore) at the Costa Rica and Prague meeting.

(Christopher) is (Cristoff)'s replacement. (Christoff) has moved on to other things and we're pleased to have (Christopher) in that role and he will be speaking on behalf of the Red Cross and Red Cross Society this afternoon.

I also wanted to introduce my colleague, (Katherine Bebin) from the Canadian Red Cross, so just wanted to acknowledge them and if you could please welcome them and if you see them walking around, extend a warm ICANN welcome because it is their first ICANN meeting. So without further ado, (Christopher).

(Christopher Rossi): Thank you (Debbie) and thank you very much for inviting us here today. it is my first ICANN meeting. I joined the Federation on October 1st. I'm not new, though, to the work of the Red Cross and Red Cross and movement. I've been affiliated with different organizations for several years. I am coming to the Red Cross, Red Cross and Movement from a very difficult, I think, area of the law.

I worked for international criminal tribunals for many years, both (unintelligible) along the tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. And there I dealt with many difficult legal issues. I find the issues surrounding the protection of the Red Cross, Red Cross and Emblem and names and designations to be quite simple compared to that because to me, the protections are, well, of paramount importance but also firmly embedded, firmly established in international law and also in domestic laws of all the countries that we represent here.

So it seems like for me it's - and I think for my colleagues, it's a very - an easy issue for us but we, at the same time, we understand nuances that are here, that are obviously apparent and we're happy to answer any questions. Instead of going over all our positions that you can see in our public comments that we posted in response to the drafting team recommendations, we're happy to answer any questions, offer any clarifications and further (in so) of these comments and further into the drafting team recommendations and our policy papers and - that have been - that are on the record.

And first of all, I'd like to open it up first to questions. I think we'd be very happy to answer any and offer any clarifications.

Marilyn Cade: Well, I'm going to ask - I'm going to surprise John. John, I'm going to surprise John by asking I think you and (Lanry) are the two counselors that are here and, of course, there is the discussion that is going on on the GNSO council that maybe I might ask you - for some of you, you should - let me introduce you John Berard who's the BC counselor.

And John's background includes a good stint at (Hilantoin) and a real expertise in communications. And I was just going to put him on the spot by saying, so I came up with this clever title without consulting with (Debbie), but I am sort of wondering, really, if part of the problem we have faced in getting

an understanding about why the Red Cross and Red Crescent identities must be protected.

It's that people do not understand that in war torn areas and in times of natural and manmade disaster, it is that identity which is respected by, you know, it gets people safely through and retrieved and rescued from medical emergencies. And I guess I - you know, it's kind of, to me it's an identity that I just thought that somehow we would be able to find a way to respect.

But our rules that ICANN seems to have bound us in some different, you know, failure to recognize the public interest aspect of this. So I'm really putting you on the spot to say, you know, has part of this been a communications problem from the beginning inside our community, the ICANN community? I'm not talking about you guys.

John Berard: Hi, this is John Berard, one of the two GNSO counselors from the BC. It's hard to - I can't really - it looks like a star chamber up there so I apologize. I don't know. But the GNSO council agenda for tomorrow does have two items on it with regard to protecting the Red Cross Red Crescent.

And each of them, they're in alignment. They're moving as quickly as the policy development process can move to certify and code the instinct that the board had to make sure that the names were protected. There's no one who sees any other outcome in that regard.

So yes, they - the Red Cross, in my case being from the United States, the Red Cross and Red Crescent, on a global basis, is clearly one of the most recognizable marks, not just in terms of this visual presentation but also it's the meaning behind that visual. So I think you can - I mean, it's never till it's over - to quote the (sage) Yogi Berra. But I would be hard pressed to think that the protections that you're looking for will not be forthcoming.

Marilyn Cade: And so will you say that last sentence again. I just want to hear it again.

John Berard: I would say that the protections you are looking for will certainly be forthcoming, perhaps not at the pace that you would like, but you know, we don't really operate at human pace. We operate at ICANN pace. In terms of key words and phrases, (Maryland) is absolutely right. In most cases, key words and phrases are important but in terms of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, the meanings are quite clear and well understood already. And so I don't think we need to be changing any of that. We just need to get on with the business of protecting the mark.

Man: I'd like to thank (Debbie) and her team for the continuous education of the community about general rules of the RCRC. I'm a member of the (drafted) team and my organization is that at the beginning there was some kind of resistance to additional protection, especially on the (unintelligible) groups within the drafting team.

But with continuous education, people are beginning to see the needs to protect - to give those additional protections. Now the issue that I can see is locking the RCRC with some of the organizations to be specific with the (IOC) so people see a need for protecting the RCRC but not the IOC.

And (unintelligible) to that, is you (IG also KP). The (IG) is also asking for the same protection, so again, that also added some additional complexity to it. But my personal observation is that each (unintelligible) for the RCRC and I want to believe that that is not of (unintelligible), it is not of the continuous education. We're different from them, something like the presentation they just did.

And I want to encourage them to continue doing that so that people see the need to give this additional protection. And like John said, these are beginning to (comply) and the protection seems to be on the way, though at some point, the (adjustments in) almost completed or on giving that protection and the board (unintelligible).

Now the board seems to be the one (dragging) it again so with the board being (unintelligible) and the drafting team is - the opinion of the board and the drafting team seems to be converging so I also want to share John's view that the protection is on its way. Thank you.

Man: Hi (Debbie). It's (Unintelligible) (Bianco). I was relieved - all of us were relieved - to see that at least one of the new (apps) voluntarily said (donuts) and said they will not allow registration of Red Cross or (Olympics) in any of their TLDs that they should win.

And then we heard the GAC on Sunday discuss potentially a temporary moratorium on that and even more names while ICANN goes through a PDP to determine second level protections. Given this is so close with you, we were hoping you could give us any update or insights or predictions on what's likely to happen with that moratorium because I know on council tomorrow, John will be leading our effort to try and move ahead with the PDP and we're pretty confident that it will get approved. But what about this moratorium? Is that likely to happen?

(Debbie): And unfortunately I have no further insight. I wish I had more to say. What I can say is that from our perspective, we'd rather have the name protected now. With the anticipation that the ICANN community makes the decision to do a policy development process, we don't think that that's needed for these names.

They're very, very distinct as we explained in - that he explained so eloquently as well. The names have nothing to do primarily as an identifier for any organization or - it's about being a symbol that's a call to action when you see it and we're hoping that people understand that you need to state it but then warrant us spending resources within the ICANN community to come up with the end that we all think we need.

But we understand the process. We don't necessarily agree with it. And I wish I had more insight on the moratorium perspective but we just want to make sure - and I'll let (Chris) speak a little bit since he's the IHL expert on the specific unique status of those names because we're not talking about a name that is used to solely identify an organization. It's a word that means something. So (Chris), do you want to...

(Chris): You said it eloquently, (Debbie), for them. We don't see it, as (Debbie) said, it's not that for protection just one or two or three organizations that are here. And we're not trying to undercut or undermine any efforts by any of these IGOs that are all trying to seek - serve protections.

To us, this is, it's more than a brand. It's a movement and it's - I mean, it's a legal obligation which is why we don't see it as a policy issue. It's really a legal obligation and we believe - well, GAC obviously sees it that way too. You know, countries around the world are very supportive of this legal obligation because it's - they've instituted it in their national legislation.

They've signed on to this as one of the most widespread and most respected international legal documents, legal instruments in the world and at the (Geneva conventions). So we - it's a legal obligation and therefore, we don't believe it's a policy- it needs to go through the policy process for that reason. However, we'll participate and we'll stay and we'll stay the course and we'll seemly working through the process to make sure that the ultimate result is protection which allows many, many different people around the world to do their job and to enforce the protections.

Marilyn Cade: Bill has a question and then I have a question for (Debbie). Bill.

Bill Smith: Okay, I'll form it in the form of a question. That's okay. What does Red Cross Red Crescent feel about use of its mark at the third level or the fourth level? And are there things that you would expect ICANN to do to protect it at those levels? And I agree that the name should be protected, okay. I have no

question about that in my mind. But we are seeing abuse of marks at levels well beyond the second level now. So that's just a thing for you to think about but also what would you expect, because at the third level it's out of ICANN's hands.

(Debbie): Right, and I mean, we understand what ICANN has - you know, what it doesn't have a remit to do. I think the important thing that we wanted to share with this group is that, again, these names are more than just an identifier for an organization.

They happen to identify organizations but like, you know, the name of an IGO would recognize that IGO. But the reason the request is so stringent and so urgent is because they're facing a very, very specific, very, very strongly ratified set of rules that were signed on by 190 countries.

And so we're, you know, talking about what's the scope of our request? What's the scope of the government's request? Because they have the ultimate responsibility to protect these (decimations). They did exactly what they should do by going to the board and asking for GAC advice and its assistance and we believe they have the ultimate responsibility.

Individual organizations within each country that were signatories obviously have a responsibility to enforce in their jurisdictions what we are mandated to do but certainly the movement isn't trying to ask ICANN to do anything that's outside of its remit.

And those of us who know domain names and understand its (face), we're not seeking that which is outside of their remit. But we would all recognize that ICANN is - has signed up through its articles of incorporations to follow international (unintelligible). And because of that, that's the ask that the government's making and we certainly support the government's request.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to ask (Debbie) a softball question. But I had to write it out. So (Debbie), Marilyn Cade, obviously closed TLDs are not a concern for you. But are you worried about all open gTLDs?

