

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers Constituency Meeting

Tuesday 16 October 2012 at 14:00 local time

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

Tony Holmes: ...session to give input on a number of items on - certainly on the SSAC Nominating Committee and the update on the Whois protocol itself. So that's going to be part of the time on the early part of the meeting.

The meeting schedule to begin now at 2:00 and carry on until 4:00. And then at 4 o'clock there's just a members only session to deal with some of the procedural things that we need to look at.

So I'd like to welcome you all here. My name's Tony Holmes and I'm here representing (unintelligible) chair this group. What I'd like to do is just quickly go around the table asking people to introduce themselves. (Unintelligible).

(Chris): My name is (Chris) (Unintelligible) and I'm actually here representing an ISP called Tech (unintelligible).

Man: I am (unintelligible). I represent the ISP from Uruguay (unintelligible). And I am in the GNSO Council, representation (unintelligible).

Man: My name is (Unintelligible), representing (unintelligible) Telecom and I'm a member of the GNSO Council.

(Jennifer Taylor): I'm (Jennifer Taylor) with (BT).

Mark McFadden: I'm Marilyn Cade - I'm doing some of Mikey's channeling. My name's Mark McFadden with Internet - Interconnect Communications.

Man: Don't make me laugh. My name is (Unintelligible) Japan (unintelligible).

Man: My name is (unintelligible), also from Japan, network (unintelligible).

(Eduardo): Hi, my name is (Eduardo) (Unintelligible) from CGI (unintelligible) and I'm actually (unintelligible) Brazilian ISP Association.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And (unintelligible) from Japan ISP Association.

Man: (Unintelligible) from France (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) university, we are the operators of the Austrian Research and Education Network. And I'm here just out of curiosity at the moment, thank you.

(Olivier): (Olivier) (unintelligible), I'm from France (unintelligible).

(Malcolm): I'm (Malcolm) (unintelligible). I'm with Euro Expert, the European Internet Services Providers Association and also with - I'm also with (unintelligible), it's a London Internet Exchange.

(Olivier): (Olivier) (unintelligible) for the German Internet Industry and ISP Association (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor. I'm just looking at Mark McFadden and laughing.

Tony Harris: I'm Tony Harris with (Kabachi) from Argentina, the Argentina Internet Association and also the Latin American Federation of the Internet and Electronic Commerce.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks, Tony. Maybe I could ask people that have just come in to - at the back of the room to just briefly introduce yourself, thanks.

Thank you. Okay, is there anyone on the remote participation? We lost our - okay, let's move on anyway. There will be a list circulating if you could just put your coordinates on the list.

We're due within ten minutes to have the presentation from the SSAC but before we get there - something that's not a million miles away is to pull up to the top of the agenda, the comments we've got on the DSSA (unintelligible) report.

Mikey, I think it would be helpful if at this stage for some people if you gave a little bit of background to this work - (unintelligible) on that particular group.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Tony. Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. I gave a brief summary of the DSSA to the GNSO, maybe - if you give me just a second I'll bring that back up and just take five minutes - you want to go through that for five minutes?

Tony Holmes: Sure, let's do that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay. While I'm bringing that up the DSSA stands for DNS Security and Stability Analysis working group. And our charter is really to - we are a cross constituency working group.

We have representatives from the ALAC - it was not only a cross representational but - it was cross charter. It was chartered by the ccNSO, the GNSO, and the ALAC. And it was endorsed by the SSAC and the NRO.

There are ten representatives from each of those on the group. So this is about 50 people working on this. And we've been at it for - and I'm the GNSO Chair of that and effectively I'm the Chair of the whole group because I'm the one that runs all the meetings and wrote the report, do a lot of the stuff. So I'm pretty invested in this.

We took about two years to come up with really three big deliverables and it's pretty small on the screen, I apologize for that. Maybe I can make it a little bit bigger.

The three things that we did on our way to where we're at right now is we built a methodology, a risk assessment methodology for DNS providers of one sort or another. You can't read any of those but you'll be able to in a minute. I'm doing this mostly to refresh my memory.

We also came up with - the diagram on the left is - and it will also get bigger in a minute, is a summary of sort of the roles that we are going to take a lot at in the DNS Security.

And then the one in the lower right is about the five big risk scenarios that we've already identified. We sort of rolled all that into a report that's about 90 pages long and published it for review to the community.

And in the initial reply period we got precisely one comment from an inventor who misunderstood what we were doing and published a completely off topic reply to our report.

So I - and the rest of the co-Chairs, have been pleading with members of the group to get responses from our respective constituencies. And since I was the guy that wrote the report it seems sort of inappropriate for me to write the response from the ISPCP so I asked my friend Tony Harris to do it and he did it. And I greatly appreciate that.

So let me just give you a really quick background on what's going on. It's - I'm going to skip to the methodology. Now one of the interesting things about methods is that you can spend a lot of money on methods if you want and you can get some really neat methods if you do that.

But because we're doing this for ICANN and because our hope is that people in the community will steal and use our methods, we based our methodology on (NIST), the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which is a part of the US Department of Commerce standards because it's free. It aligns pretty well with ISO series methodologies which are not free. And it's in English.

And because I was doing the work, because I'm hopelessly far away from anybody that speaks anything that English is their native language, I don't speak any other language, so part of this is a combination of me.

But the methodology is a compound sentence. We read it from left to right on this - and it's pretty hard to read. And I will maybe circulate this pitch to the list so that you can see it better.

But basically if you start on the left you say an adversarial threat source that has capabilities intent and targeting or a non-adversarial threat source that has a range of effects - so that's the first part of the methodology is that you can pick, you know, spreadsheet format from a long list of these.

You can then lay in the preexisting conditions, the security controls that you already have in place in your organizations and the vulnerabilities that you want to take a look at.

Could initiate with a likelihood that they will actually initiate the event, a threat event, which has a range of impacts. And thus has a severity of risk.

We built this for us. We realized that this is something that's quite generalizable and so for those of you who are in the risk management functions of your organizations you are welcome to steal this and use it in your own organization.

You don't have to give us the results. This is just something that's available as a result of our work. So I just want to do a little advertisement for that. At the very end I'll show you how to get it.

When we applied this methodology we came up with five risk scenarios and I'm going to go through - essentially what you're getting is a one-and-a-half talk in five minutes. So it sounds sketchy it's because it is sketchy but there's quite a lot of detail underneath this in that report.

If you think of - the risk scenarios are on the right sort of the page and at the bottom are the sort of technical ones. And - but the one at the most technical is some sort of inadvertent technical mishap brings down either the root or a major TLD.

The next one is attacks - you know, the typical sort of scaremongering, (DDAS) attack stuff that we all deal with. The middle one is widespread natural disaster brings down the root or a major TLD.

But the two on the top are the ones that at least interest me the most because while there are technical risks associated - here comes the SSAC. I better talk fast before they show up. Yes, we'll circle back. Yes, and that's fine. They're coming to address us.

You've seen this before. I'm filling for you, (Patrick). But now that you're - you have slides that you want to go through or you want to just talk?

(Patrick): What did you think?

Tony Holmes: (Unintelligible). Sorry, we were just going through the DSSA stuff. I think what we should do is I know you've got a very tight time schedule.

Man: No, (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: So what I'm going to do is - yes, I know you do. So what I'm going to do is just ask Mikey to hang on to that thought train and we'll break. And I think we ought to take the SSAC stuff now because I know that you've got other commitments this afternoon.

So firstly, (Patrick), welcome, thanks for coming along. And (Julie), for your help in arranging this as well. And the intent is to - well, it's an open floor for you to present the SSAC stuff but as I mentioned the key to this is really - we would ask you to focus down on what you would consider. And I know you have a good view on this, but the key aspects for the ISPs.

(Patrick): Easy, okay. Thank you, that's easy. So first of all, thank you very much for inviting me and us from SSAC. We actually do - one good thing that I can mention to all of you that it was a very big interest from SSAC to actually be at this meeting. So we have a whole bunch of SSAC members outside the door that couldn't come in because the room is full.

So for future meetings, I think that's - I know you invited me to come here and still we occupy the three chairs but for the next time I think it might be a good thing to - maybe for this common meeting we should try to work on the logistics. But we can see what we can do.

Anyways, SSAC is a group of individuals that together is having the skill set needed to write the reports and advisories that we make available. We do have at the moment 38 members. They're appointed on three-year terms and we have - we are evaluating one-third of them every year.

And these three last years when we have been running this more formal membership program we have rotated in or out, about four members each year.

The way we are appointing people is that anybody can apply, self-nomination or you can nominate your best friends or your worst enemy depending on how you view things. Those - what we're doing is that - joke aside, we do have a formal process. We do have a membership committee.

And Jim Galvin sitting to the left of Tony is Vice Chair of SSAC but also Chair of the Membership Committee because we have decided to very explicitly divide the division of labor between me being the Chair that is primarily responsible for the contact with the ICANN leadership, the (unintelligible) CO.

We have a separate liaison to the Board, Ram Mohan. And then we have Jim Galvin that is taking care of the Membership Committee.

The three of us together with staff from ICANN, that is our secretariat, specifically Julie Hedlund, she is our main staff support. We together create administrative leadership for SSAC and we have weekly meetings all year round.