(Debbie): I mean, listen, again, the Geneva Conventions are really clear. I mean, if you have - if you're a company that's operating a closed TLD where you're not offering domain names to the public. And let's have a conver- I mean, we're reasonable people here. Okay, we're not talking about our domain names that are going to be open to the public that may be offered for sale to the public that are going to be used in a public way, right, to conduct all sorts of things - everything from commerce to information.

The Geneva Conventions didn't allow for improvisation. I guess that was a conversation we were having with somebody else because of the purpose for the name. It was a very strict set of rules. It doesn't allow for a lot of flexibility in how they're used because they're supposed to be important, right?

They're supposed to be reserved to act as a symbol. It has nothing to do with any particular country or national society. Those words mean something separate and apart from any of us here at the table. It's about when there's a conflict, when there's a need, those words meaning something. And the reason the request is so important and so yes, all open TLDs would be an issue because the Geneva Convention said you're supposed to protect the name at all times.

Marilyn Cade: ...(wrapping), please.

Man: How does the Red Cross Red Crescent plan to deal with the fact that there are - there's at least one brand name that, Red Cross, that I believe, if I'm not mistaken, I think Johnson & Johnson is able to use the term Red Cross. And if so, do the Geneva Conventions really disallow that as well but there's been an exception made? Or how does that work?

(Debbie): Yes, let me explain to you. So the concept you're talking about are grandfathered users. So in - so the Geneva Conventions are very clear (et al), right. And then they instructed - I'm just dumbing down IHL law here a little bit - they instructed each country that signs on the Geneva Convention to establish a Red Cross or Red Crescent or Red (Crystal) Society in their country through legislation or enactment of some sort.

When each country did that, they established perhaps criminal law. So, for example, the United States, they issued two statutes that made it a criminal act to use the word in the United States. They also recognized that there may have been people who were using those terms for specific things prior to the enactment of the section.

So in 1905, for example, Johnson & Johnson was using the word for plasters, for example, which is a common word for a band aid, okay. When the statute was enacted, what the U.S. government decided, it didn't want to make the continual use of the term for band aids or plasters a criminal act. So they grandfathered them in and said, "You can continue to use that term for that (process) only."

It doesn't allow them to expand their use into any uses that were not in existence and not being used prior to the enactment of the statute. So they had a limited right to not be considered in violation of a criminal statute. Their rights don't trump that of the movement. Their rights are not allowed to be expanded into other goods or services.

So they don't have a coexisting right. What they have is a right that's not unlawful because of the enactment of the statute. So the rights to use the terms in the United States are to the Red Cross and the statute recognizes that in 1905 or before, there was a use that existed. That use is not unlawful but it does not allow any organization that's a grandfathered user to expand into new uses which would be becoming a domain name registry or using the domain name for advertising services on the Internet or any of the other

goods or services in talking to my corporate friends now who are trademark professionals - doesn't allow them to expand their use into goods or services that they weren't using before.

It just makes their existing use not a crime. And I'm sorry, we also addressed that we published a comment - the American Red Cross published a comment when we addressed this issue and we'll be happy to follow up with anybody.

Marilyn Cade: Well, I want to thank (Debbie) and her colleagues for coming and joining us. But I'd like to thank (Debbie) for one other thing. (Debbie) and a colleague of hers from the not-for-profit community a few years ago decided to be the initial pioneers in introducing the first new entrant constituency into the ICANN landscape.

And it turns out that new entrants, regardless of whether they're in the telecom space of any other space, all have the same experience. And that is, incumbents are slow to move over. So (Debbie) and (Amber) did a fantastic job of building the credibility and there's now a fifth constituency in the non-commercial party house. We're looking forward with enthusiasm to their getting their legitimate voting rights on the council.

But we all owe (Debbie) and others from the NGO a world, a (vote) of such deep appreciation for bringing in the true NGOs that many of us who helped to found ICANN envisioned as really being partners in helping to broaden and deepen the multi stakeholder model.

Woman: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, our next segment is focused on issues that we have not addressed or need to readdress or haven't completely addressed. We're going to have a brief period of time to spend on that. One - we're just going to run through the

list of topics. We allowed a few minutes for preparation for interaction with ICANN staff.

Let me decode that. That will be an update on preparation for our meeting tomorrow with (Sally Costerson). The briefing from some I've asked to work with me to put some ideas together for that. But the issues roundtable, we want to just overview with you what we're planning to address and then start going through them with some priority.

We've got a left over topic from this morning. We're going to hear from (Gabby) - you are - we're going to hear from (Gabby) on a - or (Cecilia) on a high level very quick presentation on an outreach and participation initiative that they're working on as one of our three regional priorities. We'll be doing one in (Nena) in the (Nena) region, one in Latin America and one in Africa with I think our newest member.

They'll all be done at different times but we'll hear from (Gabby) and (Cecilia) today. But I'm going to ask (Steve) to run through the items that we think we still need to address on the gTLD space including sort of summing up...

(Steve): And not to begin now, but just to list them for...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

(Steve): Okay great. There were two that were mentioned yesterday during our one hour session on prep for council. One is a quick discussion of a proposed alternate model to do the services of getting in and out of the trademark clearinghouse and given the BC's position we're, you know, very attracted to the model and want to discuss with all of you how you feel about it.

Now another topic has been brought to at least my attention from a few BC members, is a discussion of closed TLDs and a notion where especially where they're closed TLDs for a generic keyword, both in situations where

the generic keyword is tangential to the company's service and in situations where the company that wants to close the keyword is in the same industry. So a brief discussion of how you feel about that, whether and how it fits into ICANN's concern.

Marilyn Cade: And then we should talk a little bit about the action items from the RPM discussion with the board. That one's going to be very brief. I had a quick exchange with the staff and the board and I can summarize that. So what else? Elisa, what have we missed that we need to put on the issues roundtable.

Elisa Cooper: Did we want to talk about what the board had wanted us to discuss which their - like their issue about whether or not, you know, patents should be disclosed when going into a negotiation or contract?

Marilyn Cade: We better. I promised them we would.

Man: Yes, I have to leave in about 45 minutes to catch a flight. Could I get a brief summary on this patent thing? It's the first time I've heard patents raised inside of ICANN.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I think that brief summary is probably going to be the extent of the discussion. So let me do that first because I think it will be - it'll either be quick or postponed. How's that?

So someone - some entity has objected to a recent move by a present legacy provider in the registry space. And rather than dealing with it as a single item, others have said, well, it has bigger implications. And others, as far as I can tell, Bill is, you know, sort of individual people who - or entities - who think that maybe you're going to get a competitive business opportunity if you sign a contra- you bid for a contract with ICANN and the product or service that you provide is going to involve something you're working on that you intend to patent or already have patented and you haven't disclosed it.

And then if it were to go to binding consensus policy and everybody would have to buy it, then - and implement it, then that would be a locked in market opportunity. So it seems to be around that. That's the best that I've been able to gather from the conversations. Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Well, having been married to a patent litigator for ten years I know a little bit about this. So, yes, I think the concern is that somebody is going to be negotiating and it's going to be encouraging a particular standard and not disclose that they have a patent for it, so that once we all agree to adopt the standard, then, oh gosh, I gotcha.

Either you better license this or, you know, they'll litigate. That's the concern. And so just personally I think - my personal view is that there should be the requirement to disclose any known patent that may have some bearing on what it is that's being negotiated. Does that make sense?

Bill Smith: Yes, this is Bill Smith from PayPal. I am not an attorney but I have had to deal with patent issues for way too long and intellectual property issues. This is a huge can of worms for ICANN. I can't imagine how it could be dealt with in this type of organization.

It's dealt with in technical organizations where you make contributions or you sign something but in terms of showing up in an open forum and making suggestions, I don't know how you can commit...

Elisa Cooper: I don't think it's, like, public forum type stuff. It's when you are negotiating a contract. So they had some specific language. It was around, like contract negotiations or...

Marilyn Cade: Whether the community sees a need for a policy with respect to declaring patents in policy development or contract negotiations. So I - Bill, I think

actually - I'm not a patent lawyer and neither have I ever been married to one and won't talk about any other personal interactions.

But I guess, you know, it seems a lot easier - I was the policy advisor at AT&T when there was a big patent (unintelligible) at IPS and at (W3)- when it was (W3C), so I had to learn a lot about it. And someone in the middle of a standards development process at W3C did purposely - did not disclose. It turned out later - purposely did not disclose that they were in the process of (borrowing) for a patent. That was about to be widely embraced as a standard.

I thought what we were dealing with was not in a standards environment but when you were making a bid or in the midst of a policy development process, and you purposely were proposing a solution that you had a financial interest in because you (now) hold a patent on it and you didn't disclose that. That was what I understood it to be.

Elisa Cooper: I agree.

Bill Smith: Okay. Bill Smith again. Fine. The contract negotiation might be easy to deal with. The policy development process, I can tell you that if there is a patent policy related to PDPs or other things that happen at ICANN, I will not be able to participate probably because the legal hurdles I will have to jump through to get signoff to participate in something that gets anything that would affect our intellectual property I must get approval on.

Marilyn Cade: So my question as even if it didn't have to do with your intellectual property. If a PDP or the policy development process was about Whois proxy...

Bill Smith: No, no. Okay, so let's - we'll just say there is a policy development process. I decide to participate in it, okay.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Bill Smith: Because I think it's a good thing for me to do. It turns out my company - I won't use my company's name - but my company has a patent in that space that I am unaware of, okay. And at some point, my company says later, "We'd like to license that," okay.

To prevent from happening, because we don't like that to happen, in a patent regime that you have at standard setting organizations, we have to get approval for each and every group that we participate in.

Marilyn Cade: I'm with you. Now I understand.

Bill Smith: It is a huge issue. It is not easy to solve. I have had to solve it before. I strongly suggest that ICANN not go down this road.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, I said that this would either be really short or postponed. And Bill has convinced me that it's definitely postponed because I hear Bill and others may fully agree with him but we're not going to have time to fully hear everyone else. And I think - I know (Benny)'s on the phone. I'm going to ask (Benny) to clip the part of the transcript that relates to this and to suggest that we take this up online because I think it's a really important point.

There are many member, not just Bill. I see some other heads nodding and I know a few other people that, gosh, if they had to go clear what was in the pipeline, et cetera, we'll have even fewer people in working groups. So if it's okay with everyone, we'll put it on in a different space and I'll get written clarification on exactly what the question is. Is that all right? No decisions. We'll park it.

Bill Smith: Yes. No, we should do that. Someone should - I think - this is coming from the board. Someone with knowledge about this stuff should contact the board and say, "Do you have any idea what you are asking for? You have patent

attorney who is providing you with - that has standards experience that is advising you on this issue.”

Marilyn Cade: I will put that in the answer. We're not...

Bill Smith: Because - and just one other - because this would be a great way to kill policy development.

Marilyn Cade: (John), (John).

Man: This is the third time this subject has come up on agenda. It's not been made clear to me at any point what the hell anybody's really talking about. The only specific reference that was made, I think was made by (Bruce Tomkin) who said that - he made reference to business process patents such as you might have for the sale of domain names.

So that was as specific a reference that has existed. We are all aware of business process patents. Priceline had a business process patent. Amazon's one click commerce is a business process patent. And those companies choose not to enforce those patents. They have them. The world understands they have them but they choose not to enforce.

So until we know more I, you know, there's so much else to get whipped up into a frenzy over, I'd just set this one aside.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to go on. I'm going to see if we could go - are we ready to go to (Gabby) because the longer discussions are going to be on the rest of the issues related to new gTLDs. So I want to reintroduce (Gabby) and (Cecilia). Most of you know that not that long ago, we were very fortunate to have (Gabby) and (Cecilia) join the business constituency having first come to ICANN through fellowship program.

And they, too, made the mistake of asking what it was they could do. So we have them hard at work. (Cecilia) has been in the newcomers lounge. Now this is her second meeting. And she is their greeting and introducing all of the newcomers to ICANN and also helping to recruit new members for us, by the way.

She and (Cecilia) are putting together a fantastic set of eCommerce events. This is going - we're working on making what they're doing related to what we can do to talk about participating in ICANN and being aware of the BC. There you go.

(Gabriella Flack): Okay, first of all, this is (Gabriella Flack) from (NC Data) for the transcript purpose. I want to thank, in particular, all members of the BC but in particular, Marilyn Cade, for her membership and help. Without her, this wouldn't be here and so I want to start by asking how I go over the slides. I have to ask.

Okay, next slide please. So I wanted to start by telling you about what we do and who we are. We are the organization in the middle of this chart and it's called (Instatuter). It's Latin American eCommerce Institute.

And all the organizations that you see around it are eCommerce chambers and (other) chambers of Latin America. So you have there Argentina, Mexico, Paraguay, (Uruguay), Chile, Brazil, Ecuador, Columbia, I think (unintelligible), Buenos Aries as well.

So we are a network of these Internet related institutions and we can reach around 80% of Latin American businesses that are using the Internet like (unintelligible). So next slide please.

So we started in ICANN - I started as a fellow as well as (Cecilia). And afterwards, I became a member of the newcomers lounge. But at the beginning, we were only focused on EDRP and we wanted to be in the EDRP

for providers for Latin America because we thought we didn't have that and it was necessary for many reasons.

And then afterwards, we realized that we needed much more. So we needed understanding and awareness for our businesses in general and so we did a lot of (unintelligible) our organizations and (with these) initiatives that is called (Equalamenta) referring to (instrument) governance is Spanish.

So what we are going to do is to (spread the word) as an outreach on Internet governance issues and to raise participation of these businesses in general in the Internet in governance and develop- and in policy development processes. But actually what we want to do is to represent them as much as possible because we (unintelligible) here on the smaller and medium sized companies coming to ICANN or to this forum.

So we went to be able to bridge and have tools to do that, so that's what the initiative is about. The next slide please. So our strategic forums, I'm not going all over it, because I'm going to focus on the most important issue. We are launching this initiative now in November, next month in Buenos Aires in universities thanks to (Cecilia) who works at the University (De Gella) which is one of the most important private universities in Argentina.

And what we're going to do, and it's most important, is that we're going to announce that for next year we have a very important event called eCommerce Day and this event happens in all these countries I mentioned during next year.

And so we're going to be doing workshops there for Internet governance and we're going to bring Internet governance to this (unintelligible) try to make them come here, but so we think about. It's the only way they will be aware about all these things that are going to affect their businesses so much.

So everything is going to change for them but no one really knows about this. So we're trying to make a change and bring understanding and awareness for them. So next slide please. Just to explain what these events are - we started in 2007 in Buenos Aires. We had a lot of success with 700 participants and then we started adding countries with all these local partners and now we have nine events in 2012 which I think incorporated Costa Rica and (Uruguay) this year.

Costa Rica was the first time and it will also come here with the other Caribbean countries. So it's going to be interesting. And also we have in this round of events, one of them here is a regional event like the (San Paulo) one where you see there the number of 35,000 is because it's a regional event and San Paulo's huge so we have lots of participants there.

That is the total - the next slide - so we have the total numbers here. There 31,000 is the 31,000 companies that participated in this event during the last five years. And I'm sorry that some of the explanations there are in Spanish but it says that we had six regional events and four local events and we had 13,000 experts and 31,000 companies participate and blah, blah, blah.

So what I wanted to say with all of this is that really we want our businesses to get involved. We're going to ask for you sometime to either come forward and talk at those events because you're really able to explain to our companies and to our members how the Internet is going to change for them and what they need to do about this.

Next slide please. So just to finalize, to realize that we have lots of companies that are already supporting us in these events but none of them - well, some of them are also related to the DNS and to ICANN that they're supporting us because these are eCommerce events but now we want special sponsors that will be supporting these workshops on Internet governance.

So if anyone is interested, we need to talk about your involvement. So thank you very much for this opportunity of talking here. And I just want to say that our purpose is to help our businesses to understand what's going on because they just don't know. And we don't want them to get surprised when everything's done and they can't do anything about it.

We want them to be aware and to take all the preventions that they need as everybody else. But our goal is to at least for them to understand that this exists. We have many companies that don't know anything about new gTLDs, so we're going to bring this information to them and we want your help with this. So thank you very much for this opportunity.

Woman: Just one more thing to add to that. I think it's important to note that these are the people that are driving innovation in Latin America and these are not only, you know, Latin American companies. These are companies where a lot of Americans have come to Latin America and invest in European, et cetera.

So if we don't let - if we don't act as a bridge for these people, we're in a good position to do so, they won't know. The (unintelligible) haven't been announced and we need ICANN's support and your support, too, so we will be probably reaching you to continue working on this to reach these companies. Thank you.

(Gabriella Flack): And just to add one more piece of information, eCommerce is growing in Latin America around 40% each year. From 2003 to this year, this has happened every year, more than 40% each year, so we're talking about a lot of people getting into this (unintelligible) every year. And so, like, anyway, any crisis that we have is not affecting the growth of eCommerce. So this is important information as well. Thank you very much.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I want to turn to I think Patrick and others who have questions. Patrick, do you want to...

Patrick Ryan: Yes, thank you. Patrick Ryan with Google. I'll be quick. I'm really pleased to see that we're a sponsor of this awesome initiative. It looks great and your presentation is wonderful. The only thing I would ask is, you know, maybe you could elaborate a little bit more and possibly with an email to the group about best ways for the business community to engage.

Like, if I wanted to take this back and say, "Hey, this is something we need to engage on. You know, here's an email that shows what the step are and what you're asking," I think that would be helpful.

Woman: Yes, just to clarify, (this) is now a sponsor of the eCommerce day event, not the governance entity itself so we would like to have you as a governance and (entity) sponsor, so - for these events in particular. And we're preparing now - we have that kind of information but in Spanish and we're just right now translating a special representation for you to have it as soon as possible.

Marilyn Cade: So let me must put into context how the addition of the Internet governance - because the eCommerce activities were already launched by (Cecilia) and by (Gabby). And in getting engaged in ICANN, both of them have become very interested in the broader Internet governance issues and have decided now to append onto this - and we talked in the BC.