We produce between - at the - this year, we have so far produced seven advisories on everything from comments on the ICANN fiscal year 13 budget process to comments and advisories on blocking access to services using the DNS.

For the - for ISPs, I think the one interesting report is probably this document that we have on blocking use in the DNS because we wrote a two-page document, SSAC 50 that was written on request from GAC that explained the benefits versus harms regarding blocking using the DNS, which resulted in the recommendation that anyone that want to do any kind of blocking before

they do so they should calculate and look very carefully on potential harm and negative results when doing the blocking.

In this report we much more explicit - we were then asked by the community and specifically GAC to please explain a little bit more what you're talking about - I'm talking in riddles.

So what we did in this report - and this is where I think the interesting part is for an ISP, we looked into different kinds of blocking using the domain name system and try to look at the - how different the consequences were.

And if I take an example of different areas for blocking is, for example, what the report is trying to look at is the difference between blocking by asking a registry/registrar to do something with the domain name and asking a resolver operator which often is an ISP to do equivalent things.

And the conclusion of report is that blocking by the registry and registrar has the least impact. And blocking - so the closer to the registry the less impact it has, blocking at the resolver has quite a large secondary consequences including a specifically impact on the interest and ability to deploy DNSSAC, which we from SSAC think is something that is very important for the stability and the security on the Internet.

So - and then there are some other indications also regarding blocking and different ways, etc., that you can see in the report.

We - just because we tried to be a little bit specific on these various impacts it would be very interesting for us to get feedback - informal feedback is absolutely fine for us.

Formal feedback, of course, also on this topic and/or this report because we are not - even though we are now - this year, so far produced seven reports,

we don't measure success in the number of words or the number of documents but how much a document has been helping.

So for example, if it is the case that this document is helping you in your respective discussions with your governments or if it's not helping, something is missing, please let us know because that makes it easier for us to - maybe it is the case that we get questions from others, maybe even from you to write a third document on blocking that is clarifying various issues because anyone can ask us things.

And this case, it happened to be the GAC that asked us twice in a row but maybe a third document is something you want to ask us, can you please dig a little bit deeper in this specific context and that you might be happy to help in one way or another.

So both regarding a new potential new document but also in general we would like to know whether you think this document is - because we're going to write more and more documents, of course, and it's good to know whether it (unintelligible) helps.

So that was the blocking one.

Tony Holmes: That one in particular.

(Patrick): This is the particular one that I think is interesting, yes.

Tony Holmes: Just on that one, (Patrick), one of the things we can do as sort of the ISPCP is push that document out to the contacts that we have, particularly the regional associations, I think. And (Malcolm), I'm sure that might be something that interests you to help with.

That's just one strand of that and to try and get some feedback to you. Is there any urgency on this?

(Patrick): From SSAC perspective this document is done, it's made available, and that is (unintelligible). So we are not working with this anymore, we're done.

Tony Holmes: (Malcolm), did you want to pick up on that or not?

(Malcolm): I'd only say that we had - (unintelligible) had read these documents and have incorporated them into our messaging using them as citation when discussing with policymakers within our work (unintelligible) and we're extremely grateful to SSAC for being able to provide that solid and credible, mutual technical guidance, which is better coming from an organization that is mutual like you rather than industry body like us.

Because it adds more credibility that way and it's a very valuable contribution so we thank you for that.

(Patrick): Thank you very much, so yes, that kind of comment of course is very valuable. At first when you said that you were introducing this document I was very impressed because we released it Friday last week and it has been - yes, the first one, that is absolutely correct. I know you're effective and you (unintelligible) I like, yes.

Jim - so this was the blocking document. From your perspective, is there any documents or activities related that you think - which you mentioned?

Jim Galvin: Nothing else that I would - you know, put forth immediately, I mean unless you want me to but - okay, yes. We do have an active work party. Looking at the question of rolling the key for the root, the - if you - most of you will - I'm sure are familiar with.

If you've got DNS SSAC in your environments and in your region, you've obviously experienced what happens when enterprises or even yourselves if

you've signed your own domains, you know, clearly rolling a key can be - you know, can be an issue.

You know, people don't get it right for a variety of reasons and so there's a lot of sensitivity to whether or not the root key should be rolled. And there are a variety of opinions about that. There's even a variety of opinions about what enterprises should do as far as key rolling is concerned.

But we pay particular attention to the root, obviously. And everybody's paying attention to it. When they first signed it, the procedures and practices that they had put out had suggested that they might consider rolling it in five years.

So in advance of that, since discussions have now come up about - given what's been happening in the community with respect to key rollovers now, I assume that many of you - or you have staff, technical staff, that pay attention to the various DNS operations groups.

And there's a fair amount of discussion. Everybody notices when, you know, significant places roll their keys and everybody notices when they have little issues. So we're learning a lot about that process and that has caused the question of what happens when the root key rolls? And are we really ready for that and do we really want to do it?

So SSAC has a work party in which we are considering that question of is it important to roll the root key? Because that actually turns out to be an interesting question that the cryptographic community has been asking itself. You know, are rollovers really necessary in any case?

We've had a lot of - the assertion to date has always been to roll keys, there's a lot of belief in that. But there's now some evidence to suggest that the basis on which we were always asserting to roll the keys might not apply in all cases.

And it's worth reexamining that question. So that's one of the critical questions to answer is taking in input from the cryptographic community considering that particular set of evidence.

And then just the general process if we are going to roll it what does it mean, what are the implications and consequences of it. The root is a special case compared to anything else because the root public key itself is special. It's the one key which essentially has to be manually configured. It has to be manually made available.

All other key distributions are done automatically. They're all part of the DNS protocol itself and they're distributed by the DNS. So the rollovers have a much more natural process that doesn't directly affect applications and services assuming, you know, they do their implementations correctly.

But the root is a special case because of that one key which has to be distributed manually. So what does it really mean to distribute it? Do we really want to do it? Do we have to do it is an important question that needs to be answered first?

So that work party is an active work party, we've been looking at that issue. Although, normally SSAC always like to say the fact that we have a work party doesn't mean we'll say anything or not. Sometimes the conclusion that we come to is there's nothing to say.

I suspect in this particular case there will be something to say. And once we figure out what that is there will be something forthcoming and hopefully that will happen, you know, at least early next year, sometime into next year, not too long into the year because there are many people interested in that topic.

Tony Holmes: Any question on that? That last point, I think there's a lot of interest in that one, sure. What is - one thing I haven't understood with SSAC, what is your

ability to roll this stuff out? I mean how do you get this - information like that that probably a lot of people are seeking, how do you handle that? Or do you just leave it to chance?

(Patrick): You mean distributing the documents?

Tony Holmes: Yes, because one of the things that I see as far as we're concerned is that that is possible something we could help (unintelligible) providing that linkage but I don't know whether it exists already.

(Patrick): So what we do with the document is we publish them on the ICANN website and see whether someone picks them up. So - no, we do - well, we do have some other mechanism as well.

First of all, it might be the case that the report itself for the advisory is an explicit advisory, for example, to ICANN Board. And it might be the case - and we have the ability to request that the Board actually - it might - the document itself might result in a Board resolution that in turn might, for example, instruct staff, ICANN staff, to do something or whatever, that's one way of getting things more widespread.

The other way we are trying to do is we're trying to spread out reports by communicating with various organizations like (unintelligible) as much as we can in the limited resources we have.

But we also do participate in other meetings in between ICANN meetings. For example, we are hosting a session at the Internet Governance Forum in (unintelligible) where we're specifically going to talk about the blocking issue, for example.

Yes, so that is one - so we are doing outreach activities where we are talking about the various reports we are doing. Including - which you should not

underestimate having meetings like this with all constituencies and ourselves and ACs at the ICANN meeting.

We just had a one-hour session with the GAC which have now 130 members - 100 members from 130 countries and they will have all our material distributed.

And now with MyICANN.org website it will be easier, also not only for us but for you of course to distribute material. But in the general sense, I was hardly joking, we put it up on the ICANN website. We are in the same physical situation as you to distribute whatever material you are creating.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, (Patrick). One of the things I think we should do is - a matter of course, try and use anything that goes down that path of linkage to ISPs is we should certainly make that link with you. And I'm sure we can work - we can do that and certainly as far as our membership's concerned, certainly benefit from them and probably benefit from you as well.

(Patrick): Yes, and I think - and we in SSAC absolutely. We don't mind having that kind of linkage and we can start by having - we don't have to build anything formal because we are very, like, laid back in SSAC compared to some other structures in ICANN.

For example, one of the reasons why I had a little bit of problem coming up with what we're going to talk about when you said, please let us know what is interesting to ISPs and I didn't really know.

For me that is indication that we do not communicate enough. I should have known, right. So we should absolutely talk more.

The second topic I just want to mention that we are working with because that is something where SSAC members - because we have a lot of SSAC members here at the ICANN meeting and I see a few of them managed to

actually find chairs in the room, (unintelligible) and (Andre) and a few others, it might be the case that they are reaching out to you, to you specifically from ISP community.

And that is a document on abuse metrics - sorry, work (unintelligible) abuse metrics. That is a - compared to the one Jim was talking about, this work party might not result in a report because what is important here is instead to try - we are trying to encourage parties that measure the amount of spam, the amount of - like, any kind of abuse regarding spam originating from newly registered domains and those kind of things to start to measure that in the same way and use the same variables.