We applied for a small amount of money from ICANN do to three regional events and the idea - we got \$24,000 - and the idea was that we would spend that \$8000 per region, building a small briefing event in the region. But we tried to abandon that. And instead - and (Gabby) and (Cecelia) are really kind of the prototypes for this - what they've done is taken an existing business event series, where businesses coming together, and so they're adding on, Patrick, this additional value which I think from the discussions that we've had, (Ayesha) and many others and I have had with (Chris) and others, this is what we really need to be doing.

So they're going to be our prototypes. (Mamay) is on the board of one of our newest members, (Abica), and (Wanda Segongo) will be with us later. They will be doing an event in (Mosanbeek) where we will be trying to work with them to do a similar sort of thing, to help them find speakers and to bring - I'd hoped to get (Jeff Mosk) there as a speaker because it would be such an attractive pull.

But we do have a commitment that (Michael Silberg) from the board will come as a speaker there. And what we need to do is surround our business colleagues with other business colleagues who can come as expert speakers who could become engaged because they're bringing - it's already a business event. We're not changing the business event but we now no longer have to pay for the venue, right, because the business event is already there.

The third business event will be in Jordan in February and (Misar Zaka) will be here later. And that is (Mina) ICT Week. We'll have a significant focus on Internet governance including ICANN. All 13 of the (Mina) ministers for ICT attend (Mina) ICT Week and (Fadi) will speak at that.

But - so they're all very different but it's an effort to take the business community into the region and to try to build awareness and understanding of what ICANN is and what it does. So anything, you know, it's a prototype and any of the members who can collaborate on this, this leads me to say one quick thing because then we need to go to these substance items.

Let's do the substance items and then I'll come back to the longer term discussion that we're having with (Sally Costerton) that (John) will be helping to lead on communications and materials that can help to support such events on a more consistent way. But I think we just signed Google up for being involved in this.

Patrick Ryan:: Oh, I definitely - this is Patrick for - with Google again. I am, of course, very interested in learning more about this. I mean, there's nothing more, you

know, closer to my heart than Internet governance when you bring business needs and interest into that. You know, you're really hitting a sweet spot for me so I'm very excited to talk to you about this more.

Woman: I'm really happy to hear this. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Marilyn. It's Steve DelBianco. We have two quick topics we'd love to cover and whatever else we can squeeze in here. And the first is the BC to begin discussing at a high level how much we - what we think about an alternate model to run the trademark clearinghouse, running the model for which it's implemented.

The BC's position has been that we supported a centralized trademark clearinghouse that supports (sunrise), trademark claims notices, and uniform rapid suspension or URS. And, again, this refers to only the new TLD program.

Currently, ICANN has got a model that's advancing with the help of its consultants from IBM and Deloitte. And they've got two documents posted for public comment. One is on the limited matching rule they'll use to match trademarks and it only includes replacing spaces with dashes and vice versa, replacing an ampersand with and, and it makes it clear that that matching extends not to plurals but only to the exact match.

They also have a document posted for public comment on how one proves they have use or proof of use when they try to get into the clearinghouse. And these alternate models that are in front of us, though, are not open for public comment right now. They're not.

And the question comes up should we ask, should a BC ask for these alternate models to be considered or not? We think that based on the presentation yesterday and it also came up over the weekend, that the alternate model, which is being currently advanced by all the registries and

registrars, to my knowledge and I think that Elisa can help with that, is more centralized than the model ICANN staff is proposing.

So a quick summary - the trademark clearinghouse isn't a service. It's just a list. It's just a database. And on that list, the trademark owner would put their trademark terms, and they would put where and when it has been trademarked which all makes its way into the trademark claim notice.

After that's in there, there are at least two services that'll use the list. The one service is through a registrar a trademark in it so that you can then register that trademark in a sunrise period in a given top level domain, a sunrise registration.

The second is that later on, when it's open to the public, if a registrar tries to obtain a domain name that is in the list, the trademark clearinghouse list, well, then the service is supposed to provide a warning notice to that registrar. The registrar would either acknowledge they saw it and proceed to register the name or they might decide not to register that name.

And that warning notice has carefully constructed text describing that a particular trademark owner, and it would name them, has for such and such a time had this trademark. And they might even describe places where it's trademarked. And that would be an appropriate warning.

That warning, then, is recorded that the warning was issued. And then the trademark owner is notified that such and such a registrant has registered a name. And the name goes into the (zone). They're allowed to use the name. The point is that they've been warned and acknowledged it and the trademark owner knows about it.

So this is the trademark clearinghouse and often we just call it the trademark clearinghouse. But the clearinghouse, again, is just a list. The services are sunrised and claims notices which we can call warnings for short. On this

new model, is proposed to be more centralized. They want to make the sunrise process easier.

And Elisa and I, several of you, sat in on a presentation yesterday. It seems that as if with respect to the sunrise, the new certificate in the SMD file is universally acknowledged as an improvement. I think that everybody agrees that the sunrise registration did come up with a technically superior way to allow PayPal to obtain a nice little package file that's got a certificate in it. And he can encrypt the file if he wants - Bill can.

And that package file will then be handed over to a particular TLD operator, folks who are operating, say, dot insurance. He hands it over to them and says, "Look, we'd like to do a sunrise registration of PayPal dot insurance." They validate his file, his claim, and he gets it in sunrise. Simple enough and I think the improvement is well worth supporting and Elisa's agreeing.

The second is still more controversial. It says that after sunrise is over, registrants are coming in and they're trying to register a name. Somebody in an open TLD, like say dot insurance, he tries to register PayPal dot insurance. Well, when the individual does that, where does the registrar and registry look up to see whether there's a claim on this?

The ICANN model supposedly has gotten a copy of the full trademark clearinghouse which includes the strings and the trademark, when and where it was trademarked. All these shoved down to every single TLD. In the open TLDs that's somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 to 500 I guess open TLDs.

And they'd each have a full copy of this file and they would each implement their own rules, writing their own code, business processes, their own rules where they look up, in the rules for the display, the rules to record whether the registrant saw it and sending that notice back up to the trademark

clearinghouse so they could tell PayPal that they'll be on just register PayPal dot insurance.

The alternate model says go give everybody a full copy of the entire file. Give them an emergency copy of just the strings so that the registrar can quickly look up and say is this string - PayPal, in this case - one of the strings that's in the clearinghouse? If the answer's yes, the new model says do a round trip up to the clearinghouse, a live query if you will, to obtain the full notice to provide to the registrar and then another round trip back to the clearinghouse to let them know if the registrant proceeded.

So therein lies the controversy. One of the board members got up yesterday and said, you know, there's a lot of merits to the new centralized model and he acknowledged some of them like there's lower risks for the trademark owner if some of this data gets leaked to the public and there was a big controversy of how much risk that was and whether it was already public.

It's far easier to modify the matching rules in a centralized or alternative model because let's suppose that we're successful at getting the BC's position on some broader matching rules for these warnings. While having to implement that at several hundred TLD's it's far more difficult than changing it in one place so that both the match and claims notice warning would come from one place, one place to change it instead of many.

The downside is live query and (Shelabee), Mr. (Shelabee) got up and said look, "The real question for me at the board is should we put ICANN in the critical path for somebody getting a registration?" That critical path meaning if the trademark clearinghouse that's operated by ICANN isn't up right now, it's not working, well then what would the registrar do? The registrar wouldn't be able to validate, wouldn't be able to understand whether the claims notice was there and they wouldn't get an answer.

Now that would only be the case if the string was in the short list, right? If it was in PayPal you could go up and do a query and if the clearinghouse weren't up. So Elisa in the queue and just love to take a (unintelligible) of what the BC's general thoughts are about this principal - Elisa and Bill.

Elisa Cooper: Okay so I actually wanted to go back. You're mentioning the two documents that ICANN had published about the clearinghouse and one of the documents was the document about matching. About how, you know, if you had a trademark that had two words in it, you know, that the space could be replaced by a dash or it could be registered without the dash.

Anyways on second read of that document I noticed that one of the options for replacing like - well to replace an ampersand is, you know, can be replaced with the word and but that word is - the language of that word is dependent upon where the trademark is registered and I don't think that's a good thing.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: I think it should be - I think you should have the ability to choose whatever translation of the word and you want. For instance in the United States we don't really have an official language. So if you want to have and in Spanish, which, you know, I don't know what the Spanish speaking...

Man: (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: ...yes, you know, I don't know what that percentage of the population is but it's pretty big. You wouldn't - well from what I saw from the trademark-clearinghouse they weren't offering that up as an option because that wasn't - that's not the language of the U.S. BTO. So anyway I wanted to bring that to our attention and I think it's something that we should comment on that it should be up to the trademark owner to decide if they want to have a variation that they get to select what language, you know, for the word and or

I think with the at sign I think they're - I don't remember what the - if they're allowing for the translation of at, I would assume so.

Man: Elisa I wanted to mention that today is the last day for the initial comment period on that, it's a great insight. It turns out that that insight's appropriate whether we use the ICANN proposed model or the alternate model...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yes but this has nothing to do - yes I just wanted to - this has nothing to do with the two models.

Man: So it's still worthy of doing it right away. Is it even possible to begin, I mean we're going to submit it before the November 7th reply date, we won't make the 16th, which is today but if you could draft that it would be faster.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I mean we can do - if we all agree that you want to have the ability to register in whatever that translation of that in whatever language. Okay, so anyway long story short, I do think that the ARI model is a better model. It's the registries and registrars that have to implement it. They've selected what they think is the easiest and least expensive route and I support that.

In addition I just don't see - I don't see all the risk in that centralized model. I think that ICANN can and should be required to get a 99.999 percent of time on that trademark clearinghouse. This is their program and I think they can do it and I just think that it's a better model. The reason it's a better model is it concerns me that each registry would be adequately equipped to be doing the updates of their cached versions of the database and I think there's too much opportunity, you know, if you go with the decentralized model.

I don't trust that all the registries will do a good job of refreshing that data because it would need to be refreshed in my opinion more than once a day because those updates are going to be made to that trademark

clearinghouse database. And to me that's the real reason why I don't think we want to go with the decentralized model.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa, Bill and then Jim Baskin.

Bill Smith: Sure, Bill Smith, PayPal. Let's see, where to start...

Man: Try to keep it high level.

Bill Smith: ...I will. High level with the board, a comment that it would be difficult to implement a service that's up.

Steve DelBianco: No, the board asked the question to the community and said, "Do you think we should put us in the live query model?"

Bill Smith: Someone stood up and said - and I thought it was a board member "That this would be difficult." But whoever said it, ICANN already does this, there's - well there's the L root and 12 copies of it and 300 and change of those around the world.

So we have an existence proof but it is possible to have a highly reliable, resilient system that is made available. If there is a will to make it happen it can happen.

Secondly, I heard conversation last night about in essence (Mark Holders) concerned that the information they put into the trademark clearinghouse might somehow get leaked. My understanding is that information is already public, number one. And number two...

Elisa Cooper: They're not really worried about it, I mean the ones I talked about? They're not really worried about it.

Bill Smith: Well if they're - let me go on. If there is a - even a suggestion that that should happen this runs an absolutely countered to all of the - who is requests that we are making for public information for registrants. This would be in my mind - believe me you will get the civil society people coming up and saying, "What are you talking about."

This would be a bad idea, okay. And then I really don't - I don't have a problem whether it's centralized or not, I think that's an implementation detail actually. The other thing though on a trademark clearinghouse is, I certainly would like to be able to block things other than just trademarks.

Man: (unintelligible).

Bill Smith: Well I have to leave, so.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn's going to bring you the list that the BC and IPC came agreement on and you read it and I'm going to put you back in the queue as soon as you're ready. And I'll note that Bill - Bill's right, ICANN today through it's IANA function operates the L root and it gets several, you know, something in the neighborhood of 200,000 queries per second. So ICANN today does operate a real live query service that's in the critical path of doing resolutions, not registrations.

So Patrick and (Andy) if you start running 50 or 60 - Google starts running 50 or 60 open TLD's during registration, I think to support what you do ICANN ought to be able to provide a real time query for looking up in the trademark clearinghouse. We have Jim Baskin in the queue next.

Jim Baskin: Yes thank, Jim Baskin from Verizon. Two things, this idea of ICANN not wanting to or shouldn't be put in this liability issue - well first of all I wasn't aware that ICANN was planning to run this thing themselves. I thought this was going to be contracted out just like you contract out with TLD operators.

But if I'm wrong there's still the fact that they run a root is in existence proof that they can do it and so that's - I think that's been discussed. The other thing, the two models and the issue of whether the TLD operators, the registry operators would possibly be a source of problems because of the constant updates that are necessary, I think both models suffer from that.

Yes - listen because it's the changes in the strings that are in the list that have to get down to the - whether or not they have the whole thing it's the strings themselves that need to be update - up to date all the time and that problem exists in both models - that the strings are down there at all 1400.

Elisa Cooper: True but that's a much smaller database and not nearly as complex.

Jim Baskin: But if you don't update it right it doesn't matter how many things you missed.

Steve DelBianco: How big a thing you missed. Thanks and Bill Smith is there anything to add to that? Okay so anybody else in the queue, any other high level observations on whether it's appropriate to ask ICANN, yes you ought to at least consider stepping into the shoes of a live query. Getting into the critical path on registrations, not resolutions you're already there on resolutions but for registrations.

If that's the general feeling we can start to explore it further if these are posted for public comment, that's when the BC would issue its first written statement on it.

All right and the second topic that I wanted to table was something members have brought up, which is the concept of a closed generic key word TLD. This would be by a single competitor in the key word industry. I'll give you an example, Progressive wants to run dot insurance in a closed way. Goodyear wants to run dot tires. Dish television wants to run dot phone and dot mobile, Priceline wants to run dot hotels.

Google has some, (unintelligible) from Amazon, they each have several key word TLD's - generic key word TLD's outside of the dot brand and it's somewhat of a new concept. The BC was one of the leaders of trying to get the guidebook to create some space and flexibility for a brand owner who wanted to have their own TLD -- a dot Amazon, a dot Google, a dot You Tube, a dot Kindle.

We created a lot of space for them by giving them the ability to opt out of the code of conduct if it was a single registrant TLD, actually a term we coined, single registrant TLD. You don't have to use all registrars, you don't have to turn back it over - turn it over back to ICANN so they can re-delegate dot Google to somebody else when you want to shut it down.

We created some excellent flexibility for brands running their own brand name. I guess we really hadn't thought through the possibility that many, many other words would be applied for as a single registrant TLD, totally in control of an applicant. And we certainly hadn't anticipated the notion that sometimes that would be a company that has a lot of market power in that industry - Progressive running dot insurance in a way that maybe no other insurance company would get anything in dot insurance. Same things with tires, same thing with Priceline running dot hotels.

So not to ticket you or what BC members think about this, keeping in mind that ICANN's role is relatively limited. There's really nothing in the guidebook that would prevent it. It's really a question of whether governments would issue early warnings to those applicants or general statements from the GAC that might discourage applicants from proceeding down a path like that. I'll take a queue, Ron go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Ron Andruff. I just wanted to add to what you just noted Steve that where this actually came from was in the vertical integration working group. And it's important to highlight that because there was a lot of discussion about whether or not a registrar and a registree could actually be the same entity or within the same group.

And we were trying to think through all the elements about how those things could be gained and what did happen in that circumstance in terms of access to specific words that people might take and claim and resell at a higher value and those types of things.

It was very little discussion about the brand TLD and how we would give them a set of certain rules. And at the end of the day it was almost a by-product, just like kind of a thing on the side. So to see that it's now being used in this way is really disconcerting because obviously it's impossible for any working group to think through every possible situation that might occur.

So I think that there may be some way to bring this back to the table from the - looking back at the vertical integration working group and where we were at as a body trying to think this through. And where that obviously misstep if you will, where we didn't have a look at this concept because at the end of the day from my part I think it's a real - it would be a travesty to see that happen, kind of see these generic words be taken and put into brand context because that's not what the brand concept is all about. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: (Andy).

(Andy): Feeling lonely here. I guess - I'm (Andy Avros) from Google, I'll share our perspective. We are a gTLD applicant, we do have some applications that I think may be the subject of this discussion. I qualify that term because I, you know, I think there is no real such thing as a monolithic definition of closed generic.

You know, it's easy to throw down the words closed or single registrant but I think this is actually an area where some of the most innovation is going to occur in a gTLD space. You know, the open spaces are meant to sell domains, that's fine, you know, most of our registries are open.

But when you're talking about single registrant or closed, you know, we have a lot of different models as do a lot of other companies like Microsoft, Amazon and so forth. You know, we have a lot of - put into this, we're thinking about offering pointing registries where we have millions of third-parties that are accessing a hosting product or we work together with partners, affiliates, approved developers, like with dot app, that's our motto. You know, or - so there's a lot of different models for closed. There might be some ideas from social networking like leasing a second level space to people or for special events like birthdays, weddings. That's the kind of innovation that is not going to occur on a pure open space and so I think it's a little bit of disservice to a lot of large companies and you mentioned them.

You know, like ourselves, like Progressive, you know, you have Semantic, Wal-Mart, Amazon, I mean these are large business users and while this is a complicated issue, you know, I don't pretend to speak for everybody. You know, I think there is a different point of view especially because this definition is so ambiguous.

You know, I mentioned the different definitions for closed, what about dot generic? There's so many gray areas between dot generic and dot brand, you know, there's a lot of brands for generic terms. And if you throw those in there, you know, a third of the gTLD applications are generic or, you know, there's a lot of terms that are generic that are associated with a brand. You know, Microsoft is dot office, dot docks, there's dot food for foot network.

And so there's a lot of issues that sort of have to be sorted out and so I'm interested to hear everybody's perspective and happy to have a dialogue about it but...

Steve DelBianco: And (Andy) the words generic, that's rather (unintelligible) around the table but in the guidebook the only word that matter is if you're a single registrant TLD and you pledged to not let others control their own domains. You're eligible to apply for an exception from the code of conduct.

And that allows you to own your own registrar and to allow that registrar alone to decide who if anyone gets a domain name. So that's - the word generic the word brand don't even show up in the guidebook. It's all about whether you're a single registrant. So it's a one thing to say it's disconcerting or a travesty that Ron had used, it may be or may be not but it also might be innovative. But that's not - that's okay for rhetoric but it's best for us to understand do we think the BC and ICANN have a role of figuring out right now what if anything should be done before the applications get evaluated and processed.