So it's possible to compare data from all different kind of various sources.

So that is an activity that from my point of view as a Chair, very much might be end up - we SSAC just encouraging different third parties to talk more with each other. And it doesn't have to be us really writing a report. But for that it might be the case that SSAC can reach out to you or you reach out to us.

Man: Getting to what you just said, (Patrick), I've just remarked that in Argentina, in our Internet Exchange and Association, we have what we call an observatory. And we are - with some universities working on different applications to measure the domestic traffic to our exchange and different types of alternatives.

So this sort of application which you just mentioned or function would really be very interesting for us.

(Patrick): Thank you very much, and this is - (unintelligible) now spoke up and made it aware of - and made SSAC people in this room, including myself, aware of the initiative that you have.

That could be a success by itself, that I just mentioned that we're working on this topic. So for us that is a good thing because now we know about that, we help you connect with others. And this is one example of maybe we have success without writing report.

Man: (Unintelligible), just a small question regards how you are working. You report you are publishing - they are based on (unintelligible) I understand. Or is it how can I understand?

(Patrick): Yes, good question, thank you very much. In SSAC when we decide in SSAC as a whole, and we are the moment 38 members as said, we are seeing that we are - we can work on maybe five topics in parallel. This is due to people being interest, having time because we are volunteers, and of course the amount of staff support we have. So up to five topics in parallel.

Each topic has something that we call a work party, which has a work party leader which is an SSAC member. And then - so one can say that a work party is a subset of the SSAC members. And they are the ones that produce the report or come to the conclusion, no, no report is needed.

What they do is that they send that report to SSAC as a whole, just like you say, is then - it's a consensus driven process. So SSAC - we don't have a vote or anything. Either SSAC as a whole think this is a good thing to publish or not?

In the SSAC report though we do have an acknowledgement section where you will see the name - we think that it's important, where you see the names of the people that have helped with the report, with the production on the report.

That doesn't necessarily have to be one to one mapping with the work party members because sometimes you have an SSAC member that at this last stage is coming in and helping to really polish things, to be correct.

But at the end of - so you have the acknowledgement section where you can see what individuals have really been working on the report itself if you're interested. But the report itself as a whole is by consensus SSAC.

Jim Galvin: Just to add - just as we have an acknowledgement section we also have an opportunity for SSAC members who may have a particular point of view, which is opposite any particular portion - they don't even have to object to the document as a whole.

They might have a minority position that they want to represent. Our documents do actually have a place for individual members to indicate a minority position if they so wish.

I'm not actually aware of that ever having been exercised to date - one time, it did happen one time Julie says. I just wanted to add that.

Tony Holmes: Okay, Mark?

Mark McFadden: (Patrick), thanks. It's about the audience of the reports. And one of the things about the reports is that in our usual style they're complete, they're technically accurate.

But I think that for some people, I'm thinking of, like, the (.list) domains report and also the (Blacken) report as well, the technical completeness of the report gets in the way of some audiences actually reading it.

And I'm wondering what you think about it - I don't want to push a second document series on you and Jim, but the idea of taking some of the key findings that - for instance, some of the ones that are sort of counterintuitive in the (.list) domain one because people simply don't understand how the root works.

Crafting a new document from them or sort of adapting a new document that might be readable by policy makers, might be readable by consultants to registries and things - registrars and so forth. That actually takes the work of SSAC but adapts it for a wider audience.

(Patrick): Thank you, Mark. We have been thinking about having that sort of extra series but also that would add confusion. So we're - on the other hand, anyone is free to write something and reference our document, for example, write a simpler version or write something that fits their needs, like, I sort of heard that (Malcolm) was doing.

What we have been trying though and what we are doing is that we are today explicitly communicating with ALAC regarding the text in the document and the (unintelligible) and also work harder on having documents translated to make it easily available for - in the case of ALAC specific, developing countries and certain economies.

We - if it is the case that we are producing (unintelligible) documents, that would end up being a new document in our document series. And it would take the blocking document - for example, the first document we wrote, SSAC 50, is two pages long and the recipient was very explicitly targeted to be governments and people that don't understand the technical level.

The feedback that we got on SSAC 50 is that people who don't have the technical level do understand what we wrote, hooray. Either they're lying or just nice because they got a short document. They said, we understand the document but what they meant was thank you for short document.

But - so I do hope as the Chair that it is possible for us to actually write documents which are readable and understandable. And for example, for the root scaling document, we were discussing in the meeting this morning exactly this point, who is the targeted audience and what kind of wording should you use?

And so basically is it a document people should read and understand or is it a document that must be technically complete just - because other people write documents and reference it, that's a slight difference.

Man: Yes, I agree completely with what Mark said, especially about the (.list) (unintelligible). The (.list) (unintelligible) very important questions, especially for the brand names. I assume the impact was not very, very strong in the community. (Unintelligible) of impact.

(Patrick): For the (.list) domain, what happened was the Board - ICANN Board issued a resolution to instruct staff to - let's see if I remember it correctly here, to look at the consequences if the SSAC recommendations were implemented.

Staff decided - ICANN staff decided to be able to answer the question from the Board the staff wanted to have more input on what the community thought about the (.list) domain paper. So what ICANN staff did - notice not SSAC, they opened a public consultation that closed end of September and the reply period is still opened until November 5.

There are quite a large number of comments there actually, I guess around 20 or something. And then some replies are on its way coming in.

So - and the comments themselves are all the way from - if I exaggerate a little bit, SSAC is completely wrong, they do the wrong risk - when they did the - they came to the wrong conclusion when they did the risk analyzers to people saying, SSAC was far too nice, (.list) domain should absolutely be prohibited and removed from the Internet. So it was like the whole spectrum.

So I think regarding the (.list) domains, one reason why you don't hear so much about it might be just because they open consultation periods in ICANN or sort of silent periods. And now you have reply. So we'll see at November 5 what happens.

Man: Thank you.

Tony Holmes: I've got two quick points, (Patrick), before we have to wrap up. This has been incredibly useful for us. But maybe there are things that I'm sure are going to get asked and should know.

First, is there anything on your agenda that you haven't actually mentioned we should watch out for now in terms of...

(Patrick): No.

Tony Holmes: Okay, and the second is from our membership perspective, if they wanted to bring things to you what is the mechanism to do that, to get something on your agenda? How open are you to that?

(Patrick): We are extremely open. We actually - at the moment are looking at the question that got sent to us from one individual that are not even very active in ICANN. I think - yes, I think it would help my work if it was the case that SSAC wrote a document on this topic and we are now contemplating how to respond to that.

It could either - the result is quite often it ends up being just an email reply from me as the Chair after we have consensus in SSAC to send that or it could result in a work party being spun up.

The thing though as I mentioned, the only - to be able to do work party we must - just because we can only run sort of five or six a year and four in parallel, the better you focus on the question you ask - and not only - the higher the likelihood that we'll figure up, what is the question, what is the need, etc. Why - then we'll just do it.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. There is one topic area that you haven't mentioned, I understand that you do addressing within your scope as well deaddress, yes? Am I correct about that? Otherwise what I'm about to say is completely out of scope.

(Patrick): No, it might be the case (unintelligible) about IP addresses. Is that what you're thinking about? Or routing?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

(Patrick): Yes, we have had a couple of...

Tony Holmes: Specifically I was going to ask, have you done any work on (RPTI)?

(Patrick): We have so far not done any work on (RPTI). We do have our meeting in SSAC actually just after this and that's why we have to run away but the question has come up whether we should do any work on (RPTI).

We do feel confident - correct me if I'm wrong, I look at Jim, that is as Chair of the membership committee that we do believe that we do have the skill set necessary inside SSAC to be able to work on (RPTI). What we have experience with specifically - I have staff, ICANN staff as Chair. I refuse to accept work parties to start if it's not the case that there's a well-formed question.

So can you write a document on a (RPTI)? It's not good enough. Let me be straight.

Tony Holmes: Okay, what would you consider a well-formed question?

(Barbara Roseman): (Barbara Roseman) from ICANN. You know, one type of well-formed question might be should there be a single trust anchor or multiple trust anchors?

Should it be implemented, you know, with that trust anchor at IANA or somewhere else? Those are like the kinds of issues that go across the technical and somewhat political spectrum.

We give an answer on the technical issue in that case.

(Patrick): We're doing - we do - we draw technical - we do - we draw objective conclusions from technical inspections of the problems (unintelligible), that's basically where we are.

So apart from what (Barb) said, it could also be what would the impact be if - and have sort of a scenario, that could also be - for example, we have the root key rollover thing. We also have this blocking thing. What is the impact of blocking domain - blocking a service using a domain name for example?

Tony Holmes: Okay, we are ahead of the time when the impact of blocking or attempting to suppress rooting availability through replication of (RPTI) certificates is really an issue because we haven't had the (RPTI) adoption yet that we make that even remotely a thing.

However...

(Patrick): But it could be a valid question.

Tony Holmes: But it could be a valid question at some point in the future. At the moment, ISPs are faced with the prospects of (RPTI) as an issue and are faced with a question of whether or not to adopt it and what would be the longer termed impact of this.

And what - and the security aspects of (RPTI) in my opinion have been - in my rather uneducated opinion have been well studied in the context of the technical aspects of the protocol and those things. Have been very poorly

studied in the context of if this were deployed operationally how would this actually - what would the potential impact be broader?