And then I have in the queue Jim Baskin and Elisa and Tim.

Jim Baskin: I'll try to be quick then, Jim Baskin. It sounds to me like there's general consensus, agreement in the room that there may be both reasonable and unreasonable uses of these kinds of TLD's. They're not necessarily all bad but we haven't had enough discussion about that.

So I guess we need it but then my question is, is it too late? Is there really anything - despite what we may find that there's some way to differentiate the good uses from the bad uses and get it done before the uses are out there in the wild, outside the barn door.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Jim and Elisa's next, Tim and then Lanre.

Elisa Cooper: Well I have many thoughts on this topic. I just wanted to clear that I do have a conflict of interest here. Many of MarkMonitors have applied and so while I do have many thoughts and I had written about this previously I will refrain from any discussion on this topic.

Steve DelBianco: Tim and then Lanre.

(Tim Smith): Hi (Tim Smith) from the Canadian International Pharmacy Association. And there are a couple of gTLD applications that affect us that I see has been closed. One being a dot health and there are competing applicants there and another one being dot pharmacy.

And I certainly believe in a couple of those cases it may be particularly closed whereby the only people who will actually be able to use the gTLD's will be potentially pharmacy or health related companies that reside within the United States and I believe that's particularly restrictive.

I believe that will be then promoted by the owners of those domains as being the only way to find safe online products. And it's not the only way to find safe online products and therefore that would be very restrictive certainly for my membership.

And so maybe there are good uses and bad uses. We were talking this morning at breakfast about the public interest and I believe in the cases that I'm using the public interest would be negatively affected.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks (Tim) I wanted to confirm, you may not be on the list - the BC list but on Sunday the GAC met and discussed dot health. If you were on the list then you would have seen that dot health, there are four applications but they're all open. And the GAC heard from the World Health Organization, please issue an early warning and the GAC took no position.

This discussion was initially with respect to single registrant closed, dot health doesn't fit into that at all. So it's a - certainly a relevant topic and what GAC is talking about it, that's not part of this discussion. We had Lanre and then Marilyn.

Lanre Ajayi: I believe that they have a good reason to be concerned about this (unintelligible). And I'm sure - just kind of concern is not only limited to this forum. Yesterday the GAC (unintelligible) about dot health and almost

everybody there shared the concern that addition be allowed and I want to believe that something should be done about it.

And then if we are to probably presume the GAC (unintelligible) to try and (unintelligible) it's very difficult.

Steve DelBianco: And when you say something should be done, this came up with respect to a couple other commenter's. If the governments would do something long after that delegations out there. Progressive ran dot insurance in a closed fashion and discriminated against competitors. That may or may not be a competitive problem in that particular country.

But at that point it wouldn't have anything to do with ICANN. You might be saying that if the GAC intervenes now well then it certainly is ICANN that receives the GAC objections and decides whether to act on that. That would happen sooner - those post delegation objections would happen later.
Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: So Tim thank you for raising this because it is something - well we're not going to have time to talk about it right now. I think we need to park it and take it up on the list and that is the issue of objections and the fact that Jim just described a concern about an industry implication.

There is a objection process available but the right to use the objection process is so narrow....

Man: There is - agree with you.

Marilyn Cade: ...the right to use the objection process is so narrow that industry groups that might see particular models being proposed don't have standing. And, you know, I'm not being critical about ICANN making the process very, very narrow. There was so little understanding about the different kinds of applications that would be received or the approaches that would be taken.

And the objections process was narrowly defined to entities that can be defined as having standing. So without going into that I think we - what we should take from this discussion is let Steve sum up on the things that we talked about so far on this and park the idea that we're not done yet and are going to have to try to have some organized discussion online on some of these things.

So maybe Steve and I can work with Elisa and Chris overnight and by tomorrow we can at least have the categories defined that we think continue - need to have further discussion. And then rather than having this kind of golly gook approach to using email, which is driving me nuts as well as all of you, maybe we could just make sure in the subject line we put the heading for the topic we are going to focus on so people can keep track of each others comments because right now I'm a little confused by our emails.

Could you sum up on what you think we did on those?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Marilyn. So we'll close this section of it, thanks for the high level round table. I think with respect to the alternate model it is consistent with the BC's established position on centralized and we'd like to explore it further but it looks very positive compared to the ICANN model and we'll try to talk about that.

Elisa Cooper: Did we want to ask for it to be put out for public comment?

Steve DelBianco: Who on the BC feels we should ask ICANN to put out the alternate model as a public comment? Keep in mind it could delay the trademark clearinghouse. As (Sufadi) said today, they wanted to build this thing by January. They put out to the public comment delay. Okay that's practically unanimous so we'll mention a very quick public comment period.

And the second topic, which was the notion of a closed generic key word TLD is mixed feelings about it, even those who feel like there's a tremendous potential for abuse don't really have a consensus to whether you stop at A

priori or wait until it happens. (Ron) was of the opinion that it doesn't keep in the spirit of why we created the exemption. That's hard to know and as we examine all of the detail behind all that.

But I will do my best to summarize a lot of this and circulate it in the next few days so we can continue to have this conversation, Marilyn back to you.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sure the nominating committee will be joining us shortly so I'm going to see if I can wrap up with a couple of quick announcements. I just caught Bill on this issue so let me just be sure everybody understands what happened this morning with the board in the discussion about RPM's.

We have a document - it is the final document, it was already signed off on by all of us and by the IPC. Individual participants or members in these two constituencies are free to jump up and down and object and send something else but this is our bottom line plus the 60-day extension in the objection period.

Bill just asked for an addition and we're not in the position to make that but we can add a explanatory text elsewhere having to do with cyber security. So you'll see something about that - what you're going to see is this document is going to be publicly posted - publicly posted not only on our Web site but it will be publicly posted as correspondence to the board. Between now and the next 48 hours we'll be trying to have small discussions with the contracted party representatives to tell them about this and we'll see how we do.

But you guys need to know that when you are talking to people, this is your bottom line, this is your constituency position. You don't get to open it back up and so we made that commitment. I just want to be sure everybody understood that.

The other thing, which we're not going to talk about right now and I mentioned it this morning and I mentioned it just briefly. We have a

commitment from ICANN to work with us on devising a communications tool kit. Elisa) will be leading the short term topical area working with me and with others and John will be leading the longer-term area.

So we're going to be putting our brains and our information to work real, real quick so that there are materials that can educate registrants about how to use the RPM's, whatever they look like in the end. Whether they can use the objection process, whether it applies to them as a resource. And we're going to be doing all of that on a pretty fast track since the communications information - that the communications delivery mechanism has to kick off in November, operate in December, operate in January, operate in February.

And we're going to be turning to everyone of you who is an association and asking if you can imbed or participate in Outreach activities. That's probably as far as I can go right now because our next guest is here but we'll be looking back to you to ask for more active engagement on all of this. Don't feel excluded if you're not assigned a job, just come and tell me you're feeling excluded and you'll get a job - Aisha.

Aisha Hassan: Very quickly can you just clarify for us what time we're meeting tomorrow and where because I think something had changed?

Marilyn Cade: Okay great, thank you. Can I invite please the nominating committee to come and join us and we'll make some space here at the table so we can get our speakers all close to a microphone. Tell me how many seats I need.

Woman: Four.

Man: Five.

Woman: Hi, how are you.

Marilyn Cade: Hi.

Man: Hi.

Marilyn Cade: Who did you stop there? And there is a seat right there.

Man: Okay.

Man: Steve thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Well thank all of you from the nominating committee for joining us and I see we have in the room before I do other introductions and I'm going to ask Waudo to come and join us at the table down here, maybe Waudo by (Yuryo).

So I want to introduce a really wonderful team that is heavily involved in contributing to ICANN not only in there present role in the nominating committee but throughout ICANN's life and many of you recognize the folks that are going to be talking to you now.

And I'm going to turn this section over to Vanda Scartezini who was the chair of the 2012 nominating committee and then let her introduce the rest of the folks and sort of run this part of the program.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you Marilyn, thank you everybody for having us here. I don't want to make any presentations and not waste time and not give opportunity for you to ask questions but - so this is the end of 2012 committee that Thursday is our last day.

And you (unintelligible) that the (unintelligible) and you like after that you give the (unintelligible) and (Cheryl), you know, everybody very well knows. Waudon and Adam is the associate chair for - where is Adam? Yes I cannot see you and (Byron), (Byron) was with us too. So there is some chair members with us and that we stop there - (Allot) and (Jolette) over there, that make a very good job for us.

So the most important issue is the reason why we are here because we need to hear again from you about the requirements that you have for GNSO positions and for the board. So what we did is here - we got those information, we published that for the candidates to know what were their requirements that will be checked against it.

And in the end after the process, that is quite a clear process, the process basing them to (unintelligible) running five for each file and then there is three selected people about 20, 25 persons. We send that - those profiles to the contract company that I previous met in - met in the beginning of the year.

Just so we - so all the requirements and asked them to make the right questions for - to get right information from each candidate and it's very, very detailed feedback that we get from that. It's about all the questions that is in all minds. If they can be team worker, if they can be (unintelligible) or not, if they can be (unintelligible) or not, they can mix the et cetera, et cetera.