What leavers would it apply? That could be used. What would be the consequences of using them in that fashion? Are there any better ways to deploy this that would mitigate those risks? Are there ways that would exacerbate those risks?

Are there variants of the proposal that could be done and so forth? That's the space that I think somebody should work in. Is SSAC interested in working in that space and if so how do we get it started?

(Patrick): So actually we need to run away now but let me say that the first part of what you just said, up until - or how should it otherwise be done to blah, blah, blah; if you ignore that part I think that's a perfect question.

You also have to remember that we are a bunch of volunteers. We don't have hired staff that (unintelligible) so we cannot do any research for example. So if - so the first part of your question is, I think perfectly valid and, yes, I do believe if I sense that the Chair of - the vibrations of the room of SSAC, yes, if we got that question we would not directly turn it down.

Jim Galvin: Yes, we do have to go. But one little thing which is interesting, want to emphasize one little point of the process. I mean the agenda items are actually decided by SSAC as a whole. So that's really kind of important.

You know, if you have a very, very specific question then it's easy to identify a few people who will sit down, answer the question, get it out and get it done, and that's good. If it actually requires setting up a work party and really uses resources, especially our staff resources, want to emphasize one little point.

It might be a very interesting topic but, you know, we have to - SSAC as a whole decides its agenda, okay. We don't drive - even the Chair and Vice Chair, we don't tell people what to do. We put out there the various topics and, you know, people have to agree what they want to work on and then we just facilitate making that happen.

So it's useful to point that out too.

Tony Holmes: Thanks to you guys, thanks.

(Patrick): Thanks.

Tony Holmes: That was very useful. Okay, we're not going back to the subject we were on before because we have another visit now from our NomCom colleagues, I think. Please, welcome.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: So the rules are you have to ask an interesting question to get a candy but otherwise - okay. Yes, but he isn't here at the moment.

Woman: Still, I don't know if - how much time we have.

Tony Holmes: Well, we've promised you 15 minutes I think so if we can keep to that - so I'd like to welcome our colleagues from this year's Nominating Committee who are going to help us really understand what we need to think about and what we need to do with regards to the NomCom for this year. Including this guy, who is representing the ISPs. (Unintelligible), please.

Woman: Okay, thank you for take us here. I do believe that's the short time so what we are here for is just to - first of all, take you some (unintelligible) about the recommendations, the GNSO, and each constituent has done last year to us

- to help us identify the candidates for all the leadership positions, Board and GNSO, ccNSO, and the ALAC.

Tony Holmes: Could I ask - could you just tell us what are the positions you actually have to fill in the next year?

Woman: Yes, in the next year we're going to have three Board members and remember that the term ending is (unintelligible). So two from (unintelligible), one from Africa.

And so what we need in first point is to say that we really make a matching metrics about the positions that we've got, recommendations like that, and the people we selected.

So all this information are inside our website and that is also the matching metrics to check each point from the slate of candidates from the Board. We only want candidates for GNSO and the (unintelligible).

So it's over that. The other thing that is quite relevant is just to see that doing the ATRT we have (unintelligible) all the sequence, the timeline and up to date this timeline, our website, and make it a clear - what is the next step, what do we want to do, what - the document we are publishing, what the candidate can read and everything to attend the first step of (unintelligible).

And another issue that is quite important is also to talk about the information that you gave us last year for the 2012. And if you can check it if that is still the same recommendation. If you - to add some new issues for - even for Board members or for the GNSO, and if you like to do that (unintelligible) the new Chair, that will be happy to be considered.

And again, matching the new candidates to that. So saying that, I would like to give (unintelligible) to the next Chair, (unintelligible), to let him make some comments about that.

Tony Holmes: Could I just ask one question that came to mind looking through this?

Woman: Yes, yes.

Tony Holmes: This new approach where there's more transparency, the process, I shouldn't have started that as you worked through this, hopefully, very large basket of candidates. You won't be actually giving any indication as to how you've slimmed that down in terms of numbers, is that..,

Woman: Yes, yes, I can, okay. What we normally have done last year's and this year's too is try to analyze each profile in each application. And the - given the first big selection. So we prefer, you know, those are, you know, possible good candidate. And those are (unintelligible) candidates and maybe those don't fit at all.

So for that position, for instance, (unintelligible). So after this (unintelligible) selection we - if it's for the Board we just send those people - those profiles and address to them - telephone (unintelligible) independent contract - (unintelligible) to analyze independent (unintelligible) profiles of the preselected members for the Board, only for the Board.

And the slate is (unintelligible), you know, like a (unintelligible) person or something like that. So we have this basket with this preselected guide with all details, information about - like, a profile - professional profile with all questions.

And that I did previously a meeting with these organizations, bring all the recommendations to them. We need to paint with this method. So please make the questions that give us some feedback that we could - you know, matching with the requirements of our community.

Okay, that's the (unintelligible). And then we go down, down, down (unintelligible) there are three positions we have on the Board, you know, and discuss each one and make the similar thing but all inside but divide in for groups inside each pair goes deeply and goes analyze and look for more information in those who - even Google and anything that you can find out about that candidate for all the other positions. And bring back to the whole committee.

And then we analyze that, that's - the process is also that, okay. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible) remember you put also the applicants (unintelligible) around which have not been appointed - selected to the basket for next year, that's - is it still ongoing?

Woman: Yes, yes, yes. Because - well, one thing that I decide to do this time was to write personally one email because that was - of course, matter of respect for all applicants. And thanking them for that and ask them to - if they want to reapply.

Some of them say, no, thank you. And the majority say, yes, please consider my name for the next year.

Man: Okay, (unintelligible) is my name, coming from Finland - Iceland and Finland and (unintelligible). Thank you very much for your time. I don't have so much to say yet because this new Nomination Committee, the NomCom 2013 starts its work on Friday. And we will work Friday and Saturday as our peak start meeting.

I would like to ask for your help and that is that since you all know I'm sure people who might be great ICANN directors or be good on these various councils or in ALAC, please tell them to apply.

And the - you know, the instructions on how to do it will be certainly on the NomCom website updated for our committee. When we start on Friday we take a look at a lot of the things of the rules of procedure of NomCom and we - looking, of course, for the - for possible revisions, amendments that could come from the recommendations that we're getting from the 2013 committee.

We're happy for all input we're getting. And I want to say that even if we are hit on the head with a bottle we certainly look inside the bottle less there is a message for us.

So that's what I'm going to do and then in Beijing we have more opportunity to talk to all constituencies and to get whatever input and recommendations they may have.

And I must say that having been a journalist actually once upon a time, I'm keen on being as transparent as possible about what we do. We are going to communicate and tell the communities what we are doing. But we have to respect one thing, and that is the confidentiality of the candidates, that's an absolute must. Thank you very much.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. And I think that's a good step forward, very good step forward, the transparency issue. Any additional questions? Okay. (Adam), another experienced man from the NomCom.

(Adam): (Adam) (unintelligible), I was Chair of the committee some years ago but I'm actually (unintelligible)'s associate Chair and will be supporting the committee this year.

Just about the section that says - request you guys to review and update the recommendations from last year. (Vanda) has published a very complete report on the 2012 work so if you go to the NomCom website, which is NomCom.ICANN.org, you'll find report for 2012.

And then there's a list of all the different criteria that people will use - people use to suggest what candidate - the ideal candidate profile should be for the directors, for the GNSO, for the ccNSO, etc.

So if you want to use that as a sort of baseline, do we think those criteria are good? Is that what we want in the candidate, then that should help you very much as sort of editing, yes, that's fine or to add some additional comments this year.

And you'll find those in the - Page 19 of the report. But it's all there, very comprehensive report with all the listed criteria. So, you know, any improvements very welcomed. So it's all there.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, (Adam), that's really helpful. Okay, thank you very much for joining us.

Woman: Thank you for your time.

Tony Holmes: And we'll see you in Beijing. Thank you. So we really got a pretty full agenda so we're going to move on quite swiftly. And we - the next point on the agenda we want to turn to is Whois. If I could ask you to excuse yourself to the meeting and bring us up to date on the replacement protocol issue for Whois?

Man: Thank you, Tony. I do have (unintelligible) should I use it or - wasn't it - okay.

Tony Holmes: (Unintelligible).

Man: Sure. Yes. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Could I just make sure in the meantime that anyone who hasn't signed in on the sheet with your coordinates, could you please do so? Okay, you're

driving? Can I just check how many people on the remote participation?

Okay, thanks.

So maybe we should make that an apology, it appears we may struggle to put this presentation through the Adobe. Thank you.

(Francisco): Thank you, Tony. First of all, I'm not (unintelligible). I'm (Francisco Arias). I work in ICANN in the (unintelligible) liaison department on the technical side.

(Unintelligible) is tied up in another consistency giving similar presentation so I will try to do my best here.

So the presentation is about the replacement of the Whois protocol, this is something that has been - this (unintelligible) several times in the past and (unintelligible) to make it happen.

The idea of it has been a couple of (unintelligible) previously to develop a new protocol to (unintelligible) the old Whois as we know it, the (unintelligible) Whois.

The - some of the reasons why people think we need a new protocol are - (unintelligible) here, for example, the lack of internationalization support in Whois, the way Whois is defined. There is no way to identify the encoding that is being used.

So you don't really know what you have there and what has been used - traditionally is to use ASCII data. And you cannot support other languages beyond English, let's say, or a few Western languages in Whois.

Also, there is the issue of the lack of consistent format for the output every single (unintelligible) software squeeze, they can do it in (unintelligible) ways. Same thing for the registrants, there is no consistent (unintelligible) as to what they should show.

And I'm not talking about the specific elements of the show because that's a policy decision. I'm talking about the way the format in the technical sense that these elements should be present.

In the same way there are no standard for the format of the elements that are included in the Whois (unintelligible) like the dates, phone numbers, etc.

Next slide, please. Also, another thing that people have brought to the discussion is that the current Whois protocol does not support differentiated axis.

By this it means there is no way to - for example, (unintelligible). The client that is making the query so you can offer differentiated access to the informants of security vendors or some other way and so this way in (unintelligible) could offer more queries to a certain file that is authenticated or more detail information about the specific record given that they would be able to authenticate that the party.

And this is something that cannot be done with the current who's protocol. Next slide please.

So to solve this there is a new working group in the idea that was formed a few months ago.

This yes and the name is sometimes in (ADF) they lacked in then creative names let's say.

So the charter of this working group is to standardize the format and of the protocol and describe the objects that will be delivered on Whois and is building upon the previous support to replace Whois.

There is a protocol that what developed in the past called (IRIS) and the name of the working group that work on that is (Chris) which is the what is shown there in the two bullet.

They develop a series of requirements that surprisingly so they are very up to date most of them so we the people participated in the working group thought that they could build upon those.

The other interesting goal of the protocol is to produce something that is easy to use and implement and of course that has to support the internationalized registration that. Next slide please.

Also the protocol is plant includes the differentiated access that I mentioned before. So as the need or the I'm sorry the other thing important queries which have different types of (unintelligible) mainly in ICANN most of the four usually is focused on the (unintelligible) but there is also the part of the number raise just by this I mean the (IRIS) regional like raised just like (Arie) arrived (Lockland) etcetera.

And in this case they are actually in the way. Next slide please.

So what does (IRIS) mean? They the protocol there is being developed is called (unintelligible) Whois. (Unintelligible) is a concept of what develop a few years ago and it's the best model for the (SCTP) protocol. (SCTP) protocol is what is used in the Web.

And the idea is to have something that is very simple to use that you can have urls to point to the specific objects that you want to query in Whois. There is an example there from one of the (IRIS) are in they already offered this type of interface.

So one of the good things about this is built upon the tools that are accessed in the Web that are many programmers many people that know who to

implement this and so it's cheap and easy to implement and offers all the advantage that the Web already offers.

Next slide please. So I mentioned before the number raised three (Sara) ahead on this they were one of the main parties switching for having this happen.

Are in particular they have a production service already working and they reported I believe it was at the start of this year that the (unintelligible) Whois service since January receives more queries than the portfolio Whois so this service in (unintelligible) attracted more users than the portfolio Whois.

Next slide please. So the working group in the ITF was started in April this year and is working on five different services being the standard the name for the standard developing idea.

Here there is the list of the types of the specifications that are being developed I don't think I need to go into detail unless you really want.

And the important thing here is that this for it is scheduled or is planned to be completed by December. I should note however that this doesn't mean by them will have immediately a protocol there's still this is when the working group is going to finish then there is a still small piece of the process in the idea that goes into the ratification through the steering group in the idea and that will take between two to four months depends on who complexes the protocol.

So we we're talking about having a protocol ready by early 2014. Next slide please.

This is there are a couple slides about the detail process that will be followed in the idea of I don't think there is too much volume going all through this next slide please.

One more please thank you. So lastly in this invitation for you to get involved in the work of this working group in the ITF.

They there is an opportunity in the next idea meeting which is happening in Atlanta for the week of November 24 November and you can also participate in the mainly list in that link you can find all the information about the working group and you are more than welcome to join.

Thank you.

Man: Okay thank you very much. Open for questions.

Man: Yes (unintelligible). Just a question for the process after a few machines of the corporate is one year ahead. So just to understand what does he means when the protocol is has been developed so who is in charged while which implemented?

Is it so in the ICANN environment how is it as process?

Man: Thank you very good question. So this is a virtual presentation and we didn't have, you know, space to cover the other topic.

We actually have a session tomorrow morning I believe it's at 11 it's a during he Whois updates in which we are going to talk about the other piece but in very short what this is about.

There is an (unintelligible) report (Sack) 51 is the name of the report that was released I believe last year in which (essa) called for the between other things for the replacement of Whois the board adopted that report and called for the development of a road map to replace Whois.

That road map went through poorly comment number process and was the final version of that roadmap was published on June this year.

And basically what this roadmap calls for is and it's low adoption of the protocol in the ICANN sphere.

For example in the case of the (CC) gTLDs there is no mechanics that was that is in the system itself for required for this sensitivity of this so the only mechanics that is available there is to invite them to adopt it.

Because of the gTLDs there are mechanics to other mechanics available to make this happen like the development of policy development process or individual enable in the contracts.

And what the roadmap says is that both should be done ups at the same time. And ICANN report that have or there is one well two gTLDs that have agreed to move forward with these and adopt that as a provision in their contracts that's dot com and dot name they are of this is morae.

I just went through the presentation. Yes we are on the questions so you are just in time.

Then I was saying their recent dot com renewal they accepted (unintelligible) accepted provision to implement the replacement of Whois once it is standardized and ICANN calls for it and same thing for dot name.

I'm not sure what's the status of that but the draft that was for poorly common included that provision.

Man: Okay thanks. I have a follow on question. This might be a little bit out of scope but be interested to get view if you're able to offer one.

Went up to this before. It seems that what's actually being provided here I think you're presentations set it out well is an extension of the capabilities and that the protocol was changing to provide more capability with to its.

But I've heard some people make a case that in terms of policy issues around Whois we really should need to wait until the new protocol that comes along.

Well I haven't seen anything in here suggest that the policy issues as they need to be drafted around existing Whois would not some degree be compatible with what's been set out here.

Is there anything you can specifically point to which you would say this is this would be a real roadblock on policy where you fundamentally have to change anything that exists today.

Man: So then then the idea is to separate to the couple I guess is the right word here the policy from the protocol the technique of work upon the protocol. That yes we have a protocol that is capable of the implement and policy that is required and by that I mean a raises that like to have a very restricted as access to the information or on the other end raises that like to have a very open access to the information.

So yes to have a protocol that can support all of that and so you will leave the decision of what a policy implement to the race thing. So in that sense that yes to completely separate both so the protocol will not require any policy to be implemented you will enable the (unintelligible) to implement the policy that they want or have to implement depending on their policy maker that applies to the TLD.

Man: And so what you're really saying is if you made a policy that was applicable for the Whois as it is today you'd put virtually lift that up and apply it to the new protocol there's no barriers to doing that so.

Man: Correct if you have a policy that you develop at this time then your protocol should be able to support it.

Man: Just a little bit on background. On there one because I was on the Whois (RT4) and we've found ourselves we being the review team plus ICANN plus some other parties in this pretty complicated ballpark where there were couple of suggestions either coming from ISOC or coming from (RT4).

And some of them or many of them would eventually lead to sort of development or protocol work to actually get it implemented. And as I got it by that point in time there was a common understanding that ICANN is not a place to do protocol development.

So the proper way to do protocol development is actually to go to the ITF. And it is exactly what is happening now. I do agree that the goal is as much as I have learned recently to decouple the policy decisions from the implementation decisions.

I am a little bit reluctant to fully subscribe to the idea that we can go ahead already within the ICANN framework to do policy development and not wait to adopt wait until we have pretty good understanding what a technical basis would be.

So I do agree that there are very substantial and very fundamental questions that may require a PDP there are potentially other things which do not require a PDP but rather a decision by the Board of Directors of ICANN in relation to the recommendations of (FDS) or the (RT4).

So do we agree we should try to speed up the whole process to get the stuff implemented but we should not open the situation open the structure to attempts from the outside from parties which are not subscribed by now to this whole process to find good reasons to block this thing again.

Man: Okay thank you. Any other comments on this?

Okay if not well thank you very much. Do you presentation?

Man: I don't know if it's possible to give more interpretation to.

Man: Much are you can take if it's come please.

Man: Thank you (Francisco) for doing this on my behalf and I agree with everything I'm sorry I didn't get your name sir but the ITF is very allergic to policy to implementing policy.

So I think that everybody in the room is kind of agreeing that what we want to provide is tools that would allow you to provide this service and implement whatever policy is imposed upon you or you see fit or however that's going to work.

I think that that decoupling is ideal. I understand the concern though about well I don't know what this is going to be before I start writing policy about it.

But I think my only useful input to that process is we want to enable you to do whatever policy you want so as much as you trust me when I say that you can possibly start drafting policies earlier rather than later.

And you can see what the protocol looks like in its very early stages now just by going and looking at the draft (Francisco) provided the url. But I understand absolutely the reticent to do so to jump the gun.

Man: I was actually coming out of it from the other side but I've heard arguments made that we should just stop doing policy right now until protocol from the protocol stat.

And my question was I couldn't see anything in what you presented that said even if you've only got that far down the road with policy development you can't lift that up and apply it to the new protocol.