So there is those informations will balance that and those are the pre-selected then it starts to - because we have only three positions so we start. So people go to personal interviews with us and with the NonCom. And after those interviews we get together and we start to discuss one by one and start to compare this one against that one.

What to expect - everybody is very good at that time, you know. In depth they (unintelligible) at work. It's awful, it's very difficult because everybody's brilliant. It's very - yes everybody's brilliant, you can read the profile, you get

amazing. My God what those guys - so it's very, very difficult it's not an easy work.

This is not easy work, yes even - not only for the board for all those positions because we just start to select, select, select so the time was late my God. It's hard to (unintelligible) to this. So we have, you know, that we have some by-law issues that not allow less than one person for one region.

This year was Lutz Donnerhacke and the other is (unintelligible). So this is never happen, no (unintelligible) not anymore. And so it's mostly when happens like this time we need a special effort to bring better people for that region because we must select someone from that region, that is one point very clear.

So we try this time to start to approach everything - the process, information, the timeline, update the timeline all the time. (unintelligible) may use thank you all we come to dates and blah, blah, blah. Everything that we heard as a complaint for the last year and the other recommendation for ATRT.

So certain there is a lot of room to improve. And I'm sure that with better recommendations, more detailing recommendations about those groups like yourself, you know, what it is specifically you expected for instance for a board member or for - not just - we have a lot of general issues like honesty and (unintelligible).

Those in the jail we don't select, you know, not yet. We don't know the future but the reality is more detail is very good because you can - in the finals late is more easy to select this match better than this one. It's something to discuss, that's my opinion of course but it was more easy when you make the match methods. It's very difficult to find out what it is that was - or why this guy is better than this guy.

Mostly are very similar and we need to choose. So saying that I'm open to any questions and I'd like to give the floor a little bit if you allow me to (Yuryo) just to address some words to you. Do you have the questions?

Woman: Now I am whatever.

Marilyn Cade: (unintelligible) we're talking about a little bit of past experience, let me ask (Yuryo) which he would prefer. Do you want to hear questions first and then address us or would you like to address us now?

(Yuryo): Well I'd just say a few words.

Marilyn Cade: Lovely.

(Yuryo): Just to repeat (Yuryo Anciporo) from ISOC Finland. I don't have much to say because we only sought our work this Friday, working on Friday and Saturday. Going through (Monda's) recommendations that's where it left to us from the NomCom 12. And of course they have a big overlap actually, which we accommodate 11 members continue.

Now we take a look at our input, we have gotten when we start revising and amending our rules of procedure for this NonCom and I'm going to say even if we had been kicked on the head with a bottle we still look inside the bottle if there is a message to us and try to read that message.

So that we evaluate all inputs who are ready. The other thing that we have to think of is the timetable because not only meetings next year. The ICANN meetings are historically very late so the timetable has to be revised and the - how we use for instance the Beijing meeting, can we still use it for the Outreach? That is one of the questions.

And talking about the Outreach, I want to ask your help. That is to say you all know people who might make ICANN directors or, you know, be on the

councils or (unintelligible) - please tell them to apply because without a good candidate pool from all regions, that by the way includes very much Africa now.

We need these - we need a large candidate pool to be able to select good people. Thank you (Davis).

Marilyn Cade: So I don't know - it's Marilyn. I don't know how many of you have had an opportunity to read the report from 2012 but I'll have (Benny) send it around again. And in some of the previous emails you've had from me you have had the reminder to read not just one of the nominating committee reports but several of them.

And (Waudu) and (Ron) have suffered from the assignment of having to be the last seven I think, there will be a test later. But seriously both (Waudu) and (Ron) have been delving deeply into not just the report from 2012 but the reports from the previous years because I think it helps where we've been so we can figure out where we're going.

What I would just say is, the nominating committee was instantiated in response to a different effort to find a way to elect board members, which was determined not to work. And it has fulfilled a very important role. It - for those of you who are not aware of this it selects eight of the 15 board members - 16 board members now because of the (unintelligible).

And it also selects three representatives to the GNSO council and Lanre who is here with us is actually one of the appointees of the nominating committee process. It selects three ccNSO council representatives and it selects some of the ALAC representatives.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: The business constituency in the past has informally discussed calling for major improvements and changes in the nominating committee. Including

questioning why the nominating committee maybe should still be appointment counselors and whether there are other mechanisms but we haven't ever - we haven't done anything about that.

We will be talking about the new directions and expanded scope of ICANN and how the nominating committee process fits into it in the future but for 2013 we will be where we are now and trying to help to find candidates and bring candidates in for all of those positions.

What normally happens and some of us have seen this, is there is a fair amount of inside education about this. So some of the Outreach is actually Inreach into the Internet community. Some of the Outreach is Inreach into the rest of the I community, such as through IGF activities et cetera.

And the interesting thing that is really new in the last three to five years is it is a much broader pool of people that we interact with at the IGF and at the national and regional IGF than we ever did before. A few years ago we wouldn't have found that many new people, right.

So I think that's the other thing that we would ask - I'd ask you guys to think about is, assess who your normal suspects were for interaction and providing information and then help us - give us a little more thought on what we can do to reach out into the broader business groups and interactions that these individuals have or that these associations have.

Man: It's still business - it's straight business. We - well...

Vanda Scartezini: Straight business is also difficult, we just got a few of them.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly, so that's an important point and I'm really glad you said that because I was - that we should talk more about that. It's very difficult, when you say straight business maybe you should explain what you mean by that.

Vanda Scartezini: Because most of lawyers for instance, a lot of lawyers...

Marilyn Cade: I wasn't going to use that word.

Vanda Scartezini: ...lawyers enter the business area but that's not I call - I call as a business experience like, you know, experience as a TO or this kind of thing.

Man: Operation program.

Vanda Scartezini: So yes, this filling of how business operates, how the market is, these kind of things.

Woman: (unintelligible) I can reach it from here. I probably don't need it this is a recording. It's the level of cash flow, you know, you don't talk about 12 million dollar turnover things, let's talk about 200 million dollar turnovers. It's got to come from the right (unintelligible) not just a (unintelligible).

Man: Yes Marilyn what you said about the broadening pool of people, this is absolutely true and of course that's really (unintelligible). Whatever seven years ago or ten years ago not all businesses were so interested in the Internet at all. I mean Internet was an optional extra to what you were doing now it's the absolute critical infrastructure. So that's a very good observation in which I do take that into account in our work.

Marilyn Cade: Well I'm going to ask - I'm going to comment in just a minute. I'm - I think this is an interesting tie back to (unintelligible) speech on Monday and to the discussion we had with the board this morning about how do we see - how is the new gTLD program and I'm - we think that's an incomplete question. How is the new gTLD program and the broadening and deepening reach of the Internet and the importance of the Internet, how is that changing ICANN.

And then what are the - what's the skill set and the experience that - because these board members, one of the things that I didn't say and maybe I just

took for granted all of you know that. The board seats are for three years, renewable for two, three year terms or if someone completes a term that partial term doesn't count.

So should a board member resign or retire for health reasons or something then if you'd completed two years of a term you would still be eligible for two three year terms, that rarely happens but it has. The counselor seats are two year terms but the - so I think that it's not just the new gTLD's to me it's also the point that (Yuryo) was making and I think that many of us are making.

Adam I think you wanted to - and I think it'd be good, go ahead.

Adam Peake: Adam Peake, so I'll - there's three pieces of information that I think the nominating committee would like you and the business group particularly to take a look at. And that's on the nominating committee's Web site, which is the usual ICANN process of noncom.icann.org, you'll find that there's advice from the board on skills to the nominating committee. And this was last year on board skills to the nominating committee.

And this was the boards advice on what are the sort of character profile that an ideal director might have. And so you might like to look through that and see how you judge that and respond to the nominating committee on that.

There was also and this was following the sort of process that we're doing now that Vanda did last year, add recommendations from the constituencies to the 2012 NonCom. So you'll find a list of things that the constituencies thought were important for these characteristics.

And then the report that Vanda's produced and I believe has already been circulated but again that's linked from the Web Site, that includes quite a lot of difference of criteria, what sort of issues that you - what issues - what - it's really a candidate profile. What are the skills that we might look for, the experiences and criteria?

And again if you want to look through those and see other things that you want to add or other things that you think are more relevant than others. Then those help the NonCom when they look for candidates and when they then evaluate candidates. So there's quite a lot of information but it can be very helpful to hear your feedback, if that's useful.

Vanda Scartezini: Well I'd also like to remind especially from - people from Africa that is here. We had just seven persons from Africa and 73 candidates just seven for all positions. So it's - it was very disappointed in that we need to make some effort to bring more Africans to participate on this, you know, in this application and there's debate inside the ICANN in general in leadership position.

So please, any effort that you could do for reach African candidates, spread the word around because it's quite important to do that. I see Waudo wants to speak and maybe Lanre as well.

Waudo Siganga: Thank you I think I like to reiterate that issue about Outreach that's been mentioned by the outgoing chair and the incoming chair. I think it's very important because at the end of the day the quality of the work that's coming out of the NonCom actually depends on the pool of candidates that the trick is.

The skill sets are very important but having skills and not having the pool I think is a big disadvantage. And I was wondering which the number of candidates that the had from Africa last year I think, was disappointing. It's been like that for quite a while.

So I think what I would request from business colleagues and other colleagues is assistance with this Outreach issue, it's very important. It doesn't have to be yourself to be explicitly we could also just do it some advice both from the NonCom and also other individuals as a member of the

business community. How to go about getting more interest particularly for the business committee from Africa.

I think my friend Lanre here will agree with this. I think the business community from Africa is not involved in ICANN and the Internet governance in general to a level that it should be considering that the Internet for business in Africa is as important as the Internet to business anywhere else.

And I know that we have had Internet meetings, we have an ICANN meeting in (unintelligible) my country a couple of years ago. And we've had a (unintelligible) meeting and the level of participation of the local business community was not to the level that I thought it should be.

So what I would request is that as a community - as a business community if you have any advise, any hints how we could go about to try and bring more business participation from the developing world from Africa on board, I think that would be very useful and these meetings that the NonCom is having with the communities including the peoples community. I think this is an opportune time to bring forward any ideas that you may have for us to increase the participation of this part of the world. Thank you.

Lanre Ajayi: Thank you very much. I want to agree that Outreach is the key to getting more Africans and people from developing countries into better participating in ICANN. And I believe that the best people that can do the Outreach are the few African people in ICANN itself.

We have quite a few but the (unintelligible) to take the works out to various countries and highly or not to be nominated and then (unintelligible) and that has actually empowered me to start my - some kind of (unintelligible) in my own (unintelligible).

Some few months back we have the national IGF in Nigeria and I used the opportunity to enlighten people about the activities of ICANN. And through my

(unintelligible) a lot of people showed interest, you know, in ICANN
(unintelligible) a whole bunch of people came to me to ask for that question,
which means the interest had been aroused.

And I think a process like this will get some more people interested in ICANN.
Certainly to get in more candidates it needs to know about ICANN and the
only way they can know about ICANN is through Outreach and the best
(unintelligible) of Outreach are the people inside now where there's a part of
the general community.

Woman: May I say something.

Vanda Scartezini: Of course and then I'll go to (Yuryo) and we'll...

(Scavi): Okay this is (Scavi) (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). I want to thank you
both because we have the same kind of challenges in Latin America. And I
want to tell you that we have many African participants in the fellowship
program, which I would be willing to introduce you to.

Maybe they are not from the business community, all of them but some of
them are and also if they are not we can help you with the Outreach as well if
you don't know of any personal (unintelligible).

And also I have some (unintelligible) something within our region, we can
think about ideas and help each other replicate the things that are successful
in each of the regions. So just to offer my collaboration and to work together
for this, thank you very much.

(Yuryo): When Marilyn mentioned the sort of broader perspectives of the development
of the Internet I can't help mentioning - remembering that we were at one
point of time set on the presidents (unintelligible) committee. And of course
each report has been gathering dust for some time now but I still feel that

what's actually happening at ICANN right now - what's happening at the ICANN right now is that those ideas are being developed and implemented.

For instance when it comes to internationalization, there's also if I can still - since I'm taking office actually on Friday, I can still put on my (alich) or at-large hat and mention that today (alich) has approved a white paper, which pretty much covers these issues of longer term development and I very much recommend that for everybody to read.

And of course like the CO said, it's new season at ICANN and I think that eventually all this needs to reflect on the processes of the Non-Com and it's of course the next review of the NonCom that is really relevant here and they should think of what these processes should be. Not for the - in the ICANN as it is today but for the ICANN of the future. Thank you.

Aisha Hassan: Thank you Aisha Hassan, ICC, just for the record I'd like to state that my partner is an ICANN board member nominating committee appointee to the ICANN board. I'll be speaking as - on behalf of ICC to raise a point that we've made in many different contexts but I think it's helpful to underscore this as a compliment to some of the skills and capacities that are in the documents that Adam plated from last year.

A growing awareness in the ICANN community at all levels about how ICANN fits into the Internet governance landscape and the challenges both to preserve and protect ICANN but also to understand the landscape it lives in, I think is an understanding that would be helpful to consider as you're looking at candidates for the various appointments, thanks.

Marilyn Cade: I think it's excellent, I can take one more question or comment before we need to summarize and if I see anyone who wants to - well so I'm going to explain something about being on the nominating committee because I was on the nominating committee for one and one-half terms.

And I just think it's important for you to know what (Ron) and Waudu have signed up for to do. So you've heard a little bit about some of the work that they're going to do but what you - what Vanda might not have been quite disclosive enough about is that it is actually a very, very challenging job that we've asked them to do.

And the people who are on the nominating committee do not represent you. They are put on the nominating committee by you and they have the responsibility to ensure that there is a focus on both small business and large business but they're not representatives of large business and small business. They will work as a team and we will be there to help them but they really have agreed to - and they're agreed to take consultation not just with you but with other people as well.

So basically just gave them a whole new big assignment of work and there's a new team that they will be joining and that is the larger group of nominating committee participants who will be working with (Yuryo) and with Cheryl as the chair elect and with Adam and with the staff.

But it's a very, very challenging job we've given them and it can be incredibly intense in terms of the work demands and taking themselves away from their day jobs at times, which might not be convenient to them. So I think sometimes that's not visible, you know, we just sort of assume that we take somebody and drop them into a dark hole and somehow they come out at the other end and they're still alive.

But I tell you that because you had the opportunity - Waudu has been on the nominating committee before, if he's your colleague spend some time with him, learn a little bit about the work demands and (Ron) has spent some time interviewing past nominating committee participants and I'm not sure if that's because he's going to take up weightlifting or, you know, training for sleep deprivation, one or the other.

But the point of this, not to trivialize this guys, it is a huge responsibility. Eight of the sixteen board members are selected by the nominating committee and three of the counselors for the GNSO, three for - this is an incredible, incredible responsibility that we are entrusting to the members of our community and I'm very pleased to say to the wonderful leaders who have been appointed as the chair and the chair (unintelligible).

And Adam too, thank you to you for stepping up to also play this critical role and to the staff. So now that I've, you know, pepped you all up for the hard work you have ahead of you, anyone else want to say one final thing before we sign you up to do recruitment to help interest people in these ICANN positions.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay I would like to also thank you for your recommendations for all the (unintelligible) that you send or was in some way applied and were with us in the selection process. Waudo and to (Salieu) where is (Salieu)? No matter and to (Salieu) to that help us in this year. Thank you for all the support we have this year and all the board too and thanks to God it's just Thursday and Thursday I'm out of that, I will continue to be representing my region, let the Americans carry the (unintelligible) area but the board then will be the (unintelligible).

So there is - but it was very, very good time, very fun. A lot of difficulties of course but it was very interesting opportunity not only to work with very good members but also to have a chance to interview excellent people that is not useful for ICANN this time maybe I can hire myself. Because the profiles really interesting and very good ones.

So it's - I hope 2013 we'll have even better, you know, candidates and even better (unintelligible) for the time. So thank you - Marilyn thank you for everybody if you want to.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Well you know, actually we will be putting together - we will be looking at the report but looking at our views I think, you know, we do want to talk about the views of the members about the new season at ICANN and those implications.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Because, you know, I think for business people we're used to thinking if you're going to lead an organization, you know, if you don't know where you're going any road will get you there. And so, you know, we need to talk a little more about how we see not only where the CEO is beginning -is going, I suspect there is great synergy and interest on the part of the BC members with what we think his goals are as well. But it will help us think about the leadership it seems to me.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes it's quite important to have a clear feel about the future. It's important for the constituents to talk about that and, you know, think about who you're going to invite and make sure that maybe the best candidate to be selected because it's quite important to have a business person obviously inside the (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Do you need the timeline on when you need constituency comments on...

Man: Well actually any time but...

Vanda Scartezini: Now that's all a timeline.

Man: ...Beijing will be the main - next actually for the comments from the constituencies. It's Outreach from our part but you're also listening to all communities, listening to - I mean okay we'd be listening now already but I mean we give you time to do your recommendations, thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Six months from now, Beijing.

Marilyn Cade: Guys we have a - I'm going to thank you again and then I'm going to see if Chris can quickly look up - I was not aware that we had changed anything - I should but we'll look.

We have a meeting tomorrow at noon and I - it really is important that you be there on time because we have an hour and the first 30 minutes is with (Sally Costerton), the new senior advisor to (Tafati). You'll see some high level notes, (Ron) will - sorry, John Berard will be speaking for three minutes and Elisa will be speaking for three minutes and then I've asked some of the rest of you to be preparing your one to two minute snappy comments should the opportunity present itself.

But basically 30 minutes of (Sally) tomorrow is her getting acquainted with us and telling us what she's doing and our talking about the need for a communication plan and Chris we are tomorrow for our meeting where?

Aisha Hassan: Aisha Hassan - Marilyn but...

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Man: My Bible time review tonight.

Woman: You had heard it was at noon?

Marilyn Cade: The last annotated agenda said 12:30 to 1:30 Harbor Sea, that's why I was asking.

Man: That's still the information I got.

Marilyn Cade: And then you just said noon.

Aisha Hassan: Sorry, you mean 12:30?

Marilyn Cade: It is 12:30, I'm so sorry.

Aisha Hassan: Sorry and just to ask where is the cocktail with the board tonight for the CSG?
Chris, (Marina), thank you.

END