That didn't seem to be any variance...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I totally agree as an engineer I wouldn't wait but as a first as a not I am not a policy person so I can't claim to understand the reasons why you'd want to wait.

So I'd look there are two different worlds and that's kind of how we want it to be.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes then Mikey. I just sort of woke up from my mid-afternoon eyes open nap and realized that do you have any thoughts about the difference between thick and thin Whois on this protocol? You want to...

((Crosstalk))

Man: This is not this is the second time that question has happened today.

Man: Oh it's because we're in the middle of a motion to evaluate that's why it's the hot topic...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Again to avoid it as a policy question and strictly to take it as a technology question what we are trying to produce should allow you to be either of those mode in either of those modes.

Man: Okay so that I want to pause on that and just brief the rest of you. I'm the Chair of the drafting team on the thick Whois charter. That came out of the (IRTPB) working group where we were trying to get people moved over to thick Whois because we thought it was a really good idea.

It's also coming out of (IRTPC) because in order to enact the recommendation form (IRTPC) that introduces a change of registrant process in addition to a change of registrar.

Change of registrant is easy to do in thick Whois because it's pretty easy to validate that the Whois data has not changed and thus the registrant has not changed and then there's no mechanism to do that.

Is it safe to say that if let's wave our magic wand and all the stuff is built and it's implemented that this could be used to validate the Whois data by both registrars in a thin Whois environment so that we could say yes the registrant didn't change from during this inter-registrar trans because we could do this query on both sides.

Man: Multiple times in fact.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Multiple times yes.

Man: I'm having trouble coming up with a reason to say no so I believe that yes you could do that.

Man: Okay that's wonderful.

Man: I believe that's true.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible) thank.

Man: In order to be sure of that I think that I will take that question back to the working group and say this is something that we need to address and or is this something that we need to address or is our protocol actually so generic already that you can do that and we don't have to think about it but that can be real could well be the case.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay any on the points? Oh thanks very much to you two thank you.

Man: Hello?

Man: Yes sorry did you have a question?

Jaime Wagner: I put the question in the Adobe Connect and so what happens with the Whois studies already in cross and do you have the adoption of the new protocols?

Man: Jaime this is Jaime isn't it?

Jaime Wagner: Yes this is Jaime Wagner.

Man: So can you just repeat the question Jaime I didn't quite catch it?

Jaime Wagner: I understand we the GNSO council authorized the a series of Whois studies and by third parties and those are in course I think both is more or as well could have a better understanding of these but I think there are some studies already incurred and they were in the event of the rapid adoption of these new protocols would and the and these studies in these and they didn't come to an end are they still valid?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey let me the sound quality isn't terrible good so let me just read his question out of the chat.

Man: Okay yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Jaime said what happens with the Whois studies that are already in course or are already underway in the GNSO and there's a whole draft of them statistics and so on and so forth.

Are they still valid with the adoption of weird and I think it's a similar question to mine which is but it might be a useful exercise for the policy game and the ITF gang to get together with those reports and kind of eyeball them together.

Man: I'm aware of the studies I haven't seen them with the results yet but they are certainly people in the working group that forward them to the working group list every time ICANN has put out a call for (unintelligible) our winner from complete.

And we're actually doing one of our own as well an inventory of all the Whois servers out there and what day-to-day report, what it looks like, what formats they follow so that when we roll out something the data model we're talking about can accommodate the vast majority of or all of them depending on what's practical.

So happy to hear happy to share research is all I mean it's all public anyways so but yes if there is useful valid we had that we should have it.

Man: Okay thanks again. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh hang on one second Jaime got a follow up in the chat. Sorry, you know, I well you should think about poor old me I haven't had any coffee I've had too much chocolate I took a little eyes open nap this is really hard.

Man: Sorry to wake you up sir.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Jaime asks a follow up question which is these studies touch for instance the questions on proxy. And...

Man: We're talking about redirection?

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm not...

Man: No?

Mikey O'Connor: ...sure. Jamie you want to expand on proxy? You mean technical proxy or do you mean proxy as in proxy privacy? You may be new at...

Man: Are you there Jaime?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes privacy proxy. So in other words if we had a big rhubarb in the policy arena about how privacy and proxy providers behave in the Whois and all that is there anything in weird that would make it easier or harder to implement?

Man: No keep in...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...mind that weird is a strictly a query of existing data not a registration so I have to assume you're talking about if A is asking for registration data on behalf of somebody else is that what you're talking about?

Mikey O'Connor: The other way around. The proxy is for registrant who wants to remain private and so they use a proxy provider to...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...their idea and I think I'm going to make something up for you because I've been...

Man: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor:a guy all day and I'll tell you later what that means. But I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm glad I have your card.

Mikey O'Connor: ...you know, the proxy provider will have weird compliant data in the model. You know, they will still have name, address, phone number, fax, blah. And that from the weird's perspective there's no difference.

Man: Yes so just want to say some. I think there is not impact because at the end of the day the way proxy registrations work or the way I believe they work is you have someone else put in their data instead of the pie that they're using the domain name.

So there is no impact by having the new protocol there.

In that sense however there could be a new way in which this could be implemented if there were any interest because by having for example our indication as part of the protocol then you could have for example a case in which you have imagine a theoretical policy for registering in which you only have access to certain set of fields if you are one of the indicated.

But if you authenticate because you are a law informant so who knows what you have access to the rest of the data. So in that way you could perhaps change the way the proxy registration work is that where for interest to

anyone I just don't know but I'm just thinking here that that could be a different way to do it because I have to be the way it's just ideas of what the protocol could enable to do.

Mikey O'Connor: Jaime comes back and maybe Jaime will draw a line under this one because we are running a bit late.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: But he's got one last question and that is any typing? This guy Jaime he's tricky.

Authentication will be required for every registration question mark.

Man: That's a registration question not a Whois question right?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: He wanted another mike (Tony) is not in your dreams.

Anyway thanks guys.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: And Jaime thanks for hanging in there with me I'm sorry I'm so choppy on the remote participation today.

Man: Yes okay thanks. What I want to do now is very quickly turn the floor over to one of our colleagues from the (ISP). Thomas is stand in for the GNSO council chair election.

We all know Thomas well and I think it's a great opportunity for you to say a few words back to us as we're poised at this very near point in time where we

have to vote on this issue so the floor is yours Thomas and welcome (unintelligible).

Thomas Rickert: Thank you so much for you kind introduction. For those who haven't met me I'm Thomas Rickert and I have been nominated for the position of the GNSO council chair.

I am a non-comm appointee which means that I am one of the three persons that do not originate from there is groups or other groups are constituency and as such as I have been allocated to the contracted party's house.

And since I was allocated to the contracted party's house I give the registries and registrars I felt it was inappropriate for me to further participate in the (ISPCP) for, you know, obvious reasons of, you know, not being conflicted.

Nonetheless I would like to remind you that prior to my GNSO position I was in this group I represented the (Echo) the Association of the German Tenant Industry and now (Oliver Zooma) is much more active than I am because, you know, I put sort of my activities with the (ISPCP) on hold.

I don't want to take too much of your time but just give you the opportunity to ask me any questions should there be any. There's still enough time the elections are tomorrow so you might want to learn more about me or what I'm doing and if so feel free to ask me any question you would like to.

Man: Okay thanks Thomas. Any particular follow up questions. I think most of us know you very well Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: But you don't have to make up questions but I just wanted to come in show my appreciation for the group.

Good to see the good turn out that's very encouraging we had meetings where there were not so many people present just to give the opportunity to, you know, discuss...

Man: And we've had meetings where there's been a lot more as well so. (Tony).

(Tony): I don't have a question I just wanted to wish you luck.

Man: Okay and I'll add my name to that as well. Thomas just one point for clarification which I believe is my correct understanding that as the non-comm appointee to the contracted party's house you are actually a virgin member and I think it's been clarified now that when we have this vote you actually have a vote as well is that correct?

Thomas Rickert: That is correct. There has been some confusion surrounding that. I think that (Will) is much better place to expand the background because he was one of the persons drafting the GNSO operating procedure which defined the election process.

In there it is defined that, you know, there's a sense and there should a non-comm appointee not camp out at one of the houses that should be a non-voting chair.

And there are folks that read that sentence in a way that the NCA is just allocated to the house but is not originating from the house and that therefore any NCA that is collected GNSO council chair would be non-voting.

Others way that following the allocation to one of the houses that would be NCAs inside the house so that only the non-voting NCA there's one non-voting NCA only the non voting NCA would then remain non-voting chair.

This might be a little bit confusing it has been confusing for many others. We have sought clarification with general council and general council has

responded that the NCA chair would remain elected a voting if that person was voting before which means that yes answering your question I would be voting both during the election and afterwards.

Man: Okay thank you. Any other questions? Well we've got Thomas we certainly wish you luck and I hope whenever your term ends whenever that may be we'll have both you and (Oliver) back in the (unintelligible) space.

Thomas Rickert: You won't be able to get rid of me that quickly...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you so much for listening.

Man: Okay I want to step back quickly Mikey to where we were with the (DSSH) stop and what we want to do because of the time is try and bring that conversation to a conclusion the explanatory conversation fairly quickly.

And then one of the things I'd like to do today just to draw attention to the draft response back to the new ISPs on that issue where hopefully we can within a couple of days approve that...or get comments on it whatever may be.

So if you can give us the very short version of (DSSH). And I know we were on the short version anyway because it makes the a little shorter.

Mikey O'Connor: Even shorter. This is the Zen of (DSSH). So I'm going to go right to the payday slide.

There's three things that are going on right now that we're asking people for help on. One is what we're going to talk about in a second which is my

cracked voice pleading to all the constituencies oh please comment on our base one report so we can get some feedback on it that's what we'll talk about in a second.

The other two things we'll talk about later. The key is down at the bottom as a url where you can get to all kinds of information about the (DSSH) and if anybody in the group wants I'll just post this whole thing out to our list because we are running way late.

Let me take you to our purposed language and again offer my heart felt thanks to Tony for drafting this. Tony Harris yes to be clear.

You know, if you guys could like change your nicknames or something so, you know, one could be like we did this is Antonio actually.

Man: Antonio well that's handy. (Unintelligible) so there's not consensus about nicknames.

Man: You've been in South America.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay. Tony do you want to take us through this real short thing you want me to read it? I have...

Tony Harris: If you read it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay. That's no problem I've been really exercising my tranquil pills today because of the way this is working out. So our suggested draft is to say the ISPC wishes to offer support to the (DSSH) working group phase one report which addresses issues which are critical to the ISP and connectivity provider's core activities.

For example ISPs connectivity providers are often the frontline responders to DNSSR issues. ISPs have a strong culture of collaboration and support the collaborative nature of (DSSH) work.

Evidently ISPs would benefit from this because there maybe gaps and overlaps and the existing response to DSS DNSSR issues it need to be addressed.

Identifying DNSSR issues are likely to reduce risks, improve customer service and improve the quality of ISP services.

The ISP thanks the working group for the work they've done so far and supports the continuation of that work to its conclusion.

This is certainly an important step towards enabling a better understanding of the security and stability of the global name system DNS.

So as the eventual recipient of this I think it's darn nifty so I will conclude my reading with a big thumbs up from Mickey and then open the floor up to questions.

Man: Okay well we can take any questions on this now but my intent with this is that we should post it to the (ICPC) list and I'd like to cut it really short.

So if there are any comments back on this we should probably set a deadline for two days and then I would suggest we submit it. I don't think that meets your timeline (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: That would be lovely I'll send it out to the list in a second.

Man: Okay thanks Mikey.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Just a comment to you to the anti-issue. You know, I've followed several times when the Mikey came up and he raised his fingers and said, okay here's a report because this could be very important for you for your company's near back order.

So and I also tried to get (Sue) and I told you once that is a time problem and it's also a problem about how to dig into that report for me personally.

So I could give you an example I tried because I have a big company in the background so I sometimes I don't know where those guys are who maybe interested in those things so they have to court of you and I the organization and all these matters going continuously forward.

So that what I personally did well I contact a few persons I send them this report they the condensed ones the condensed version and informed them about that I still waiting for any reaction on that.

I just offered, you know, that I personally cannot give some support and explanations about them but we have contacts to friends here who could do that that's what I would try to do so.

I personally support your work cavity I don't have any problem with that left here so in this regard.

So I would like to say that and encourage others how to do so to try to find out people who may be involved or maybe interested in that in the company and sometimes it helps you may hear then from another corner out of your companies and you have expected that there's somebody who may be interested in so thanks.

Man: Yes I think there was an element of that that went into Tony's draft as well...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...to support work without to (unintelligible) it down any more so what might seem as a fairly top level response I think there was no one with that that came into that.

Thank you so we could cut down that past.

Mikey O'Connor: There's quick shot on the screen of our Website. There's lots of stuff for you to steal in addition to the report. All of the methodology that we've built is sitting out there it's all in Excel it's all in open format.

So, you know, they're there's plenty of material that you could, you know, you might want to even point them at this page and help them navigate through some of the how you can help and tools you might find useful section and that might...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...be another set of tools for you to use with people in your organizations.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay thanks. We've only got about 15 minutes left before the meeting as was scheduled. And then we need to do some official things with the membership which will be a part of the meeting which restricts its members.

But we've got a couple things to go through. And one of them is and speaking some feedback here on an issue that's been paired a number of times across the last couple of days.

It's this issue of this intersessional meeting that started off as an attempt to further outreach within ICANN this is GNSO based I should add.

And what's spun out of there is proposed amount that is in two forms one is to have an intersessional eight foot either of these is a roundabout the end of January.

One person said in the CSG meeting the other day was that it fixed in 27th or 28th of January. I don't believe that's the case it's still open.

But the timeframe is the last two weeks in January or the first week in February. The help place for this is going to be either Brussels or L.A.

For most people I think it's open but some I know are pushing heavily for L.A. on the basis that what we need is staff involvement. And that staff involvement is going to be fixated by the format of the meeting.

And currently there's two approaches that have been put forward. One would be because there's a budget in it of 150 (k) been allocated for this that we should look to fund somewhere in the region and the number of areas from constituency to constituency in the proposal.

But between six and ten people will be funded from each constituency to attend. The other proposal is to open this meeting up a lot wider to provide some similar level of funding but the details have not yet been established.

And maybe take it up to a maximum of about 175 people and broaden the discussion out to include a number of policy issues that can be progressed with the help of staff.

So a little bit is going to be with some people have suggested briefings by staff others have suggested keep the briefings to a minimum but actually have an interchange with staff around some of the key issues.

And there's a session planned with the jazz of the SGs to discuss this later during this ICANN meeting.

So what I wanted to get out of this meeting was what are the critical points for me to represent your views in that meeting. The status of this is that to date because it's started with outreach my input initially was to suggest that if there's going to be a limited amount of funding for the constituencies it's far more appropriate to divert that funding to the people in the constituency who are really dealing with outreach.

So in our constituency we do have a group of people that are responsible for that and we're working towards having an outreach event with the Beijing meeting.

They're also working to put use materials for the constituency and this is one of those things we're going to touch on when we have the close meeting as to where we are with some of that stuff.

And I think that whatever happens whether we go for one option or the other if an element of that is going to be outreach those people should be front of the queue for whatever funding exists rather than just some of the exact members as well.

So that was my initial input. And there's been little clarity if anything the scope of this has got broader and wider part since the last call we had we've well poke our rather than tying it down.

So I want to get some feedback from constituency members particularly as to where we go with this, what are the key things we should look towards you what is there a desire to have a boarder meeting to try and progress some of the policy issues with staff.

A counted to that I suppose the support for that is based on the fact that ICANN doesn't meet for six months in essence no or whether we still make sure whatever happens we want the outreach issues incorporated in that.

And particularly I'd like some feedback from some of the members who are dealing with outreach in this constituency to say whether you'd be able to consider attending that because I don't want to make a case if you can't and what your views are, Tony.

Tony Harris: Well first of all I am working on outreach and I can attend actually I will be in L.A. myself on that day. And as far as what you've described at the meeting it's concerns me a little bit because if it's discussing or reviewing policy pending policy issues we could end up the two days talking about intellectual property or something like that and never get to outreach.

It would turn into a regular ICANN meeting but compressed into two days so that sounds a little complicated.

Man: Yes and thanks and that's the line that I've taken so far is that whatever happens has to be this strong component of outreach in some form or the other as part of that (Alan).

(Alan): Yes well also prediction that we'll be admitted number of people like who attend at this meeting is that correct?

Man: Well there's two elements to that two answers to that question two elements is the answer.

The first is there will be a limited number of ICANN funded attendees and that's where my point was that those at the front of the queue should be...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...well let me answer the second part as well.

The size of the meeting could be limited to a maximum it's been suggested of ten from each constituency. On the other hand other people have said let's broaden this out and whilst the travel support wouldn't extend to cover all this I'm glad to say that it could go up to something like 175 max but I haven't even got a venue yet or date and so.

(Alan): Is there a risk to wait for a bit to get at the total number of people about to attend or to the number of people attending the constituency and there the ways to repeat the budget.

((Crosstalk))

Man: The budget's certainly not ever going to go beyond ten per constituency if it ever reaches that level.

(Alan): Yes. One point (unintelligible) where is that meeting be only open to people we request some funding?

Man: Well this was one of my problems where the boarder meeting because if you say well there's got to be a max and that I don't know whether it's to give 175 was random or whether they have some substance behind that level but one of the questions asked was what if you're going to pull an artificial limit on that.

How are you going to ensure those representation for mores it first come first serve or where did you go on the line and that's one of the issues that needs to be discussed.

But let me put this another way. Is everyone happy particularly those of you who are involved in outreach that we make the case that whatever happens whatever form it takes outreach has to form an integral part of that meeting.

So that's a first issue. And the second is I'd just like to get in agreement so we know where we stand on funding oddly that people dealing with outreach should be at the front of the queue for whatever funding is available and I don't know what level that is then, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes I fully agree with regard to the outreach item from our side. So I understand that the agenda would (unintelligible) is not available not yet. So they just some discussion.

So what I would like to say is when I heard this morning the board in the in our discussion of the board on Whois (RT) recommendations you it gave me the impression that (Steve Copper) mentioned that it's a decision the board decision is not yet mature to be taken on Thursday about what to do with your recommendations.

So that's where I got the impression. So that means that there shall be something in between it shall be done with Whois the (RT) recommendation and the question is what and if that's that it mean that this could be an item for that meeting.

Man: Well I hope not because the issue of making a decision on Whois is pretty much with the board now. So I don't know what needs to be done from a policy perspective other than if on Thursday they don't pass the or that GNSO as they kind of agree on submitting the matrix that everyone subscribe to then there's a problem there because the board haven't got much to go on.

But I don't think that that's going to be out in the debate again in council I think that decision will be taken on Thursday.

That doesn't mean Whois won't be on the agenda. One of the fears I have been opening up for broader issues is exactly the fear nothing it's only said what we don't want is to find that we end up with sending people for a couple

days half way across the world and when they get there all they talk about is intellectual property issues.

So that's why I think it would be helpful from our perspectives to insist that there's a strong element of attention to outreach with trying to pull expertise and (unintelligible) and that anti-(unintelligible) staff that can help with that, (Malcolm).

(Malcolm): Tony I'm a little confused about the concept here when we're talking about outreach. What are we talking about planning outreach activities or conducting an outreach event.

Man: Both have been tabled for various groups for this particular meeting. Some have favored that it should form an outreach event some as part of it some have suggested that there needs to be some attention given to commonality or messages and materials that groups who are involved in outreach for ICANN use.

In other words what we don't want is 15 different groups going out with outreach but a whole set of material that conflicts.

(Malcolm): Oh yes.

Man: So...

(Malcolm): But also to be perfectly honest I can't see an outreach event being successful if A if frankly policy discussion is really a major part of it which you can give out parts of discussion. It should be about an introduction to the policy issues and how to take part.

On the other hand if it's a planning event then you could say segment up the times so that some is for matter issues like accounts that outreach planning and other staff some more substantive issues.

Man: I'm with you on that and I think that that probably is a good approach. I think the whole sort of having an outreach event in L.A. I just find that preposterous personally.

We should be doing it in parts of the world where outreach is badly needed for ICANN. Beijing maybe a good place to start but certainly not L.A, (Cullen).

(Cullen): Could you just give a shot update about who else this constituency feels involved...

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Cullen): ...and reaching out to us.

Man: Okay that's probably going to form five minutes running overtime that I anticipated we do anyway.

So we'll do that.

(Cullen): Good.

Man: Just draw a line under this and I think everyone's okay with the message that part of that focus should be outreach and in terms of the way we handle it as a constituency a focus to include those people responsible.

And now it's their chance to talk about this. What I would ask is that we have a quick five minutes of update as to where we are with the outreach activities because we have started trying to take that in a much better way than we've done before.

The people involved are (Tony) (Élan) (Akinori) in particular done some great work on this stuff.

I think (Unintelligible) you've been involved is that right?

Not much. Okay Tony do you want to take that office leading that group?

Tony Harris: Sure. Well basically we've been working on get there having a brochure. We were unable to assemble the content of the brochure in time to have it printed for this meeting but that's still in the works.

As far as activities go (Akinori) came up with a great suggestion of making presentations in the IRIR meetings and I think you already quoted in it too is that correct (Akinori)?

(Akinori): Ah yes we did yes this is (Akinori). We did that thing at meeting and the right meetings and we are I've already coordinated thin apps and doing that in (Aaron) next week and also in the (Lockland) meeting it's already agreed.

And (unintelligible) meeting in November and in November they already planned that we on the way to do that.

Thank you and before I mention it's finished.

We did write up a few documents. I think the last circulation was from (Helen) a who's you sent the three documents for comments right recently?

You resent them yes. So we didn't get many comments I think. No so perhaps we should resend them if you agree Tony...

Tony: Yes.

(Akinori): ...and ask everybody please to pay attention and comment because that would be the substance of what our communications will be.

Man: I think the problem with that partly was that it was probably not close to the ICANN meeting I think that's why I've been moved that.

But it would be good to recirculate it. The other thing that hasn't been mentioned is that we were looking to hold some form of outreach event as well at the Beijing meeting.

So fortunately in some ways it is six months out. We haven't got time to do that and that's where the focus will be for the first part of that.

(Akinori): Yes there is a (Lockland) meeting in two weeks in (Unintelligible) which I will be attending and I have a slot there to make a presentation for the ISPCP.

I was thinking actually that that would be a great place to talk about Mikey's work the (DSSH) and perhaps leave some at least a sheet of paper where people can find the link and that sort of thing.

Do you agree with that (unintelligible)?

Man: Yes and what I would ask for is that people who are attending events once we have this materials ready to go carry it into other events.

For instance I know (Jen)'s going to be at (Beckert) but obviously we're not going to have it ready in time to do that.

Now but in the future if we could seek some help from members this is one area we need to work out on and also we'll use our outlets in the regional associations in exactly the same way.

(Wolf).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you (unintelligible). Just one question. I can always since from your experience with the presentations at the different outings usually I would expect that if there if you meet interest there in meetings people would urgently quickly respond or ask questions and not wait and weeks or so that you till you get any answer of that.

How is that going on in those meetings? Do you have any experience about that or it's, you know, your presentation is that also documented in the document that others can find it and do you have a contact address here?

Thank you.

(Akinori): All presentation made during right meeting was been admitting are recommended and the right agency Website or at the Website the (Japanese) Website so there is not only is there in the Japanese (unintelligible) written is that the meeting meet of kind.

Man: What and any action right now until?

(Akinori): All right actually I and I talked about that and in I've at the meeting I've got two or three (unintelligible) oh okay at in general they're and the the rest of this month's last queue not the issue comments and for ethnic meeting I've got response back quite deep responders well like that.

And but I did it is not very bad but I think that it's good because they it might the presentation drew their attention by in such way well like that.

And then I've got a opportunity to explain about the presentation and then moreover to explain about ISPCP and our my intention to do that.

So in a right meeting (Alan) got no response from that because that is a ten minutes just to ten minutes presentation between or rather items in the writing develop session.

And the (Alan)'s prospective on that is the right communities that not very interested in non-technical teams but are quite specialized to the technical operational Internet sports quoting.

So that is a characteristics of that right meeting and those I think are also very good finding.

Man: Yes thanks yes and I think yes (Alan).

(Alan): I think that's right communities of technical communities very technical community. And ICANN is seen by that community as equity where people make business very political and very meant and they're not feeling very what can I say...they're not in just scope it is not in their scope in the in their interest.

Man: Sure and I don't think it's tailored in the material with experience as well to hit the right notes.

Then I'm sure we'll have some conversations about this (Malcolm) going forward.

But thanks for all the effort you have put into that. It's certainly days to pick it off in a way that we have done. And I'm sure it'll get easier into when we get the right message to the right target area as well.

It's interesting that the other some of the other constituencies to claim the stakeholder group we've seen a rapid rise in attendance in the intellectual property constituency not because they're interested in ICANN but they got

this state a set a few times don't get scared of what ICANN can do to them with the new gTLDs.

And the business communities really getting enhanced with brand representation for new gTLDs. For us I think the crunch comes later down the path when we get to the stage when the new gTLDs are actually going into the root and it starts to affect life's beating ways that may worry them a little that's something when you'll see more engagement here.

(Collin).

(Collin): Is there are there that you say special groups or are there associations are whatever special target that we want to reach by outreach or?

Man: Yes there are and that's one of the things that's been progressed in this group with (Alan) and Tony and (Akinori) are actually doing.

Do you want to join we'd be more than happy to.

Okay so aware that we're already ten minutes over and we've got some admin stuff that we just need to do with members.

I'd just like to propose here that we have the next ISP call and we'll obviously advertise it on the last week beginning the fifth of November.

Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: The very last question on Whois (RT), you know, because we have the matrix slightly amended and was send it on by Mikey...

Man: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: ...already. So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes that was something that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...if we could have got it in the meeting we would have done that but as we were pushing the time I didn't manage to do that.

The after the discussion in the CSG the metrics was changed and updated in I think at least three against three recommendations. And what I would ask is that Mikey circulates that and it has to be quick because the meeting the GNSO meeting is okay.

Man: Sorry so (unintelligible) it's already brilliant. Now what we'd like done ensure that ICANN forwarded...

Man: Right what I would ask is the meeting is tomorrow GNSO meeting correct?

Man: Yes.

Man: At what time?

Man: Afternoon two o'clock.

Man: So if we said that we need any comments back by ten o'clock tomorrow.

Man: No it's not that late, you know, it is depending it should be earlier because, you know,...

Man: Earlier.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...there'd be yes because (Brian) is the one who is going to provide that this council, you know,...

Man: Right.

Man: ...on the list.

Man: Well what we need is an opportunity we need an opportunity for anybody to comment on that and then just get it out.

So let's just say no comment it goes to the list by tomorrow morning.

Man: Okay good.

Man: And maybe someone could just flag that to the list.

That's the situation.

Man: Yes.

Man: No comments by tomorrow morning it goes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thanks. So we've got I would ask those who aren't members of the constituency but not you though.

Man: Yes you're a member.

Man: No he's not member but I want him to stay I've got a special task for him.

Man: I have something special my precious.

Man: Yes that's thanks for your attendance. Okay so all those who elect our members and what I was going to ask -- we need to kill the recording yes.

Thanks to all those who joined remotely and see you sometime Jaime if you're still there.

END